

CORRIGENDUM No. 1

GUIDELINES FOR APPLICANTS

EuropeAid/130393/M/ACT/HR

Contract title: Business-Related Infrastructure Grant Scheme

In the Call for proposals published on the EuropeAid on 29/07/2010, the provisions under:

- 1.3 Financial allocation provided by the Contracting Authority;
- 2.3 Evaluation and selection of Applications (STEP 2: EVALUATION OF THE CONCEPT NOTE and STEP 3: EVALUATION OF THE FULL APPLICATION);

of the Guidelines for Applicants have been modified as described below.

GUIDELINES FOR APPLICANTS

Instead of:

1.3 FINANCIAL ALLOCATION PROVIDED BY THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

The overall indicative amount made available under this call for proposals is EUR 6,300.000. The Contracting Authority reserves the right not to award all available funds.

(...)

Read:

1.3 FINANCIAL ALLOCATION PROVIDED BY THE CONTRACTING AUTHORITY

The overall indicative amount made available under this call for proposals is EUR 6,300.000. The Contracting Authority reserves the right not to award all available funds.

An additional amount of EUR 8.912.129 may be available, subject to entry into force of the modified Financing agreement for IPA IIIc component between the European Commission and the Republic of Croatia, before the award of the grant contracts.

(...)

Instead of:

2.3. EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS

(...)

(2) STEP 2: EVALUATION OF THE CONCEPT NOTE

The evaluation of the Concept Notes that have passed the first administrative check will cover the relevance of the action, its merits and effectiveness, its viability and sustainability. The Contracting Authority reserves the right not to undertake the evaluation of the Concept Notes whenever considered justified (for example when a less than expected number of applications are received) and to go straight to the evaluation of the corresponding full applications.

Please note that the scores awarded to the Concept Note are completely separate from those given to the Full Application.

The Concept Note will be given an overall score out of 50 points in accordance with the breakdown provided in the Evaluation Grid below. The evaluation shall also verify the compliance with instructions provided in the guidance for Concept Note, part A of the grant application form.

The evaluation criteria are divided into headings and subheadings. Each subheading will be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following assessment categories: 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

	Scores	
1. Relevance of the action	Sub-score	15
1.1 Relevance of the action needs and constraints of the country/region to be addressed in general, and to those of the target groups and final beneficiaries in particular.	5	
1.2 Relevance to the priorities and objectives mentioned in the Guidelines.	5(x2)*	
2. Effectiveness and Feasibility of the action	Sub-score	25
2.1 Assessment of the problem identification and analysis.	5	
2.2 Assessment of the proposed activities (practicality and consistency in relation to the objectives, purpose and expected results).	5(x2)*	
2.3 Assessment of the role and involvement of all stakeholders and, if applicable, proposed partners.	5(x2)*	
3. Sustainability of the action	Sub-score	10
3.1 Assessment of the identification of the main assumptions and risks, before the start up and throughout the implementation period.	5	
3.2 Assessment of the identification of long-term sustainable impact on the target groups and final beneficiaries.	5	
TOTAL SCORE		50

*the scores are multiplied by 2 because of their importance

Once all Concept Notes have been assessed, a list will be established with the proposed actions ranked according to their total score.

Firstly, only the Concept Notes which have been given a score of a minimum of 12 points in the category "Relevance" as well as a minimum total score of 30 points will be considered for pre-selection.

Secondly, the list of Concept Notes will be reduced in accordance to the ranking to those whose sum of requested contributions amounts to at least 12.600.000,00 EUR, i.e. twice the available budget for this Call for proposals, taking into account the indicative financial envelopes foreseen. The Evaluation Committee will subsequently proceed with the applicants whose proposals have been pre-selected.

(3) STEP 3: EVALUATION OF THE FULL APPLICATION

An evaluation of the quality of the applications, including the proposed budget, and of the capacity of the applicant and its partners, will be carried out in accordance with the evaluation criteria set out in the Evaluation Grid included below. There are two types of evaluation criteria: selection and award criteria.

The selection criteria are intended to help evaluate the applicants' financial and operational capacity to ensure that they:

- have stable and sufficient sources of finance to maintain their activity throughout the period during which the action is being carried out and, where appropriate, to participate in its funding;
- have the management capacity, professional competencies and qualifications required to successfully complete the proposed action. This also applies to any partners of the applicant.

The award criteria allow the quality of the applications submitted to be evaluated in relation to the set objectives and priorities, and grants to be awarded to actions which maximise the overall effectiveness of the call for proposals. They enable the selection of applications which the Contracting Authority can be confident will comply with its objectives and priorities and guarantee the visibility of the EU financing (see http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm). They cover such aspects as the relevance of the action, its consistency with the objectives of the call for proposals, quality, expected impact, sustainability and cost-effectiveness.

Scoring:

The evaluation criteria are divided into sections and subsections. Each subsection will be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following guidelines: 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

Evaluation Grid

Section	Maximum Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	20
1.1 Do the applicant and, if applicable, partners have sufficient experience of project management ?	5
1.2 Do the applicant and, if applicable partners have sufficient technical expertise ? (notably knowledge of the issues to be addressed.)	5
1.3 Do the applicant and, if applicable, partners have sufficient management capacity ? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)?	5
1.4 Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance ?	5
2. Relevance	25
2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and one or more of the priorities of the call for proposals? Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal	5 x 2

specifically addresses at least one priority . Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal contains specific added-value elements, such as promotion of gender equality and equal opportunities...	
2.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal? (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication.)	5
2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	5 x 2
3. Methodology	25
3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results?	5
3.2 How coherent is the overall design of the action? (in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation ?)	5
3.3 Is the partners' and/or other stakeholders' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory?	5
3.4 Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5
3.5 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action?	5
4. Sustainability	15
4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	5
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects ? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	5
4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable : - financially (<i>how will the activities be financed after the funding ends?</i>) - institutionally (<i>will structures allowing the activities to continue be in place at the end of the action? Will there be local "ownership" of the results of the action?</i>) - at policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc?</i>)? - environmentally (if applicable) (<i>will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?</i>)	5
5. Budget and cost-effectiveness	15
5.1 is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?	5
5.2 Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the action?	5 x 2
Maximum total score	100

Note on Section 1. Financial and operational capacity

If the total average score is less than 12 points for section 1, the application will be rejected.

Note on Section 2. Relevance

If the total average score is less than 20 points for section 2, the application will be rejected.

Provisional selection

Following the evaluation, a table listing the applications ranked according to their score and within the available financial envelope will be established as well as a reserve list following the same criteria.

Note: The scores awarded in this phase are completely separate from those given to the concept note of the same application.

(...)

Read:

2.3. EVALUATION AND SELECTION OF APPLICATIONS

(...)

(2) STEP 2: EVALUATION OF THE CONCEPT NOTE

The evaluation of the Concept Notes that have passed the first administrative check will cover the relevance of the action, its merits and effectiveness, its viability and sustainability. The Contracting Authority reserves the right not to undertake the evaluation of the Concept Notes whenever considered justified (for example when a less than expected number of applications are received) and to go straight to the evaluation of the corresponding full applications.

Please note that the scores awarded to the Concept Note are completely separate from those given to the Full Application.

The Concept Note will be given an overall score out of 50 points in accordance with the breakdown provided in the Evaluation Grid below. The evaluation shall also verify the compliance with instructions provided in the guidance for Concept Note, part A of the grant application form.

The evaluation criteria are divided into headings and subheadings. Each subheading will be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following assessment categories: 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

	Scores	
1. Relevance of the action	Sub-score	15
1.1 Relevance of the action needs and constraints of the country/region to be addressed in general, and to those of the target groups and final beneficiaries in particular.	5	
1.2 Relevance to the priorities and objectives mentioned in the Guidelines.	5(x2)*	
2. Effectiveness and Feasibility of the action	Sub-score	25
2.1 Assessment of the problem identification and analysis.	5	
2.2 Assessment of the proposed activities (practicality and consistency in relation to the objectives, purpose and expected results).	5(x2)*	
2.3 Assessment of the role and involvement of all stakeholders and, if applicable, proposed partners.	5(x2)*	
3. Sustainability of the action	Sub-score	10
3.1 Assessment of the identification of the main assumptions and risks, before the start up and throughout the implementation period.	5	
3.2 Assessment of the identification of long-term sustainable impact on the target groups and final beneficiaries.	5	

TOTAL SCORE		50
--------------------	--	-----------

*the scores are multiplied by 2 because of their importance

The evaluation committee will utilise the following evaluation sub grid to complete the main grid:

1. Relevance of the action	15	Ref. CN¹
1.1 Relevance of the problems to needs and constraints of the country/region to be addressed in general, and to those of the target groups and final beneficiaries in particular	5	1
1.1.1 Does the action contribute to the achievement of goals set within the county development strategy/regional operational programme – is there a clear reference to such documents in the proposal?	3	1/4
1.1.2 Is the action relevant for more than one county – is there a clear reference on that to the county development strategies/regional operational programmes in the proposal? (If the answer is NO the score will be 1)	2	1/4
1.2 Relevance to the priorities and objectives mentioned in the Guidelines	5(x2) *	1
1.2.1 Does the action contribute to the main objectives of the Grant Scheme, i.e. to support the SMEs growth and job creation?	3(x2) *	1/2 1/3, 1/5
1.2.2 To what extent does the action contribute to the main priorities of the Grant Scheme by fostering cooperation with relevant stakeholders in order to maximise the impact of the investment or contributes to enlargement of tourism offer and development of the SMEs for tourism?	2(x2) *	1/2 1/3 1/5

Score will be transferred to the main grid.

Once all Concept Notes have been assessed, a list will be established with the proposed actions ranked according to their total score.

Firstly, only the Concept Notes which have been given a score of a minimum of 12 points in the category "Relevance" as well as a minimum total score of 30 points will be considered for pre-selection.

Secondly, the list of Concept Notes will be reduced in accordance to the ranking to those whose sum of requested contributions amounts to at least 12.600.000,00 EUR, i.e. twice the available budget for this Call for proposals, taking into account the indicative financial envelopes foreseen. The Evaluation Committee will subsequently proceed with the applicants whose proposals have been pre-selected.

(3) STEP 3: EVALUATION OF THE FULL APPLICATION

An evaluation of the quality of the applications, including the proposed budget, and of the capacity of the applicant and its partners, will be carried out in accordance with the evaluation criteria set out in the Evaluation Grid included below. There are two types of evaluation criteria: selection and award criteria.

The selection criteria are intended to help evaluate the applicants' financial and operational capacity to ensure that they:

¹ Indicative reference to the Concept Note (Section no./bullet no.)

- have stable and sufficient sources of finance to maintain their activity throughout the period during which the action is being carried out and, where appropriate, to participate in its funding;
- have the management capacity, professional competencies and qualifications required to successfully complete the proposed action. This also applies to any partners of the applicant.

The award criteria allow the quality of the applications submitted to be evaluated in relation to the set objectives and priorities, and grants to be awarded to actions which maximise the overall effectiveness of the call for proposals. They enable the selection of applications which the Contracting Authority can be confident will comply with its objectives and priorities and guarantee the visibility of the EU financing (see http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/visibility/index_en.htm). They cover such aspects as the relevance of the action, its consistency with the objectives of the call for proposals, quality, expected impact, sustainability and cost-effectiveness.

Scoring:

The evaluation criteria are divided into sections and subsections. Each subsection will be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following guidelines: 1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

Evaluation Grid

Section	Maximum Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	20
1.1 Do the applicant and, if applicable, partners have sufficient experience of project management ?	5
1.2 Do the applicant and, if applicable partners have sufficient technical expertise ? (notably knowledge of the issues to be addressed.)	5
1.3 Do the applicant and, if applicable, partners have sufficient management capacity ? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)?	5
1.4 Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance ?	5
2. Relevance	25
2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and one or more of the priorities of the call for proposals? Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal specifically addresses at least one priority . Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal contains specific added-value elements, such as promotion of gender equality and equal opportunities...	5 x 2
2.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal? (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication.)	5
2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	5 x 2
3. Methodology	25
3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results?	5
3.2 How coherent is the overall design of the action? (in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation ?)	5
3.3 Is the partners' and/or other stakeholders' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory?	5

3.4 Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5
3.5 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action?	5
4. Sustainability	15
4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	5
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects ? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	5
4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable : - financially (<i>how will the activities be financed after the funding ends?</i>) - institutionally (<i>will structures allowing the activities to continue be in place at the end of the action? Will there be local “ownership” of the results of the action?</i>) - at policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc?</i>)? - environmentally (if applicable) (<i>will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?</i>)	5
5. Budget and cost-effectiveness	15
5.1 is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?	5
5.2 Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the action?	5 x 2
Maximum total score	100

The evaluation committee will utilise the following evaluation sub grids to complete the main grid:

1. Financial and operational capacity – no sub-grid

2. Relevance	25	Ref. AF*
2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and one or more of the priorities of the call for proposals?	5(x2)*	I; 1.5; 1.6; 1.7; FS/CBA
2.1.1 To what extent will the action create or safeguard employment?	2(x2)*	I; 1.6; 1.7/1 FS/CBA
2.1.2 Does the action contribute to one or more of the priorities? Note: A score of 3 will only be allocated if the proposal includes support services. (If the proposal does not include support services the score will be 1.)	3(x2)*	I; 1.6, 1.7/1 FS/CBA
2.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal?	5	I; 1.6/3, 4, 5
2.2.1 Does the action contribute to the achievement of goals set within the county development strategy/regional operational programme?	3	I; 1.6/3, 4, 5
2.2.2 Is the action relevant for more than one county – is there a clear reference on that to the county development strategies/regional operational programmes in the proposal? (If the answer is NO, the score will be 1)	2	I; 1.6/3, 4, 5
2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	5(x2)*	I; 1.6/2-5; 1.7/1; FS/CBA
2.3.1 How clearly defined are the needs of the following groups: - SMEs - Regional and local authorities and institutions	2(x2)*	I; 1.6/2, 3, 4; 1.7/1 FS

* Indicative reference to the Full Application Form (Part no; Section no./bullet no.) and other supporting documents

- Tourism sector To what extent does the proposal address them?		
2.3.2 How high are the benefits of the project for - SMEs - Regional and local authorities - Tourism sector Is the application supported with verified data on the impact on those groups?	3(x2)*	I; 1.6/4, 5; 1.7/1; FS

Score will be transferred to the main grid.

3. Methodology	25	Ref. AF*
3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results?	5	I; 1.7
3.2 How coherent is the overall design of the action? (in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation ?)	5	I; 1.6; 1.7; 1.8
3.3 Is the partners' and/or other stakeholders' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory?	5	I; 1.7; 1.8/5, 6
3.3.1 How clearly defined is the partners' and/or other stakeholders' role in managing the action?	2	I; 1.8/5, 6, 8
3.3.2 What is the synergy effect of the proposed partnership and how compatible are the partners and/or other stakeholders?	3	I; 1.8/5, 6, 8
3.4 Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	I; 1.9
3.4.1 How realistic is the timetable?	2	I; 1.9; TS; BoQ; drawings
3.4.2 How clearly are the required activities described, especially from the point of view of required and planned time and budget for their implementation?	3	I; 1.9; TS; BoQ; drawings
3.5 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action?	5	I; 1.7/2 FS Logical framework
3.5.1 Are the indicators based upon relevant data?	3	I; 1.7/2 FS Logical framework
3.5.2 Are the indicators achievable?	2	I; 1.7/2 FS Logical framework

Score will be transferred to the main grid.

4. Sustainability	15	Ref. AF*
4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	5	I; 1.10
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects ? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	5	I; 1.10/3 FS/CBA
4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable :	5	I; 1.10 FS/CBA
4.3.1 Financially – (<i>Is it clear how the activities will be financed after the EU</i>	2	I; 1.10/4

* Indicative reference to the Full Application Form (Part no; Section no./bullet no.) and other supporting documents

<i>funding ends?)</i>		FS/CBA
4.3.2 Institutionally and at policy level – <i>(How likely is it that structures allowing the activities to continue will be in place at the end of the action? Is it clear that it will be local “ownership” of the results of the action)?</i>	3	I; 1.10/5 FS/CBA

Score will be transferred to the main grid.

5. Budget and cost-effectiveness – no sub-grid.

Note on Section 1. Financial and operational capacity

If the total average score is less than 12 points for section 1, the application will be rejected.

Note on Section 2. Relevance

If the total average score is less than 20 points for section 2, the application will be rejected.

Provisional selection

Following the evaluation, a table listing the applications ranked according to their score and within the available financial envelope will be established as well as a reserve list following the same criteria.

Note: The scores awarded in this phase are completely separate from those given to the concept note of the same application.

(...)