**A. Instructions to internal assessors**

**A.1 General Instructions**

1. Internal assessors have access to the application packages uploaded by the applicants into EMS-ENI system.
2. Each project shall be checked by using the information and documents available, provision of the *Guidelines for grant applicants,* the Manual, and any evaluation related instruction given by MA/JMC for clarification purposes. Subjective opinions on any of the questions/criteria from the checklist shall be avoided.
3. Each project is assessed by 2 internal assessors following the “four eyes” principle and one Administrative Compliance and Eligibility checklist is compiled per project by each assessor.
4. The Administrative Compliance and Eligibility checklist needs to be fully filled in, all the questions/ criteria from the checklist must be answered.
5. Assessors shall work objectively and highly professional, their verification must be thorough and by considering all the documents submitted by the applicant. Assessors are accountable if an information or document exists, but it was not checked.
6. In order to keep pace of evaluation, minimum 5 **projects per day per assessor** shall be assessed. Projects are distributed daily, as sets, to internal assessors by PSC secretary. Each set comprise 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.
7. A project is “**administratively compliant**” and “**eligible**” if it receives “**YES**” to all the questions/criteria from the checklist.
8. The National Authorities have the final opinion on the eligibility of entities located on their national territory and participating to the call. Assessors must perform the eligibility check of the applicant and project partners with due care and consideration. Their conclusions on the eligibility are forwarded to the National Authorities for the final opinion, as reflected in the Eligibility Report.
9. In case full and objective verification of the project cannot be performed due to missing/ incorrect information and/or documents, assessors may propose PSC to request clarifications from the applicants by filling in the Explanatory Note part from the checklist. The respective project must not fall under the situations listed in **Annex EV\_1**.
10. PSC decides on the appropriateness of such requests, especially if they improve or modify the project content. In case PSC decision is positive, based on the checklists, letter of clarifications is sent to the applicant. The assessor shall finalize the check based on the clarifications received, and may benefit of 1 extra-day to finish his/her work. In case PSC decision is negative, the check must be finalized only by considering the information and documents available, and without any extra working time.
11. Only **1 clarification letter** per project can be made during this evaluation step therefore, it must address all the administrative and eligibility issues.
12. The applicant has max. **10 calendar days** to upload clarifications into EMS-ENI system. They will also be sent in hard-copy version and remain unopened, kept in safe location. PSC secretary informs the assessors when clarifications are uploaded into the EMS-ENI system.
13. PSC Secretary performs preliminary quality verification of the checklists and may request revisions, if the case. Situations in which an assessor gives a “YES” while the other gives a “NO” to the same criterion/ question and by referring to the same partner cannot be accepted. In such case, revision of the checklists shall be required.
14. Based on the checklists, the National Authorities give the final opinion on the eligibility of an entity participating at the call and issue Eligibility Reports.
15. In case of discrepancies between the present manual and the *Guidelines for grant applicants,* or situations not covered/regulated by the Manual, provisions of the *Guidelines for grant applicants* shall apply. In case 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.
16. In case there is difference between the supporting documents in national language and those in English language, documents in English language shall prevail.

**A.2 Specific instructions**

1. Conclusions at the end of Administrative Compliance section of the checklist must state if the project is:

⦁ “**Administratively compliant**” (all the questions receive an “YES”),

⦁ “**Administratively not compliant**” (some questions receives “NO” and fall into situations listed in **Annex EV\_1**), or if

⦁ “**Clarifications are needed**” (some questions receives “NO”, but do not fall into situations listed in **Annex EV\_1**)

1. If the project is “**administratively not compliant**”, the underlying reasons, per partner and per criterion, must be described by the assessor in the “Comments” column of the checklist.
2. If conclusion is that “**clarifications are needed**”, the underlying reasons, per project and per partner, shall be described by the assessor in the “Explanatory Notes” part of the checklist and, if agreed by PSC, letter of clarification will be sent to the applicant.
3. Conclusion at the end of Eligibility section of the checklist must state if the project is:

⦁ “**Eligible**” (all the questions receive an “YES”),

⦁ “**Not eligible**” (some questions receives “NO” and fall into situations listed in **Annex EV\_1**), or if

⦁ “**Clarifications are needed**” (some questions receives “NO”, but do not fall into situations listed in **Annex EV\_1**)

1. If the project is “**not eligible**”, the underlying reasons, per partner and per criterion, must be described in the “Comments” column of the checklist. NAs are the sole responsible to confirm if entities located on their territory and participating at the call are eligible or not.
2. 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.

**B. Instructions to National Authorities**

1. NAs receive the preliminary Eligibility Reports (**Annex 4.1**) drafted by PSC secretary and showing conclusions of the eligibility check performed by internal assessors and, if the case, the reasons for non-eligibility.
2. NA must give the final opinion on the eligibility of all the entities located on their national territory and participating at the call. In this respect, one Eligibility Report per entity per call must be copiled, signed and forwarded to the PSC secretary, irrespective the number of projects in which the respective entity is either applicant, or partner. The respective Eligibility Report shall be used as an eligibility proof for all the projects under the respective call in which the respective entity is participating.
3. If necessary, NAs may consult other national institutions in case opinion on the eligibility of an entity cannot be given on the basis of the documents available while ensuring confidentiality and avoiding any conflict of interest.
4. In order to keep track on the eligibility of entities participating at the call, PSC secretary will hold an Eligibility Register showing NA’s conclusion on the eligibility and date of issuance of the Eligibility Report.
5. If based on the documents available, the NA cannot give a substantiated opinion on the eligibility of an entity, it may consult other relevant national institutions and mention the result of the national consultations in the respective Evaluation Report.

**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[[1]](#footnote-1), 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[[2]](#footnote-2) 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[[3]](#footnote-3) 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[[4]](#footnote-4)** | |  | | | |

**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. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 32. | The Applicant is an international organization and their base of operation is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 33. | The Applicant is an European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation and their geographic coverage is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 41. | The Partner is a legal entity registered and located in Romania and/or Ukraine. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ at least one project partner does not satisfy the requirement | |
| 42. | The Partner is an international organization with a base of operation in the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 43. | The Partner is a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation with the geographic coverage within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 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. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 5. | The Applicant and Partner(s) are non-profit making organisations. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ at least one project partner is for-profit organization. Nevertheless, NA gives the final opinion on the eligibility of the respective entity | |
| 6. | The Applicant and Partner(s) have no debts to the consolidated state budget in accordance with the national legislation. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ documentis 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 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 requested 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 requested is over 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 at project level 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 partners located outside core regions of the programme is not appropriately 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 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 project co-financing | |
| **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 [[5]](#footnote-5)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Conclusion 2[[6]](#footnote-6)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Explanatory Note** | | | | | | | | | |
| References to the application package**[[7]](#footnote-7)** | | | Partners concerned | | | Missing/Uncompliant documents**[[8]](#footnote-8)** | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |

**Assessor 1** [name, signature]

**Assessor 2** [name, signature]

**Date**

**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.

**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[[9]](#footnote-9), 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[[10]](#footnote-10) 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[[11]](#footnote-11) 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[[12]](#footnote-12)** | |  | | | |

**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. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 32. | The Applicant is an international organization and their base of operation is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 33. | The Applicant is an European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation and their geographic coverage is within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 41. | The Partner is a legal entity registered and located in Romania and/or Ukraine. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ at least one project partner does not satisfy the requirement | |
| 42. | The Partner is an international organization with a base of operation in the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 43. | The Partner is a European Grouping of Territorial Cooperation with the geographic coverage within the core regions of the Programme. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 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. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ the requirement is not met | |
| 5. | The Applicant and Partner(s) are non-profit making organisations. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for rejection**  ⦁ one project partner at least is for-profit organization. Nevertheless, NA gives the final opinion on the eligibility of the respective entity | |
| 6. | The Applicant and Partner(s) have no debts to the consolidated state budget in accordance with the national legislation. | | |  |  | | | **Reasons for requesting clarifications**  ⦁ document is provided, but 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 requesting clarifications**  ⦁ document is provided, but 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 requested 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 requested is over than 90% of the total eligibile costs  ⦁ the co-financing is lower than 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 partners located outside core regions of the programme is not appropriately 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**  ⦁ at least one partner does not provide project co-financing | |
| **Eligibility per 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 [[13]](#footnote-13)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Conclusion 2[[14]](#footnote-14)** | |  | | | | | | | |
| **Explanatory Note** | | | | | | | | | |
| References to the application package**[[15]](#footnote-15)** | | | Partner(s) concerned | | | Missing/Uncompliant documents **[[16]](#footnote-16)** | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |
|  | | |  | | |  | | | |

**Assessor 1** [name, signature]

**Assessor 2** [name, signature]

**Date**

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