

Annex to MC Decision no. 38/18.12.2024

Corrigendum of Annex A Evaluation grids
to the Applicant's Guide for the Open Call for the operations under PO 4,
Priority 3: An educated region, Specific Objective 4.2 - Improving equal access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing accessible infrastructure, including by fostering resilience for distance and on-line education and training

<p>Applicant's guide Call for the operations under PO 4, Priority 3: An educated region, Specific Objective 4.2 - Improving equal access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing accessible infrastructure, including by fostering resilience for distance and on-line education and training approved by MC Decision no 26/23.04.2023</p>	<p>Revised Applicant's guide Call for the operations under PO 4, Priority 3: An educated region, Specific Objective 4.2 - Improving equal access to inclusive and quality services in education, training and lifelong learning through developing accessible infrastructure, including by fostering resilience for distance and on-line education and training</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Justification for the corrigendum</p>
<p>Annex A - Evaluation grid - phase 1 - Administrative compliance and eligibility check</p> <p>Criterion 7</p> <p><i>The feasibility study/ Conceptual Design/work projects has been submitted (in English) and is elaborated or updated earlier than one year before the deadline for submission (for investment projects)</i></p>	<p>Annex A - Evaluation grid - phase 1 - Administrative compliance and eligibility check</p> <p>Criterion 7</p> <p><i>The feasibility study/ Conceptual Design/work project has been submitted (in English) and is elaborated or updated not earlier than one year before the deadline for submission (for investment projects)</i></p>	<p>Correction of a clerical error.</p> <p>The Applicant's Guide approved by MC Decision no. 26/23.04.2023 clearly sets at page 66 the conditions for applicants, specifying that deadline <u>should not have been elaborated/ updated/ revised more than one year before the deadline for the present call for proposals (...)</u>".</p> <p>Therefore, it is obvious that <i>Annex A Evaluation grid - phase 1 - Administrative compliance and eligibility check</i>, when presenting Criterion 7, contains a clerical error in the text.</p> <p>By this MC Decision, the clerical error within criterion 7 from the evaluation grid is rectified and the assessors will assess this criterion in conjunction with the Guide and the rectified criterion.</p>
<p>Annex A - Evaluation grid phase 2 Quality assessment</p>	<p>Annex A - Evaluation grid - phase 2 Quality assessment</p>	<p>There was an omission in the grid leading to a miscorrelation with the Applicant Guide.</p>

<p>Criterion 3.2</p> <p><i>2. Are the project outputs and results contributing to Programme indicators? Are they clearly identified?</i></p> <p>SO 4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 - not addressed at all or address exclusively RCO87 - RCR84; (NB: If 0 points are awarded for this criterion the AF will be rejected) • 1 - weak and addressing only RCO85 - RCR81 • 2 - average and address RCO85 - RCR81 and RCO87 - RCR84 • 3 - good and address PSO4 - PSR4 and RCO85 - RCR81 or RCO87 - RCR84 • 4 - excellent and address all 3 pairs of indicators 	<p>Criterion 3.2</p> <p><i>2. Are the project outputs and results contributing to Programme indicators? Are they clearly identified?</i></p> <p>SO 4.2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 - not addressed at all or address exclusively RCO87 - RCR84; (NB: If 0 points are awarded for this criterion the AF will be rejected) • 1 - weak and addressing only RCO85 - RCR81 <u>or only PSO4 - PSR4</u> • 2 - average and address RCO85 - RCR81 and RCO87 - RCR84 • 3 - good and address PSO4 - PSR4 <u>as well as one of the following:</u> RCO85 - RCR81 or RCO87 - RCR84 • 4 - excellent and address all 3 pairs of indicators 	<p>It is obvious that applicants may also select exclusively the pair of indicators PSO4 - PSR4.</p> <p>Equally, it is necessary to make an explicit logical distinction between conjunctions “and” - “or”. The distinction was implicit, based on the logic of awarding 3 points for selecting 2 pairs of indicators, including the pair PSO4 - PSR4. Still, in order to avoid any risk of misinterpretation, the logical distinction is now clearly written and explained.</p>
---	--	--