|  |
| --- |
| **Annex B**  **ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE AND ELIGIBILITY CHECK** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crt. no** | **Criteria** |  | **Sub-criteria** | **Yes** | **No** | **NA** | **Reference** |
|  |  |  | **ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE** |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Application admissibility | A1 | The Application Form has been submitted in due time (the document is registered at the Joint Secretariat or post-stamped before the deadline) |  |  |  |  |
| A2 | The identification details are clearly stated on the outside of the sealed package |  |  |  |  |
| A3 | One original hard-copy paper version, one paper duplicate and one electronic version of the completed application form and annexes are provided in sealed package |  |  |  |  |
| A4 | The annexes to the application form are signed and stamped by the legal representative of the lead beneficiary or of the beneficiary to which the annex refers / or by an empowered person (a letter of empowerment will be attached) wherever this is requested by the standard form. |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | A5 | The correct standard templates are used for the Application Form and its annexes. In case the standard format of the budget is changed, the application will be rejected without requesting any clarifications. |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | The Application Form and its annexes are filled-in in English | A6 | All sections of the Application Form are filled-in in English, by computer |  |  |  |  |
| A7 | All annexes to the Application Form are submitted in English; annexes issued by third parties (if the case) in other language than English are accompanied by their English translation |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | The integrity of the Application form | A8 | No more than 3 annexes to the Application Form are missing  In case any of the Annexes A.7, A.8, A.9 is missing in the initial package for investment projects, the application is rejected. |  |  |  |  |
| In case one “No” is checked for the Administrative Compliance criteria above, the assessment of the Application Form will stop at this stage and the project will be proposed for rejection. | | | | | | | |
| **Crt. no** | **Criteria** |  | **Sub-criteria** | **Yes** | **No** | **NA** | **Reference** |
|  |  |  | **ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA** |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | The partnership is eligible | E1 | A Lead Beneficiary is appointed among the project partners |  |  |  | AF 1.1, 1.3 |
| E2 | At least one beneficiary from each side of the border is involved |  |  |  | AF 1.3  Annex A.6 |
| E3 | The total number of beneficiaries (including Lead Beneficiary) is maximum 5 |  |  |  | AF 1.1, 1.3  Annex A.6 |
| E4 | Each beneficiary signed a partnership declaration annexed to the Application Form |  |  |  | AF Annex A.6 |
| E5 | If at least two beneficiaries previously participated in projects financed by Ro-Bg Programme 2007-2013 and their weighted average financial execution taking into consideration the value of their budgets was below 50%, than the current project will not be eligible |  | ! |  | AF 1.3  CBC ROBG 2007-2013  www.cbcromaniabulgaria.eu |
| 2 | All project beneficiaries are eligible | E6 | All beneficiaries fulfill the criteria for type of institutions set out in the Applicant Guide, including: they are Romanian or Bulgarian non-profit making bodies/organisations, non-governmental organisations (associations or foundations), public sector operators, local/regional/ national authorities legally established according to the national legislation of the state on whose territory they are located |  |  |  | AF 1.3; Annex A.2, A.4 |
| E7 | All beneficiaries (including the Lead Beneficiary) fulfill the location criteria set out in section II.2.i of the Applicant Guide |  |  |  | AF 1.3; Annex A.2 |
| E8 | No beneficiary is in one of the situations presented in section II.2.i(2) of the Applicant’s Guide |  |  |  | Annex A.4, A.5 |
| E9 | The beneficiary/ies are the owner/s of the land/building involved in the infrastructure project or they got the land in concession/ administration/rent/loan as set out in section II.2.i(1) of the Applicant Guide and the owner has given its written agreement saying that the applicant may perform the investment |  |  |  | AF 1.3, 2.3; Annexes A.2, A.8, A.9 |
| E10 | The beneficiaries are the entities entitled to take action in the field/fields addressed by the project. |  |  |  | AF 1.3; Annex A.2, A.4 |
| E11 | The beneficiaries have the capacity to ensure their own contribution and the financing for non-eligible expenditures of the project; they must also have the capacity to ensure the temporary availability of funds until they are reimbursed by the programme |  |  |  | Annex A.5 |
| E12 | No beneficiary has benefited of financing support from public funds in the past 5 years before the deadline for submitting the applications under this call for proposals for the same project in terms of objectives, activities and results (for infrastructure projects, this provision refers to the same infrastructure/segment of infrastructure) |  |  |  | AF 1.3, 3.3; Annexes; CBC ROBG 2007-2013 |
| 3 | Project fulfils minimum requirements for eligibility of actions | E13 | The project is in line with a specific objective stipulated in the Applicant’s Guide for the respective call for proposals |  |  |  | AF 2.3 |
| E14 | The implementation period and total project eligible budget don’t exceed the maximum project durations and values indicated in the Applicant’s Guide for the respective priority axis/specific objective/type of project. |  |  |  | AF 1.1, 2.3, 3 |
| E15 | The project was not physically completed or fully implemented before the application for funding under the programme |  |  |  | AF 2.3, 3.3, 1.3; Annexes |
| E16 | No activity included in the project was part of an operation which has been or should have been subject to a procedure of recovery in accordance with Article 71 CPR following the relocation of a productive activity outside the programme area |  |  |  | AF 2.3; 3.3 Annexes |
| E17 | The project has a clear contribution to at least one output indicator and one result indicator of the Programme for the respective priority axis (a clear quantification is demonstrated in case of quantifiable indicators) |  |  |  | All sections within the Application Form |
| E18 | The project activities are located in the eligible area or, in case not, duly justifications are provided in the Application Form |  |  |  | AF 2.3 |
| E19 | At least 3 of the cooperation criteria are clearly fulfilled (mandatory cooperation in development and implementation of the project + one by choice from staff or financing) |  |  |  | AF 2.3, 3.1, Annexes |
| E20 | The activities included in the project do not represent state aid |  |  |  | AF 2.3 |
| 4 | Financial admissibility | E21 | The budget of activities to be carried out outside the programme area (if the case) is not over the limits set in the Applicant’s Guide |  |  |  | AF 2.3 |
| E22 | The value of the financial support requested is in line with the limits indicated in the Applicant’s Guide for the respective priority axis/specific objective/type of project |  |  |  | AF 3.1 |
| E23 | The threshold for expenditures incurred between 1st of January 2014 and submission of the application form is observed and is applied to the correct calculation basis |  |  |  | AF 3.1 |
| E24 | The flat rates used for Staff and Office and administrative are in the limits set in the Applicant’s Guide for the respective type of project and are applied to the correct calculation basis. |  |  |  | AF 3.1 |
| E25 | The percentage of the financial support requested from ERDF and state budgets are within the limits indicated in the Applicant’s Guide |  |  |  | AF 3.1 |
| In case one “No” is checked for E1-E4 or E6-E25, or in case “Yes” is checked for E5, the assessment of the Application Form will stop at this stage and the project will be proposed for rejection. | | | | | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **QUALITY / TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Crt no** | **Criteria** |  | | **Sub-criteria** | **Maximum  Score** | **Reference** |
| **Consistency with the Programme and other strategic documents and CBC impact** | | | | | **33** |  |
| **1** | **To what extent is the project expected to contribute to the implementation of EU, national, regional and local development strategies or other programmes** | | | | **6** |  |
|  |  | Q1 | | Does the project contribute to the implementation and achievement of proposed results of the EU 2020 strategy? | 1 | AF 2.6.1 |
|  |  | Q2 | | Does the project contribute to the implementation of the Danube strategy? | 2 | AF 2.6.1 |
|  |  | Q3 | | Are the project objectives/implementing priorities in line with other EU, national, regional, local strategy or programmes? | 1 | AF 2.6.1 |
|  |  | Q4 | | Is the project capitalizing the results of another EU-funded project? | 1 | AF 2.6.2 |
|  |  | Q5 | | Is the project planning to have synergies (complementarities) with implemented/ongoing projects (if relevant) carried out under this or other EU-funded programmes? | 1 | AF 2.6.2 |
| **2** | **To what extent is the project expected to provide a significant contribution to the results of the priority axis/specific objective of the programme** | | | | **14** |  |
|  |  | Q6 | | To what extent is the project contributing to the accomplishment of at least one of the outputs of the programme priority axis/specific objective?   * 7 points in case considerable contribution to more than one indicator exists * 6 points in case considerable contribution to one indicator exists * 4 points in case there is there is a proportionate contribution (considering also the budget) exists * 0 points for other cases | 7 | AF 2.4, 2.3;  Programme indicators |
|  |  | Q7 | | To what extent is the project contributing to the accomplishment of the results of the programme priority axis/specific objective   * 7 points in case considerable contribution to one indicator exists * 4 points in case a proportionate contribution (considering also the budget exists * 0 points for other cases   **In case no contribution to the accomplishment of a result indicator is demonstrated in the application form, the project is proposed for rejection!** | 7 | AF 2.2, 2.3;  Programme indicators |
| **3** | **Does the project show a strong cross border character?** | | | | **10** |  |
|  |  | Q8 | | Are the project beneficiaries accomplishing all 4 cooperation criteria?   * if 3 cooperation criteria are fulfilled 3 points are granted | 4 | AF 2.3, 3.1; |
|  |  | Q9 | | Is the project generating a clear and tangible cross-border impact?   * 6 points in case a common challenge is widely addressed in the programme area by the project and it is proven that the cross-border approach is the best way of tackling it * 3 points in case a common challenge is addressed in the programme area by the project and it is duly justified that the cross-border approach is the best way of tackling it * 1 point in case a common challenge is addressed in the programme area and some cross-border impact is generated | 6 | AF 2.3, 2.1, 1.2 |
| **4** | **To what extent is the project proposing specific elements of added value for the cross-border area as a whole in promotion of non-discrimination, equality between men and women and sustainable development, environmental protection** | | | | **3** |  |
|  |  | Q10 | | Is the project proposing specific measures to contribute to the promotion of equal opportunities and non-discrimination?   * 1 points if at least one specific measure is foreseen * 0 points if only neutral (minimum required by law) specific measures are foreseen | 1 | AF 2.7, 2.3 |
|  |  | Q11 | | Is the project proposing specific measures to contribute to the promotion of equality between men and women?   * 1 points if at least one specific measure is foreseen * 0 points if only neutral (minimum required by law) specific measures are foreseen | 1 | AF 2.7, 2.3 |
|  |  | Q12 | | Is the project proposing specific measures to contribute to the promotion of sustainable development?   * 1 point if at least one specific measure is foreseen * 0 points if only neutral (minimum required by law) specific measures are foreseen | 1 | AF 2.7, 2.3 |
| **Operational capacity / Project Maturity** | | | | | **42** |  |
| **5** | **Is the partnership composition well justified and able to contribute to the implementation of the project?** | | | | **10** |  |
|  |  | Q13 | | Did the project beneficiaries implemented projects financed from EU funds before?   * 3 points in case this partnership previously implemented at least another EU project * 2 points in case all project beneficiaries have previously implemented at least another EU project * 1 point in case at least one of the partners implemented at least one project financed by EU funds before * 0 points otherwise | 3 | AF 1.3 |
|  |  | Q14 | | Do the project beneficiaries have the necessary experience in the field addressed by the project?   * 2 points in case there are implemented projects/actions in the field addressed by the project by most of the beneficiaries * 1 point in case there are implemented projects/actions in the field addressed by the project by at least one of the beneficiaries * 0 points in case no beneficiary has implemented projects/actions in the field addressed by the project | 2 | AF 1.3 |
|  |  | Q15 | | Do the project beneficiaries have the necessary capacity in order to be able to implement the project – the allocated human and material resources are necessary and in line with the proposed activities?   * 1 point in case resources each beneficiary is allocating for project implementation are necessary and in line with the proposed activities * 0 points in case most of the resources beneficiaries are allocating for the project are neither necessary nor in line with the proposed activities **(Project is proposed for rejection)** | 1 | AF 1.3, 2.3 |
|  |  | Q16 | | All beneficiaries involved in the partnership (including the Lead Beneficiary) implemented financing contracts in the context of ROBG CBC Programme 2007-2013 and had with financing contracts implemented in the context of ROBG CBC Programme 2007-2013 (if the case) had a good financial execution rate for each such contract (if the case)   * 4 points in case all beneficiaries involved in the partnership have implemented contracts (financed via the ROBG Programme) where they had at least 70% financial execution (considering their own budget) * - 0 points otherwise | 4 | AF 1.3  CBC ROBG 2007-2013 |
| **6** | **Is the project conceptual approach and action plan well designed and realistic?** | | | | **19** |  |
|  |  | Q17 | | Is there a logical link (correlation) between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results?   * 8 points in case there is a logical link between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results * 0 points in case there is no logical link between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results **(Project is proposed for rejection)** | 8 | AF 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1 |
|  |  | Q18 | | Are the project activities clearly described, realistic and achievable? The proposal is realistic and consistent from a technical point of view? | 8 | AF 2.3, 2.1  Annex A.9 |
|  |  | Q19 | | Do the activities follow a logical time-sequence? | 3 | AF 2.3 |
| **7** | **Is the communication / dissemination of project results clearly addressed?** | | | | **2** |  |
|  |  | Q20 | | Are the proposed information and publicity activities sufficient in order to be able to achieve dissemination of project results and visibility among target groups? | 1 | AF 2.3, 2.5 |
|  |  | Q21 | | Are all the proposed information and publicity activities necessary? Are the proposed information and publicity activities proportional with project activities as a whole? | 1 | AF 2.3, 2.5 |
| **8** | **Are project deliverables clearly defined and are the assumptions on their use realistic?** | | | | **11** |  |
|  |  | Q22 | | Are the project results realistic? | 4 | AF 2.2, 2.3 |
|  |  | Q23 | | Are the target groups clear and correctly correlated with the proposed activities? | 2 | AF 2.3, 2.5 |
|  |  | Q24 | | Are target groups needs properly tackled by the project? | 3 | AF 2.3, 2.5 |
|  |  | Q25 | | Do the beneficiaries have a clear and feasible plan for the sustainability of project results and the capacity to implement it?   * 2 points in case the continuation of some project activities is well described and feasible * 0 points in case no project activity will be continued after the EU financing will cease **(Project is proposed for rejection)** | 2 | AF 4 |
| **Value for money** | | | | | **25** |  |
| **9** | **Does the requested amount of the grant represent value for money?** | | | | **25** |  |
|  |  | Q26 | Is the proposed project budget justified, directly connected and proportionally correlated with what is described in the project activities?   * 25 points in case there is a full correlation between activities and budget and the budget is very well justified * 18 points in case a strong correlation between activities and budget exists and the budget and activities are directly connected and the budget is well justified * 11 points in case sufficient correlation between activities and budget exists and the budget is sufficiently justified * 6 points in case there is a proposal to reduce the total budget of the application of minimum 30 % and maximum 50% * 0 points in case the activities and the budget are not correlated or the budget is proposed to be reduced more than 50% of the initial proposal   **Project is proposed for rejection if insufficient connection between project budget and activities.** | | 25 | AF 2.3, 3.1, Annex A.7, A.9  Annexes  Annex C of Applicant Guide (Ceilings for expenditure) /price offers |

! The scores included in the evaluation grid are maximum values. Evaluators may grant intermediary values, if applicable.