








Annex to MC Decision no. 41/09.01.2025

CORRIGENDUM

to the Applicant's Guide for the Open Call no.4 for the operations under PO 2, Priority 2 A greener region, Specific objective 2.4. Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience taking into account eco-system based approaches - climate change adaptation

No.	Applicant's Guide for the Open Call no.4 for the operations under PO 2, Priority 2 A greener region, Specific objective 2.4. Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience taking into account eco-system based approaches - climate change adaptation and its Annexes	REVISED Applicant's Guide for the Open Call no.4 for the operations under PO 2, Priority 2 A greener region, Specific objective 2.4. Promoting climate change adaptation and disaster risk prevention, resilience taking into account eco-system based approaches - climate change adaptation and its Annexes	Justification for the corrigendum
1.	Pg.67 For more explanation on filling in the Cost-Benefit Analysis please also see: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgen/studies/pdf/cba_guide.pdf	Pg.67 For more explanation on filling in the Cost-Benefit Analysis please also see: https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/studies/cba_guide.pdf https://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/policy/evaluations/guidance_en	Initial link is no longer available. For more explanation on filling in the Cost-Benefit Analysis we provide the new links.
2.	Pg.68 <u>Annex B2 to the Application Form - Feasibility studies/ equivalent technical documents or any other design document elaborated by the licenced designer</u> that contains description of construction works and Bill of Quantities. (...)	Pg.68 <u>Annex B2 to the Application Form - Feasibility studies/ equivalent technical documents or any other design document elaborated by the licenced designer</u> that contains description of construction works and Bill of Quantities. (...)	For consistency in wording and simplification of rules for submitting the application and the <u>Annex B2 to the Application Form</u> the text has been improved and reformulated.
	In order to evaluate the technical characteristics of an investment project, the applicants must annex	<i>The Feasibility Study or equivalent technical documents or any other design document</i>	

	<p>the above document to the application form. Its elaboration and approval must observe the national provisions in this matter.</p> <p>The Feasibility Study should not have been elaborated/ updated/ revised more than one year before the deadline for the present call for proposals (the document must bear the date of elaboration/revision). Feasibility Study should be submitted in English, as an annex to the application form and should be accompanied by the legal agreements and approvals according to national legislation in force.</p> <p>(...)</p>	<p><i>elaborated by the licenced designer that contains description of construction works and Bill of Quantities should bear the date of elaboration/revision and should provide accurate information at the time of application submission (to allow for proper evaluation of the application). In case such elements are not provided or information are not accurate, clarifications may be requested.</i></p> <p><i>Feasibility Study or equivalent technical documents or any other design document elaborated by the licenced designer that contains description of construction works and Bill of Quantities should be submitted in English, as an annex to the application form and should be accompanied by the legal agreements and approvals according to national legislation in force.</i></p> <p>(...)</p>	
<p>3.</p>	<p>Pg.69-70</p> <p> <u>Annex B5 to the Application Form - Environmental Impact Report or other environmental reports requested by the EIA procedure</u> - (if required by the legislation) and English translation (if issued in other language than English) will be annexed to the Application Form. In case the Environmental Impact Report or/and other environment reports requested by the legislation are not available, the applicants shall provide the</p>	<p>Pg.69-70</p> <p> <u>Annex B5 to the Application Form - Environmental Impact Report or other environmental reports requested by the EIA procedure</u> - (if required by the legislation) and English translation (if issued in other language than English) will be annexed to the Application Form. In case the Environmental Impact Report or/and other environment reports requested by the legislation are not</p>	<p>For more flexibility and for simplifying the submission of the Application Form and it's annexes the provisions concerning Annex B5 to the Application Form - Environmental Impact Report or other environmental reports requested by the EIA procedure have been improved to be more flexible.</p>

	<p>draft document launched in public consultation, according to the applicable legislation or evidence that the public consultation was initiated. In this case, the final EIR must be provided in the pre-contracting phase. In case the document is not provided, the project will not be contracted, and proposed for rejection.</p>	<p>available at the date of AF submission, the applicants shall provide the draft document launched in public consultation, according to the applicable legislation or evidence that the process of drafting the environmental report or of the public consultation it was initiated (any internal document, report, notes etc.). In this case, the final EIR or/and other environment reports requested by the legislation must be provided in the pre-contracting phase. In case the document is not provided, the project will not be contracted, and proposed for rejection.</p>	
<p>4.</p>	<p>Pg.70-71</p> <p>! The application shall be rejected (see Annex - A Evaluation grids) without any clarification and further analysis if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  The project does not have a cross-border character and impact;  The project does not contribute to the Programme objectives and indicators and are not in the scope of the types of actions included in the Programme.  If mandatory annexes/documents are not submitted together with the application, clarifications may be requested. The application shall be equally rejected from funding in case of failure to provide requested 	<p>Pg.70-71</p> <p>! <i>The application shall be rejected (see Annex - A Evaluation grids) without any clarification and further analysis if:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">  <i>The project does not have a cross-border character and impact;</i>  <i>The project does not contribute to the Programme objectives and indicators and are not in the scope of the types of actions included in the Programme.</i> <p>If mandatory annexes/documents are not submitted together with the application, clarifications may be requested. If the missing annexes/documents are not provided upon the</p>	<p>The text has been reorganized and simplified.</p> <p>Thus, the text regarding the possibilities of rejecting the application, without any clarification and further analysis, was separated from the text regarding the mandatory annexes/documents needed to be submitted together with the application form.</p> <p>Also, some provisions regarding the rejection of the application were eliminated in order to facilitate the submission of the mandatory documents, upon the</p>

	<p>annexes/documents upon the first request for clarifications. In addition, the mandatory annexes B must have signatures/issuance date before the application submission date (except for B4 - Environmental Agreement and B5, if in situations mentioned above). If clarifications are requested and the issuance/signature date is after the application submission date, these documents will not be accepted. Consequently, the assessors shall base their assessment on the information available at the time of submission.</p>	<p>first request during the clarification process, the application shall be assessed based on the information/documents available at the submission date and it may be rejected, if the criteria are not fulfilled.</p>	<p>occasion of the response to clarifications.</p>
5.	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 1 - Administrative Compliance and Eligibility Check</p> <p>Criterion 7 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)</p>	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 1 - Administrative Compliance and Eligibility Check</p> <p>Criterion 7 - eliminated</p> <p>The criteria in the grid are renumbered.</p>	<p>Following the revision of the text at pg.68 concerning <i>Annex B2 to the Application Form - Feasibility studies/ equivalent technical documents or any other design document elaborated by the licenced designer that contains description of construction works and Bill of Quantities</i> in the Evaluation Criteria Phase 1 - Administrative Compliance and Eligibility Check Criterion 7 is no more relevant and therefore criterion is eliminated from the evaluation grid.</p> <p>Consequently the criteria in the grid are renumbered.</p>
6.	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 1 - Administrative Compliance and Eligibility Check</p>	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 1 - Administrative Compliance and Eligibility Check</p>	<p>This criterion applies only for projects including investments in infrastructure with expected lifespan of at least 5 years. For other types of projects, the</p>

	<p>Criterion 24</p> <p>The project including investments in infrastructure with expected lifespan of at least 5 years climate proofing in the sense of climate adaptation & resilience has submitted the assessment of expected impacts of climate change, the partner declaration and the independent verification report.</p>	<p>becomes Criterion 23</p> <p>The project including investments in infrastructure with expected lifespan of at least 5 years climate proofing in the sense of climate adaptation & resilience has submitted the assessment of expected impacts of climate change as stated in Applicant's Guide. Or, if the project is not subject to this requirement, the climate proofing documentation does not need to be submitted.</p>	<p>criterion is not applicable. To support the evaluators' activity in the process of verifying the fulfilment of criterion 23, the text has been simplified.</p>
<p>7.</p>	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 2 - Quality assessment (technical and financial evaluation and state aid incidence assessment)</p> <p>Criterion 3.2</p> <p><i>Are the project outputs and results contributing to Programme indicators? Are they clearly identified? Is the target realistic and relevant, supported by a clear justification? Is there a logic connection between the outputs and results and the proposed activities?</i></p> <p>SO 2.4:</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 RCO84 - RCR104 - 2 - average and address RCO84 - RCR104 and RCO87 - RCR84 - 3 - good and address RCO26 - RCR35 and RCO84 - RCR104 or RCO87 - RCR84 - 4 - excellent and address all 3 pairs of indicators 	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 2 - Quality assessment (technical and financial evaluation and state aid incidence assessment)</p> <p>Criterion 3.2</p> <p><i>Are the project outputs and results contributing to Programme indicators? Are they clearly identified? Is the target realistic and relevant, supported by a clear justification? Is there a logic connection between the outputs and results and the proposed activities?</i></p> <p>SO 2.4:</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 RCO84 - RCR104 or only RCO26 - RCR35 - 2 - average and address RCO84 - RCR104 and RCO87 - RCR84 	<p>There was an omission in the grid leading to a miscorrelation with the Applicant Guide.</p> <p>It is obvious that applicants may also select exclusively the pair of indicators RCO26 - RCR35.</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 RCO26 - RCR35. Still, in order to avoid any risk of misinterpretation, the logical distinction is now clearly written and explained.</p>

		<p>- 3 - good and address RCO26 - RCR35 <i>as well as one of the following</i>: RCO84 - RCR104 or RCO87 - RCR84</p> <p>- 4 - excellent and address all 3 pairs of indicators</p>																					
8.	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 2 - Quality assessment (technical and financial evaluation and state aid incidence assessment)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="184 548 772 1430"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Maximum score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE (NB: if the total score is below 10, the AF will be rejected)</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT (NB: if the total score is below 10, the project will be rejected)</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(....)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points (NB: If the project receives below 35 points, the AF will be rejected)</td> <td>64</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Maximum score	TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE (NB: if the total score is below 10, the AF will be rejected)	20	TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT (NB: if the total score is below 10, the project will be rejected)	15	(....)		TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points (NB: If the project receives below 35 points, the AF will be rejected)	64	<p>Annex A Evaluation Grids to the Applicant's Guide - Evaluation Criteria Phase 2 - Quality assessment (technical and financial evaluation and state aid incidence assessment)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="898 581 1486 1268"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Maximum score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE</td> <td>20</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(....)</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points</td> <td>64</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Maximum score	TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE	20	TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT	15	(....)		TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points	64	<p>For simplifying the assessment process, in the grid for the Quality assessment, the Nota Bene - NB phrases in the rows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE - TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT - TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points <p>regarding the score at which the project is rejected, are removed.</p>
	Maximum score																						
TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE (NB: if the total score is below 10, the AF will be rejected)	20																						
TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT (NB: if the total score is below 10, the project will be rejected)	15																						
(....)																							
TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points (NB: If the project receives below 35 points, the AF will be rejected)	64																						
	Maximum score																						
TOTAL POINTS FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE	20																						
TOTAL POINTS FOR CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT	15																						
(....)																							
TOTAL POINTS for the STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA: PROJECT RELEVANCE points + CROSS BORDER COOPERATION CHARACTER AND IMPACT points + PROJECT INTERVENTION LOGIC points + PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE points + HORIZONTAL ISSUES points	64																						