Belgrade 21 July 2015

**SUMMARY OF INNOVATIONS[[1]](#footnote-1)**

**Application Package CBC IPA II - Proposal**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Guidelines for applicants** | |
| General | * The preferred option is a restricted call for proposals * All references to the EDF have been deleted * The term ‘proposal’ has been replaced by the term ‘concept note’ or ‘application’, as required * Instructions containing ‘may not’ have been replaced by ‘must not’ * Under direct management, the call, its frequently asked questions and answers, and the announcement of information sessions will be published in the following websites: EuropeAid’s, the CA’s and the programme’s * We have assumed that the minimum EU grant for any programme objective will exceed €60,000 in order to avoid having different standards for low value grants |
| Notice | * Restricted call for proposals with submission of documents in only two phases: (i) concept notes and (ii) full application plus supporting documents |
| Background | * Reference to the embedment of the call into the macro-regional strategies: The EU Strategy for the Danube Region and the EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region. |
| Objective of the programme and priority issues | * Long and elaborated reference to the mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues |
| Financial allocation provided by the CA | * Competition of applications according to the programme objective addressed or, in other words, the idea is that the applications will compete with each other in separate lots * There will be possible to increase the funding available for the call when there is a large number of high quality applications * Reference to a threshold for the funding of applications (minimum 70 points as score) * Possibility of differentiating the maximum and minimum amounts of EU financing per lot * Possibility of co-financing (up to 15%) provided by the Ministry of Local Self-Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia * Suspensive clause on the signature of the Financing Agreements |
| Rules of the call | * Introduction of a reference to the article 18(2) of the Framework Agreements where the European Commission by Sectoral or Financing Agreements may provide guidance as to the adaptation of procedures and standard documents of PRAG. |
| Eligibility of applicants | * Reference to the role of Lead Beneficiary for Coordinator in line with the provisions of the FWA * In the CBC spirit, obligation to have a co-applicant from the other side of the border * Limited number of co-applicants (maximum 5) * Reference to the provisions of the FWA on the selection of operations: cooperation criteria * Exclusion of any legal relation between the applicant and the co-applicants (e.g. mother or sister organisations) * Footnote on the nationality mix that every set of applicant and co-applicants must meet |
| Eligible actions | * In line with the provisions of the FWA, definition of a CBC operation * Only one call objective should be selected in the application form * Possibility of differentiating the duration of operations in relation to the specific objective of the programme targeted by the application * Liaison between the programme indicators and the indicators displayed in the project application * Possibility of revising indicators in those applications which have been awarded a grant prior to contract signature * As example of eligible activities, the guidelines take from the programme document by result the non-exhaustive list of possible activities * Enlarged list of ineligible actions and footnote on ‘revenue’ * Financial support to third parties is not proposed as an option for CBC programmes * Total freedom for the applicants, co-applicants and affiliated entities to establish alliances and run in different applications but no legal entity will receive more than one grant per specific objective |
| Eligibility of costs | * Reference to the legal framework * Acceptance of the salaries of civil servants and other employees of the public sector as co-financing with limitations regarding additional remuneration to the standard salary rates and the total amount of these salaries in relation to the co-financing of the applicant and co-applicants * Reminder on the expenditure verification * The contributions in-kind are ineligible costs * List of ineligible costs based on the provisions of the IPA II IR and some items based on the Guidelines template and experience from other calls |
| Concept note content | * The difference in value of the EU-contribution from a concept note phase to a full application phase is only important if this exceeds in the second phase more than 20% of the requested grant in the first phase * Limits to new contributions from donors during the implementation of the action * Explanation of the term ‘clarification’ |
| Further information about concept notes | * Obligation of holding information sessions |
| Full application forms | * Detail list of what cannot be changed between the concept note and full application * Supporting documents will be submitted along with the full application form |
| Where and how to send full application forms | * The supporting documents need to be submitted in one copy and they don’t need to be submitted in electronic format |
| Evaluation and selection of applications | * Irrespective of the evaluation phase, an application can be rejected at any moment when the applicants or the action are ineligible |
| Evaluation grid for concept notes | * Reformulation of the questions 1.1. & 1.2. in order to improve their wording and purpose * The question 1.2 can receive an additional bonus of 5 points if the application is supported by a Thematic Steering Group of any of the EU Strategies for the Danube Region or for the Adriatic and Ionian Region * In question 1.4. indigenous people have been removed and ‘children’s rights, democratic standards and good governance’ introduced * Reformulation of the questions 2.1. & 2.2. in order to improve their wording and purpose, including a reference to projects having works * Reference to the lots in the evaluation of concept notes |
| Evaluation grid for full applications | * Reformulation of question 1.3 in line with the information which must be presented in the application form * The maximum score in section 3 of the evaluation grid has increased by 5 points whereas the maximum score in section 5 has decreased by 5 points in order to make prevail the applications with genuine CBC dimension (question 3.4) * Reformulation of the questions 3.1. & 3.3. in order to improve their wording and purpose * Footnote on question 3.1. in order to bring the attention of the evaluator or assessor to the maturity of potential works to be undertaken in the action * Reformulation of the question 4.1. in order to improve its wording and purpose * Provision of guidance for evaluators or assessors on how to score the questions 1.1., 1.2., 1.3. & 1.4. of this grid |
| Submission of supporting documents | * Reference to the certificate or letter of support that the applicants must submit with the concept note if they want to receive a bonus of points for the assessment of relevance at step 1 of the evaluation * Most modifications in the standard text of the section are related to the fact that these documents are required to be submitted along with the full application form * Requirements for operations including the execution of works |
| Content of the decision | * Given the scarce information on complaints to the Contracting Authority under the section 2.15.1 of the PRAG, this section of the GfA contains some useful hints in order to speed up the handling of complaints |
| Indicative timetable | * The changes relate to the submission of supporting documents along with the full application form |
| Conditions for implementation | * The recommendation to formalize the relations of project partners by the signature of a partnership agreement is made. |
| List of annexes | * Inclusion of a model detailed breakdown of expenditure with the reports of the grant contract |
|  | |
| **Application Form** | |
| General | * Complete editing of the document, introducing ‘squares’ to tick off, page brakes, section in horizontal land scape, etc. |
| Concept note | * Only the Part A of the application form must be submitted at this stage * Change in the proposed font size (from 10 to 11) * Change in the maximum number of pages (from 5 to 7 or 8 if there are works) * The table for the summary of the action has much more detail in the instructions displayed on the left hand side cells * In the section dealing with the relevance, the applicants are asked for justification of the link between their objectives and those of the call, as well as their objectives and those of the EU macro-regional strategies where appropriate * Obligation of describing the relevance of the action to any specific requirement stated in the Guidelines for the call, e.g. local ownership, programme indicators, cross-border criteria, etc. (for instance, see section 2.1.4 of the GfA) * Transfer of the questions related to the synergies with other actions or programmes from the concept note phase to the full application phase (methodology) * The question on the value-added aspects has been harmonised with the criteria for cross-cutting issues in the guidelines for applicants * An additional page is provided for the explanation on the maturity and feasibility of works as part of the action |
| Check list for the concept note | * Removal of the table on administrative data since this information is provided in the cover pages of the application which must be submitted along with the text of the concept note * Introduction of one additional question for the administrative assessment of the action and three additional question for the assessment of the eligibility of the action |
| Full application | * The table on general information has more entries in order to be able to easily compare the summary table of the concept note with this table of the full application * In the section dealing with the description of the action, there is a clear emphasis in the definition of indicators * Reference to a table on procurement, the use of equipment, vehicles and supplies by the end of the action * Reference to the projects including works * Recommendation of the use of a table to describe the project activities * Reference to procedures for internal monitoring * Possibility to include a communication plan |
| Applicant’s, co-applicants’ and affiliated entities’ experience | * Record for the last five years instead of the last three years |
| Applicant’s profile | * More clarification provided on the distinction of public and private entities in footnote 31. |
| Capacity to manage and implement actions for the applicant, co-applicants and affiliated entities | * Record for the last five years instead of the last seven years * The table on geographical experience has been deleted * The table with the cross-reference experience by sector and geographical area has been deleted |
| Identity and profile of co-applicants | * Improvement of the table with legal data of the entity |
| Checklist for the full application | * Removal of the table on administrative data since this information is provided in the cover pages of the concept note and then the full application which must be submitted along with the text of the full application * Introduction of four additional questions for the assessment of the administrative compliance and the eligibility of the action, including one dealing with the supporting documents of operations having the execution of works |
| Declaration by the Applicant | * One new bullet point on the role of the applicant as Lead Beneficiary in line with the provisions of the article 71.3 of the FWA |
| Principles of good partnership | * Totally new section. Please note that the declaration of the applicant, the mandate of co-applicants and the statements of the affiliated entities refer to the principles of good partnership but these are not enclosed in the standard application form. |
| Assessment grid for the full application form | * Thorough editing and addition of the supporting documents for operations including works. |
|  | |
| **Budget of the action** | |
| Spreadsheet ‘Budget’ | * Addition of entries in the header * More instructions under footnote no. 2 * Advice of using whole numbers under footnote no. 3 * Elaboration with an example on how part-time should be reflected in the number of units for staff * Definition of who is and who is not staff * Under the footnote no. 6 there is advice on the use of flat-rates per kilometer for transportation by private means * Footnote 7 expanded to explain when the costs of office rent and office utilities are acceptable * Footnote 8 refers to consultants and expenditure verification and request justification for global sums. * Expectations of the contracting authority in footnote 10 * Footnote 12: contributions in-kind are not eligible * Some additional recommendations on the budget heading ‘Other’, the budget headings 12 & 13, the contingency reserve and the indirect costs. |
| Spreadsheet ‘Expected sources of funding’ | * The co-applicants can also contribute to finance the action |
|  | |
| **Logical Framework Matrix** | * General editing with reference to the baseline data for indicators and proposal for having only one overall and one specific objective and link them to programme objectives |
|  | |
| **Special Conditions of Grant Contracts** | * In Article 5.1 we have opened the possibility to include other bodies as recipients of reports * In Article 6.1 as part of the annex 1 of the contract, there will also be the signed mandate(s) for co-applicants and affiliated entities’ statements, as well as the principles of good partnership * Please see footnote no. 2 related to Article 7 regarding the deadline for the submission of the final report * In Article 7 there is a reference to ineligible costs as stipulated in the IPA II Implementing Regulation |
|  | |
| **Model Reports** | |
| Interim narrative report | * Table to simplify the executive summary of the action * Different sections to report on results achieved and activities implemented with the recommendation of a table as format for both results and activities * Obligation to report on all sorts of procurement procedures irrespective of their value |
| Final narrative report | * Table to simplify the executive summary of the action * Different sections to report on results achieved and activities implemented with the recommendation of a table as format for both results and activities * Addition of two questions in the section on sustainability (one of them has been transferred from the section dealing with monitoring) * Obligation to report on all sorts of procurement procedures irrespective of their value * Introduction of a section on simplified costs option |
| Financial reports | * General editing * They have as an appendix a model detailed breakdown of expenditure * Introduction of the contract number, title of the action and implementation period of the contract in every spreadsheet * Introduction of the signature of the Coordinator/Lead Beneficiary in every spreadsheet * The list of pending payments in the last spreadsheet will be comprehensive and not only limited to those above €500 |

1. All changes are inspired by the wish to take stock of the recommendations collected by the CBIB+ Project Team over the last 2 and a half years in Regional Forums, training events, programme specific workshops and the IPA II programming exercise, as well as to ensure higher levels of transparency and efficiency in the evaluation process. This stems from the possibility granted in Financing Agreements to adapt the procedures and standard documents laid down and published by the European Commission for the award of procurement and grant contracts in external actions to the specific case of cross-border cooperation. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)