



MINISTRY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION



ROMANIA

ROMANIA - BULGARIA



Interreg 

MINISTRY OF REGIONAL
DEVELOPMENT AND
PUBLIC WORKS



DECISION no. 2
of 24th of April 2018

Regarding the complaints lodged against the Monitoring Committee Decision no. 72 of 22nd of March 2018, approving the List of approved and rejected projects submitted under the third call for proposals for the Interreg V-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme - deadline 23rd of October 2017,

Having regard to the following:

- Monitoring Committee Decision no. 51 of 2nd of August 2017 approving the Complaint Panel for the Eols and full applications submitted under the 3rd call for proposals, priority axes 1-3, Interreg V-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme, step 1 and 2,
- The Complaint Procedure of Interreg V-A Romania-Bulgaria,

the Complaint Panel of Interreg V-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme has adopted this:

DECISION

Article 1. The present document rejects the complaint lodged by the Association "Institute for Territorial Innovations and Cooperation-ITIC", lead beneficiary of the project "Active art for attractive tourism" - code 368, selected without financial allocation, and registered by CBC ROC with the number 6171/29.03.2016, appealing the score received at technical and financial evaluation.

Article 2. The applicant provided a self-assessment of the application. For 13 out of the 23 criteria the score is the same with the ones granted by the assessors. For one, Q 12, the score is lower than the one granted by the assessors. For 8 (eight), the score is higher:

- a) Q4 - 10 points (maximum) in self-assessment vs. 5 points granted. The complaint mentions contribution to two indicators (I9 and I10), while the application form just one, with a contribution of only 2.33% of the target. The information in the application form is the one taken into consideration. Analyzing also the provisions of the scoring from the Assessor's Guide (10 points were to be granted for excellent evidence and

measurement of the project contribution to the accomplishment of at least two of the outputs while 5-6 points were to be granted for good evidence and measurement of the project contribution to the accomplishment of at least one of the outputs), the Complaint Panel rejects the complaint for this criterion.

- b) Q 7 - 2 points (maximum) in self-assessment vs. 1 point granted. 2 points were to be granted for strong cross border impact (a wider joint problem tackled with a joint solution which brings benefit to the border area). The information in the application form is quite general and lacks relevant data. The tourism fluctuations are mentioned as problem and an "art and tourism festival" is presented as an innovative solution (although the Programme already finances a number of similar projects). Therefore, the Complaint Panel rejects the complaint for this criterion.
- c) Q 10 - 1 points (maximum to be granted for a specific measure) in self-assessment vs. 0 points granted. The complaint argues that the activities and result are in themselves a specific measure which contributes to sustainable development. The fact remains that no specific measure was proposed. The Complaint Panel rejects the complaint for this criterion.
- d) Q 12 - 1 point in self-assessment vs. 2 points granted. The Complaint lodged by the Lead Beneficiary states that only Beneficiary 2 has experience in the field. In the application form the Lead Beneficiary mentioned that he also has the relevant experience in the field addressed by the project. Considering the principle "non reformation in pejus", the score is maintained as granted by the assessors.
- e) Q 14 - 15 points (maximum to be granted for strong and convincing logical link between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results) in self-assessment vs. 9.5 points granted. The project proposes an art and tourism product. However, there is no clear description of the tourism product since "a study of potential application of art & culture tourist product and services in the CBC region" is to be developed within the project. Moreover, the project itself will finance just a pilot project (due date Month 16 out of 18 of implementation) and the actual results will be generated 5 years after completion. Even if the Programme would in fact be able to grant the financial allocation (which is not currently available) and contract this project by the end of the year, the project would be finalized in 2020. The actual results will be available at the end of 2025, while the Programme has to achieve its targets by the latest 2023. Considering all of the above as well as the principle "non reformation in pejus", the complaint for this criterion is rejected.
- a) Q15 - 15 points (maximum to be granted for the project being realistic and consistent from a technical point of view, its activities are clearly described, realistic and achievable) in self-assessment vs. 6.5 points granted. From the considerations mentioned above (the project will not

reach its results throughout the lifetime of the Programme granting the financing), the complaint for this criterion is rejected.

- b) Q16 - 5 points (maximum to be granted for the project excellent logical time sequence) in self-assessment vs. 4 points granted. From the considerations mentioned above (the project will not reach its results throughout the lifetime of the Programme granting the financing) while the pilot project is to be finalized nearly at the end of the implementation period, the complaint for this criterion is rejected.
- c) Q16 - 10 points (maximum to be granted for the project results can be achieved and measured with the proposed activities scope, schedule and budget and these are proven by detailed and coherent descriptions) in self-assessment vs. 6 points granted. From the considerations mentioned above (the project will not reach its results throughout the lifetime of the Programme granting the financing) while the pilot project is to be finalized nearly at the end of the implementation period, the score granted is maintained ("non reformation in pejus")
- d) Q23 - 10 points (maximum to be granted for full correlation between activities and budget and the budget is very well justified) in self-assessment vs. 8.5 points granted. Clarifications on the budget were requested and only partially provided therefore the appeal is rejected.

Article 3. The decision of the Complaint Panel is final, binding to all parties and not subject of any further complaint proceedings within the Programme.

Signed by

Members of the Complaint Panel

Member 1 of Complaint Panel - Managing Authority representative, Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration, Romania

Signature



Member 2 of Complaint Panel - National Authority representative, Ministry of Regional Administration and Public Works, Bulgaria

Signature



Member 3 of Complaint Panel - External expert (from the Evaluation Unit), Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration, Romania

Signature



1

2

3

4
