In order to be administratively compliant and eligible, any project submitted under the call must meet the requirements set in the *Guidelines for grant applicants* and receive a “YES” to all the questions/criteria from the cheklist. Otherwise, it shall be rejected and not considered for further evaluation.

In case situations leading to rejection occur, they must be carefully analyzed by the internal assessors and the PSC, and referred to the provisions of the *Guidelines for applicants* and of the Manual. Reasons substantiating the project rejection must be explained in the checklists and also in the Evaluation Report. They are to be indicated in the notifications sent to the projects rejected at the end of this step.

In case that full and objective checking of a project cannot be performed due to missing or incomplete documents, following PSC decision, letter for request of clarifications may be sent to the applicant, duly considering that such request cannot improve or modify the project content. Provision of missing or uncompliant documents shall not be considered as improvements to a project.

Eligibility requirements are checked during all steps of evaluation and in case they are not met, the project may be rejected at any time.

The application package includes the Application Form, the budget, annexes to the budget, Declaration by the Applicant, Partnership Statements, and supporting documents.

In case that information lacks consistency in different parts of the application package, data provided in documents signed by the legal representatives shall prevail over the data inserted into the application form. In case of inconsistencies between different parts of the Applicvation Form, information leading to the most favourable decision for the project will be considered.

**Reasons for project rejection**

1. The application package/clarifications provided at PSC request is/are not uploaded into EMS-ENI and not sent in hard-copy version until the deadlines.
2. The application package is received in hard-copy version later than 30 calendar days after the deadline and the Evaluation Report (step 1) is finalized by PSC.
3. The hard-copy version of the application package does not bear the Project Registration Number given by EMS-ENI, or the number marked on the envelope cannot be retrieved into EMS-ENI.
4. In case of clarifications provided by the applicant, after opening the envelope containing the hard-copy version of the clarifications, the Project Registration Number is not mentioned in the submission letter or it cannot be retrieved into EMS-ENI system.
5. Another template of the Application Form and/or annexes is used, different from that/those provided by the call.
6. The Application Form uploaded into EMS-ENI is partially filled in i.e. shows blank parts, chapters, sections, paragraphs, or it displays error alerts given by the system that can only be corrected by inserting new text or information.
7. The Application Form uploaded into EMS-ENI is fully or partially in national language and not in English.
8. All the annexes uploaded into EMS-ENI and accompanying the Application Form are in national language and not in English.
9. A category of annexes is completely missing (has not been uploaded into EMS-ENI neither by the applicant, nor by his partners):

⦁ Indicative budget breakdown for infrastructure (for all the project partners executing a share of infrastructure)

⦁ Justification of costs (for all the project partners, including the Applicant)

⦁ Job descriptions (for all the project partners, including the Applicant)

⦁ Statutes or other, similar (for all the project partners, including the Applicant)

⦁ Profit and loss accounts and other fiscal documents (for all[[1]](#footnote-1) the project partners, including the Applicant)

⦁ Certificates of fiscal registration (for all the project partners, including the Applicant)

⦁ Certificates showing obligations to the consolidated state budgets (for all the project partners, including the Applicant)

⦁ Certificates showing obligations to the local budgets (for all the project partners, including the Applicant)

1. Some annexes are partially filled in and information cannot be retrieved in other parts of the application package.
2. One eligibility criterion is not met by the project, or by the applicant or partners.

**Guidance to the Project Selection Committee**

1. In case of discrepancies between the Manual and the *Guidelines for grant applicants*, or of situations not covered/regulated by the Manual, provisions of the *Guidelines for grant applicants* shall apply. If the Guidelines or the Manual have no provisions for the respective situation, PSC shall decide on a case by case basis, by observing the working principles contained in the Manual.
2. At any point during evaluation, PSC or MA may be consulted through written procedure on specific situations which may arise in the process. In order to keep the pace of evaluation, adequate priority should be given to such requests.
3. EMS-ENI system is closed by the MA at the deadline indicated in the *Guidelines for grant applicants* andafter this, no record can be made into the system. Hard-copies of the application packages must also be delivered until the deadline, as shown by the stamp of postal services, tracking number of courier services, or the acknowledgement of receipt in case of hand deliveries.
4. Late entry is accepted proven that the delivery date does not go over more than 30 days after the deadline. In exceptional cases and under the condition that the Evaluation Report (step 1) has not been yet concluded, PSC may accept hard-copies received even later.
5. All hard-copies received are registered by PSC secretary into the Submission Register (**Annex g\_4**). In case they are sent by fax or e-mail, the respective fax or e-mail shall be kept and attached to the register.
6. Envelopes need to bear the Project Identification Number as minimum identification data of the project, and the respective number must be retrieved into EMS-ENI system. Envelopes containing hard-copies shall be kept in safe location, unopened, except for situations specifically indicated in the Manual, or at the beginning of the contracting phase.
7. Projects are distributed daily, as sets, to internal assessors by PSC secretary. Each set comprises at least **5 projects**. By the end of the day, each assessor shall deliver checklists concluded for the projects attributed or, if the case, checklists having completed the “Explanatory Note” part.
8. Based on the application package uploaded into EMS-ENI system, each project is assessed by two (2) internal assessors and as a result, two (2) Administrative Compliance and Eligibility checklists are compiled.
9. Conclusions given by assessors must not contradict each other e.g. one assessor cannot conclude that the project is “**administratively compliant**” while the other concludes it is “**administratively not compliant**”. In such case, PSC ask revision of the checklists.
10. In order to early detect such situations, PSC secretary performs a preliminary quality verification of the checklists, ensures that they are fully filled in, all the questions/criteria are answered, and conclusions are not contradictory. In case of deficiencies, PSC secretary may ask for revisions.
11. If full and objective verification cannot be performed due to missing/ incorrect documents, clarifications may be requested. The project must not fall under the situations detailed at the end of this Annex.
12. If the situation from point (k) arises, internal assessor may propose PSC to request clarifications from the applicant. Such request can only be accepted if it does not improve or modify the project content. At this step of evaluation, missing or uncompliant supporting documents are not considered improvements to the project.
13. In case request for clarifications is proposed to PSC, the assessor must fill in the “explanatory Note” part from the checklist and explain, per project and per partner, the reasons for his request.
14. Based on the checklists, PSC decides on the appropriateness of such requests more specifically, if they might improve or modify the projects’ content. For efficieny reasons, PSC may use the written procedure. PSC decisions are recorded and substantiated in the Evaluation Report (step 1) (**Annex 4.2**).
15. In case of positive decision, based on the Explanatory Notes compiled by assessors, letters to request for clarifications (**Annex g\_6**) are prepared and sent by PSC secretary to the applicants. (S)He may contact the applicants to ensure that responses will be given in due time. In case of negative decision, assessors finalize their work by using the information and documents available.
16. It is recommended to send only **1 letter of clarifications per project** during this evaluation step. Deadline for submitting the clarifications by the applicant cannot be shorter than **2 calendar days** and cannot go over **10 calendar days** (from the date following that when PSC letter is sent). The respective period will be set by PSC, by applying the principles of proportionality and equal treatment for all applicants. The applicant has to upload the clarifications into EMS-ENI system within the deadline set and send them also in hard-copy version at the JTS headquarters. The PSC will inform in writting the applicants concerned about the issues to be clarified, as well as about the deadline set for submitting clarifications. Moreover, in the respective letter, PSC will inform the applicants about the consequences of not complying with the deadline (rejection of the application).
17. In case PSC decides to sent more than 1 letter of clarifications to the same project, situation must be explained in the Evaluation Report (step 1), while duly considering the equal treatment principle.
18. Separate deadlines may be set for submitting online and hard-copy clarifications. Similarly, actions described at points (c) to (e) shall be taken. Exception is made if the outer envelope containing the hard-copy does not indicate the Project Registration Number. In this case only, PSC secretary opens the envelope and looks for the Project Registration Number indicated by the applicant in the letter of submission.
19. After being informed by PSC secretary that clarifications have been uploaded by the applicant into EMS-ENI system, assessors resume their work and finalize the checklists. In case the applicant did not or partially upload the requested clarifications in the EMS-ENI within the deadline set, the project shall be rejected (see situations detailed at the end of this Annex).
20. Exception is only made when applicants/partners demonstrate that a required document is not available e.g. pursuant the legislation of the country concerned, *duplicata* of a given lost document cannot be obtained from the issuing authority). In such cases, an acceptable alternative may be proposed e.g. declaration of the said authority that the document in favor of the respective applicant/partner is still valid, but no *duplicata* can be issued.
21. Final opinion on the eligibility of entities participating in the call is given by the relevant National Authority. Eligibility of an entity shall be checked only once per call, irrespective the number of projects in which the respective entity is either apllicant, or partner.
22. Using the checklists compiled by internal assessors, PSC secretary drafts a preliminary Eligibility Report per entity per call showing the assessors’ opinion. Preliminary reports are forwarded to the relevant NA for the final conclusion on the eligibility of the respective entity. NAs remit completed and signed Eligibility Reports to PSC secretary. NAs’ opinion shall not be contradicted, since they are the sole responsible to determine eligibility of any entity located on their own territory.
23. At the end of step 1, with the support of the secretary, based on the checklists and the Eligibility Reports, PSC prepares the Evaluation Report (**Annex 4.2**). The report is signed by all PSC members and is accompanied by evidence necessary to document this step, such as:

⦁ attendance lists

⦁ minutes of the meetings, any written correspondence with the applicants/MA etc.

⦁ Declarations of impartiality and confidentiality

⦁ Declarations regarding the conflict of interest

⦁ results of the work done by the evaluation team (checklists, Eligibility Reports)

⦁ requests of clarifications proposed/approved/answered

⦁ lists of projects selected/rejected from further evaluation

1. The Evaluation Report is sent to JMC for approval.
2. Following the JMC’s decision on the list of projects selected and projects rejected from further evaluation, PSC secretary sends to all the applicants notifications on the outcomes of evaluation. Evidence of such communications is kept by PSC secretary.

**NOTE**: For information purpose, find below information on how the internal assessors shall perform administrative and eligibility check (Administrative and eligibility check for HARD projects, respectively Administrative and eligibility check for SOFT projects).

**Appeals to the outcomes of evaluation**

1. PSC secretary registers all the appeals submitted within **10 calendar days** from the date when PSC notifications on the outcomes of evaluation have been sent.
2. PSC meets in session and decides if the appeals received are admissible or not, based on the provisions of the *Guidelines for grant applicants.* Decision on admissibility of the appeals must be reflected in PSC documents e.g. minutes, amended Evaluation Report.
3. Admissible appeals are assessed by PSC using the checklists compiled by the internal assessors, the Eligibility Reports, the application packages uploaded into EMS-ENI system and, if the case may be, the clarifications received. In case the appeal refers to an eligibility issue, the relevant NA is informed and asked for an opinion.
4. No clarification requests will be made to the applicants at this step.
5. PSC decision on the appeals is final and cannot be changed. If the case may be (if the ranking list have been changed following the result of the appeals), PSC prepare an amended Evaluation Report. The report must be signed by all PSC members.
6. The amended Evaluation Report is sent to JMC for approval.
7. All the applicants submitting an appeal are notified by PSC secretary (**Annex 4.3**). Notifications are signed by the PSC coordinator. Evidence of such communications is kept by the PSC secretary.

**ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE**

**(HARD projects)**

| **Applicant:**  **Title of the Proposal:**  **Project Reference Number:** | | | **YES** | **NO** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The project proposal has been submitted before the set deadline both in the EMS-ENI and in hard - copy? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ application package is not uploaded into EMS-ENI or is sent in hard-copy version after the deadlines  ⦁ application package is received in hard-copy version later than 30 calendar days after the deadline, and the Evaluation Report (step 1) was finalized/approved by PSC  ⦁ application package received in hard-copy version does not bear the Project Registration Number given by EMS-ENI, or the PRN marked on the envelope cannot be retrieved by EMS-ENI |
|  | The correct application form and its annexes, published for this call for proposals, have been used and filled in? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ another template of the Application Form is used, and is different from the one provided by the call  ⦁ other templates are used for the annexes, and they are different from those provided by the call  ⦁ an entire category of annexes is completely missing in the EMS-ENI (for all the partners, namely both the applicant and the partners), except for declarations and the state-aid self assessment  ⦁ the Application Form uploaded into EMS-ENI is partially filled in, shows blank parts, chapters, sections, paragraphs, or it displays error alerts given by the system that can only be corrected by inserting new text or information  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the application form and/or its annexes lack some information, but the respective data can be retrieved in other parts of the application package (e.g. name of the entity, address etc.) |
|  | The Application Form has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the Application Form uploaded into EMS-ENI is fully or partially in the national language and not in English  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ some annexes are only in national language  ⦁ some information is not consistent or missing, but it can be retrieved in other parts of the application package (e.g.name of the entity, address etc.) |
|  | Annex A.1. Indicative budget breakdown for infrastructure has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the annex is missing for all the partners executing a share of the infrastructure component (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners executing a share of the infrastructure provided the annex |
|  | Annex A.2 Justification of costs has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the annex is missing for the applicant and all the project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the annex |
|  | Annex A.3 Financial plan has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing |
|  | The Declaration by the Applicant has been filled in, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person and stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, has it been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) or lacks some information  ⦁ the applicant provided the annex, but fails to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, sent in national language) |
|  | A Partnership Statement has been filled in by each project Partner[[2]](#footnote-2), signed by the legal representatives or by the mandated persons and stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, have they been provided | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) or lacks some information  ⦁ some annexes fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, sent in national language) |
|  | Job descriptions for the each project function and for each Partner (as described in the application form), have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the annex is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ some job descriptions are missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) |
|  | Statute or other relevant document, for the Applicant and for each project Partner – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated persons, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document (uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only) |
|  | Profit and loss account and the balance sheets or other relevant fiscal document for the last year for which the accounts have been closed, for the Applicant and for each project Partner – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated persons, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only)  ⦁ some documents are older than the last year for which the accounts have been closed and the applicant cannot give sound reasons for not-delivering the document |
|  | Certificates of fiscal registration, for the Applicant and for each project Partner – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only) |
|  | Valid certificates issued by the competent state authority in each participating country proving that the Applicant and each project Partner have fulfilled their obligations related to the payment of debts to the consolidated state budget – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only)  ⦁ some documents are not valid at the date of submission[[3]](#footnote-3) or show debts to the consolidated state budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts to the state budget) |
|  | Valid certificates issued by the competent state authority in each participating country proving that the Applicant and each project Partner have fulfilled their obligations related to the payment of debts to the local budgets – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ some document fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only)  ⦁ some documents are not valid at the date of submission[[4]](#footnote-4) or show debts to the local budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts to the local budget) |
|  | State-aid self-assessment filled in by the Applicant, signed by the legal representative or by a mandated person, and stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in original, has it been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) or lacks some information  ⦁ the annex fails to meet the formal requirements |
|  | Where necessary, official mandates for the persons entitled to sign the project documents, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not /are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document |
| **Conclusion 1** | |  | | | |
| **Conclusion 2[[5]](#footnote-5)** | |  | | | |

**ELIGIBILITY CHECK**

**(HARD projects)**

| **Applicant:**  **Title of the Proposal:**  **Project Reference Number:** | | | | **YES** | **NO** | | | **Comments** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | A maximum number of 4 partners (including the Applicant) have been included in the project partnership. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ more than 4 partners take part in the project | |
| 2. | The partnership includes at least 1 partner from Romania and 1 partner from Ukraine. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ all partners are from Romania or, all partners are from Ukraine | |
| 31. | The Applicant is a legal entity registered and located in the core region of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 32. | The Applicant is an international organization and their base of operation is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 33. | The Applicant is an European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation and their geographic coverage is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 41. | The Partner is a legal entity registered and located in Romania and/or Ukraine. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 42. | The Partner is an international organization with a base of operation in the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 43. | The Partner is a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation with the geographic coverage within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 44. | The Partner is a legal entity registered and located outside the core regions of the Programme, in the conditions set by the “flexibility rule” at chapter 2.2.1.1 Flexibility rule of the Guidelines for grant Applicants. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 5. | The Applicant and Partner(s) are non-profit making organisations. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ at least one project partner is for-profit organization. Nevertheless, NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 6. | The Applicant and Partner(s) have no debts to the consolidated state budget in accordance with the national legislation. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC | |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ document is not valid or it shows debts to the consolidated state budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts) | |
| 7. | The Applicant and Partner(s) have no debts to the local budget in accordance with the national legislation. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC | |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ document is not valid or it shows debts to the local budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts) | |
| 8. | The implementation period does not exceed the minimum and maximum required by the Call for proposals. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ implementation period is lower than the minimum, or over the maximum duration set by the call | |
| 9. | The requested EU contribution is equal to or lower than the maximum grant allowed per priority for this Call for proposals. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the grant is over the maximum set by the call per priority | |
| 10. | The requested EU contribution is equal to or lower than 90% of the total eligible costs of the project. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the grant is bigger that 90% of the total eligibile costs  ⦁ the co-financing is lower that 10% of the total eligibile costs | |
| 11. | The project foresees an infrastructure component of minimum EUR 1,000,000. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the infrastructure component is less than 1,000,000 EUR | |
| 12. | In case the flexibility rule applies, is the share of budget to be spent by the project outside the core regions of the Programme of maximum 10% of the total budget? | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ budget of the partners located outside core regions of the programme is not tick-marked in the budget sheet. If tick-marked, the total amount to be spent by the project outside the core regions will be over 10% of the total budget. | |
| 13. | Joint staffing and joint financing are tick-marked as cross border cooperation criteria to be put into practice by the project. | | |  |  | | | In case boxes are not ticked-marked, but information about joint staffing and joint financing can be retrieved in other parts of the application package, the eligibility criterion will be considered being met. | |
| 14. | Is each project Partner providing a share of co-financing to the project? | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ at least one partner does not provide co-financing to the project | |
| **Eligibility of partners** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Applicant** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Partner 1** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Partner 2** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Partner 3** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Conclusion 1[[6]](#footnote-6)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Conclusion 2[[7]](#footnote-7)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Explanatory Note** | | | | | | | | | |
| References to the application package**[[8]](#footnote-8)** | | | Partner(s) concerned | | | Missing/Uncompliant documents**[[9]](#footnote-9)** | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |

**IMPORTANT NOTE**

Exception to the call requirements in respect of provision of supporting documents is only made when the applicants/partners demonstrate that a certain document is not available e.g. pursuant the legislation of the respective country, *duplicata* of a given lost document cannot be obtained from the issuing authority). In such cases, an acceptable alternative may be proposed e.g. declaration of the said authority that the document in favor of the respective applicant/partner is still valid, but no *duplicata* can be issued.

**ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE**

**(SOFT projects)**

| **Applicant:**  **Title of the Proposal:**  **Project Reference Number:** | | | **YES** | **NO** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | The project proposal has been submitted before the set deadline both in the EMS-ENI and in hard - copy? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ application package is not uploaded into EMS-ENI or is sent in hard-copy version after the deadlines  ⦁ application package is received in hard-copy version later than 30 calendar days after the deadline, and the Evaluation Report (step 1) was finalized/approved by PSC  ⦁ application package received in hard-copy version does not bear the Project Registration Number given by EMS-ENI, or the PRN marked on the envelope cannot be retrieved by EMS-ENI |
|  | The correct application form and its annexes, published for this call for proposals, have been used and filled in? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ another template of the Application Form is used, and is different from the one provided by the call  ⦁ another templates are used for the annexes, they are different from those provided by the call  ⦁ an entire category of annexes is completely missing in the EMS-ENI (for all the project partners, namely for both the applicant and the partners), except for declarations and state-aid self-assessment  ⦁ the Application Form uploaded into EMS-ENI is partially filled in, shows blank parts, chapters, sections, paragraphs, or it displays error alerts given by the system that can only be corrected by inserting new text or information  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the application form and/or its annexes lack some information, but the respective data can be retrieved in other parts of the application package (e.g. name of the entity, address etc.) |
|  | The Application Form has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the Application Form uploaded into EMS-ENI is fully or partially in the national language and not in English  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ some annexes are only in national language |
|  | Annex A.1 Justification of costs has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the annex is missing for the applicant and all the project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the annex |
|  | Annex A.2 Financial plan has been entirely filled in and is in English? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing |
|  | The Declaration by the Applicant has been filled in, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person and stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, has it been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) or lacks some information  ⦁ the applicant provided the annex, but fails to the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, sent in national language) |
|  | A Partnership Statement has been filled in by each project Partner[[10]](#footnote-10), signed by the legal representatives or by the mandated persons and stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, have they been provided | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) or lacks some information  ⦁ some annexes fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, sent in national language) |
|  | Job descriptions for the each project function and for each Partner (as described in the application form), have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the annex is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ some job descriptions are missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) |
|  | Statute or other relevant document, for the Applicant and for each project Partner – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated persons, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only) |
|  | Profit and loss account and the balance sheets or other relevant fiscal document for the last year for which the accounts have been closed, for the Applicant and for each project Partner – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated persons, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only)  ⦁ some documents are older than the last year for which the accounts have been closed and the applicant cannot give sound reasons for not-delivering the document |
|  | Certificates of fiscal registration, for the Applicant and for each project Partner – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only) |
|  | Valid certificates issued by the competent state authority in each participating country proving that the Applicant and each project Partner have fulfilled their obligations related to the payment of debts to the consolidated state budget – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national languge only)  ⦁ some documents are not valid at the date of submission[[11]](#footnote-11) or show debts to the consolidated state budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts to the state budget) |
|  | Valid certificates issued by the competent state authority in each participating country proving that the Applicant and each project Partner have fulfilled their obligations related to the payment of debts to the local budgets – as photocopies certified “According to the original”, signed by the legal representative or by the mandated person, stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in English and in national language, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the document is missing for the applicant and all project partners (not uploaded into EMS-ENI)  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document  ⦁ some documents fail to meet the formal requirements (e.g. not signed, not stamped, in national language only)  ⦁ some documents are not valid at the date of submission[[12]](#footnote-12) or show debts to the local budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts to the local budget) |
|  | State-aid self-assessment filled in by the Applicant, signed by the legal representative or by a mandated person, and stamped according to the relevant legal provisions in force, in original, has it been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ the annex is missing (not uploaded into EMS-ENI) or lacks some information  ⦁ the annex fail to meet the formal requirements |
|  | Where necessary, official mandates for the persons entitled to sign the project documents, have they been provided? | |  |  | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ only some project partners provided the document |
| **Conclusion 1** | |  | | | |
| **Conclusion 2[[13]](#footnote-13)** | |  | | | |

**ELIGIBILITY CHECK**

**(SOFT projects)**

| **Applicant:**  **Title of the Proposal:**  **Project Reference Number:** | | | | **YES** | **NO** | | | **Comments** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | A maximum number of 4 partners (including the Applicant) have been included in the project partnership. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ more than 4 partners take part in the project | |
| 2. | The partnership includes at least 1 partner from Romania and 1 partner from Ukraine. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ all partners are from Romania or, all partners are from Ukraine | |
| 31. | The Applicant is a legal entity registered and located in the core region of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 32. | The Applicant is an international organization and their base of operation is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 33. | The Applicant is an European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation and their geographic coverage is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 41. | The Partner is a legal entity registered and located in Romania and/or Ukraine. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 42. | The Partner is an international organization with a base of operation in the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 43. | The Partner is a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation with the geographic coverage within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 44. | The Partner is a legal entity registered and located outside the core regions of the Programme, in the conditions set by the “flexibility rule” at chapter 2.2.1.1 Flexibility rule of the Guidelines for grant Applicants. | | |  |  | | | ⦁ NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 5. | The Applicant and Partner(s) are non-profit making organisations. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ if at least one project partner is for-profit organization. Nevertheless, NAs give the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory | |
| 6. | The Applicant and Partner(s) have no debts to the consolidated state budget in accordance with the national legislation. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC | |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ document is not valid or it shows debts to the consolidated state budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts) | |
| 7. | The Applicant and Partner(s) have no debts to the local budget in accordance with the national legislation. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ clarifications are not uploaded into EMS-ENI system  ⦁ clarifications are not/are partially provided when referenced to PSC letter or, the applicant does not comply with the deadlines set by PSC | |
| **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ document is not valid or it shows debts to the local budget (10 days to provide new, valid, certificate showing no debts) | |
| 8. | The implementation period does not exceed the minimum and maximum required by the Call for proposals. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ implementation period is lower than the minimum, or over the maximum duration set by the call | |
| 9. | The requested EU contribution is between the minimum and the maximum amounts available for each priority under this Call for proposals. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the grant is below the minimum, or over the maximum amount set by the call per priority | |
| 10. | The requested EU contribution is equal to or lower than 90% of the total eligible costs of the project. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the grant is bigger that 90% of the total eligibile costs  ⦁ the co-financing is lower that 10% of the total eligibile costs | |
| 11. | The project does not include infrastructure, or the infrastructure component is of less than EUR 1,000,000. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the infrastructure component is over 1,000,000 EUR | |
| 12. | In case the flexibility rule applies, is the share of budget to be spent by the project outside the core regions of the Programme of maximum 10% of the total budget? | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ budget of the partners located outside core regions of the programme is not tick-marked in the budget sheet. If tick-marked, the total amount to be spent by the project outside the core regions will be over 10% of the total budget. | |
| 13. | Joint staffing and joint financing are tick-marked as cross border cooperation criteria to be put into practice by the project. | | |  |  | | | In case boxes are not ticked-marked, but information about joint staffing and joint financing can be retrieved in other parts of the application package, the eligibility criterion will be considered as being met. | |
| 14. | Is each project Partner providing a share of co-financing to the project? | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ one partner does not provide co-financing to the project | |
| **Eligibility of partners** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Applicant** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Partner 1** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Partner 2** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Partner 3** | | [fiscal registration code] | | | | | [eligible/not eligible] | | [if not eligible, give reasons] |
| **Conclusion 1[[14]](#footnote-14)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Conclusion 2[[15]](#footnote-15)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Explanatory Note** | | | | | | | | | |
| References to the application package**[[16]](#footnote-16)** | | | Partner(s) concerned **[[17]](#footnote-17)** | | | Missing/Uncompliant documents**[[18]](#footnote-18)** | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |

**IMPORTANT NOTE**

Exception to the call requirements in respect of provision of supporting documents is only made when the applicants/partners demonstrate that certain document is not available e.g. pursuant the legislation of the respective country, *duplicata* of a given lost document cannot be obtained from the issuing authority). In such cases, an acceptable alternative may be proposed e.g. declaration of the said authority that the document in favor of the respective applicant/partner is still valid, but no *duplicata* can be issued.

1. Except for cases in which the respective partner can provide consistent justification for not providing the respective document. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The Applicant does not have to fill in a Partnership Statement. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Date of submission is the date when the Application Form was submtited into EMS-ENI system. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Date of submission is the date when the Application Form was submitted into EMS-ENI system. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. If the case, after clarifications [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Conclusion at project level, having in view the criteria for which PSC may request clarifications from the applicants. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. If the case, after clarifications [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Indicate chapter, section, paragraph, annex or document of the application package that is subject of the respective request [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Detail the issues to be corrected or explained, by duly considering that clarifications cannot modify or improve the project content [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. The Applicant does not have to fill in a Partnership Statement. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Date of submission is the date when the Application Form was submitted into EMS-ENI system. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. Date of submission is the date when the Application Form was submitted into EMS-ENI system. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. If the case, after clarifications [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. Conclusion at project level, having in view the criteria for which PSC may request clarifications from the applicants [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. If the case, after clarifications [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. Indicate chapter, section, paragraph, annex or document of the application package that is subject of the respective request [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. Indicate, by name, if the request concerns the project or a specific partner or several partners in the project [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. Detail the issues to be corrected or explained, by duly considering that clarifications cannot modify or improve the project content [↑](#footnote-ref-18)