

Annex 2 to the call to cover price increase in existing projects under the Local Development and Inclusion Programme

LDIDP

Selection criteria and evaluation sheet

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of the Project Promoter: | |
| Project Name: | |
| Project Code: | |
| Project grant according to the project contract: | |
| Project grant rate from the project contract: | |
| Amount of grant requested to cover price increases | |

I. General criteria

| Criterion | Answer | Notes |
|---|---|--------------|
| 1. Was the request for additional funding received by the deadline and in the manner specified in the call for proposals? (Elimination criterion) | YES/NO <i>*The evaluator shall indicate in the remark the date and time of receipt of the application</i> | |
| 2. Is the project implemented in the current programming period 2014-2021 through EEA and Norway Grants and/or Norway Grants? (Elimination criterion) | YES/NO <i>* The evaluator shall enter the project code in the comment</i> | |
| 3. Does the projected spending reaches ¹ 10% of the Total Eligible Expenditure? (Elimination criterion) | YES/NO <i>* The evaluator shall enter in the remarks the estimated amount of eligible expenditure incurred at the date of submission of the application as declared by the</i> | |

¹ Spending means the percentage of Actual Eligible Expenditures **declared** in the Interim Project Reports to Total Eligible Expenditures.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <i>Project Promoter in its application. In case of serious doubts with regard to the state of spending to date, the evaluator shall ask the Project Promoter to demonstrate the state of spending.</i> | |
| 4. Was an irregularity immediately reported within the project? (Elimination criterion) | YES/NO <i>*If yes, please indicate the number of the irregularity in the comment field.</i> | |
| 5. A key procurement has been approved under the project ² . (Elimination criterion) | YES/NO | |
| 6. Assess the riskiness of the request for additional funds from a procurement perspective and with regard to the final date of eligibility of expenditure (30.4.2024). (Elimination criterion if the risk is assessed as very high) | Select an item. <i>* The evaluator selects the relevant entry from the list</i> | |
| 7. Have the maximum and minimum amounts of additional funding that can be requested under the call been respected? | YES/NO <i>The evaluator shall indicate in a note which of the thresholds has not been met and quantify the difference.</i> | |
| 8. What is the actual spending of the ³ project according to the latest interim project report submitted? | Select an item. <i>* The evaluator selects the figure from the list according to the last submitted interim project report</i> | |

Specific criteria required by donors before allocating funds for price increases

| | | |
|--|-----------------|--|
| 1. Has it been demonstrated that the exceptional price increase is clearly beyond the control of the Project | Select an item. | This condition shall prevent the misuse of the allowed flexibility for anything other than to cover exceptional price increases. |
|--|-----------------|--|

² Key procurement is procurement on which the implementation of a project depends to a large extent.

³ Drawdown is the percentage of eligible expenditure incurred as a percentage of total eligible expenditure.

| | | |
|---|------------------------|--|
| <p>Promoter and could not have been foreseen at the time the project application was submitted? (Elimination criterion - if the answer is no, funding will not be provided to cover the price increase)</p> | | <p>The exceptional price increase should be relatively easy to demonstrate on the basis of (publicly) available data on price fluctuations for certain (categories of) products or services used in the project (e.g. data from the national statistical office). Exceptional price increases can also be demonstrated as a result of public procurement.</p> <p>It is possible to compare, for example, the bill of quantities attached to the project application and the price stated in the currently valid works contract with the contractor. There are also other ways, for example by expert estimation. The Programme Operator (hereafter also referred to as "PO") will also accept documentation by an expert, e.g. a construction estimator.</p> |
| <p>2. Is the award of additional funding to cover the price increase the only solution to safeguard the planned results (i.e. 'save the project') within the available timeframe? (Elimination criterion - if the answer is no, funding will not be provided to cover the price increase)</p> | <p>Select an item.</p> | <p>As explained by the Financial Mechanism Office, it is not necessary for the Project Promoter to have already signalled its intention to terminate the project. The assessment is to be carried out by the Programme Operator and it is important to establish that without additional funding the risk of not achieving the intended results becomes very high and that there are no alternative sources of funding.</p> |
| <p>3. Can it be assumed that the activities financed by additional funding will be completed within the eligibility period? (Elimination criterion - if the answer is no, funding will not be provided to cover the price increase)</p> | <p>Select an item.</p> | <p>This condition underlines the importance of the project in question being completed within the eligibility period and that additional funding will contribute to this objective if this would be compromised. Additional funding should not be awarded to projects where it is clear that even with additional funding there is no chance that the project could be completed within the eligibility period.</p> <p>Thus, the PO should examine whether the project for which the additional funds are being allocated to cover the price increase is at a stage of implementation such that the expenditure (including the additional allocation) will be invoiced and paid by 30 April 2024 and that the goods (goods, services, works...) will be delivered by the end of July 2024.</p> |

| | | |
|---|------------------------|---|
| <p>4. Has the Programme Operator examined whether the additional funding to already approved projects that could yield better results have already been explored and that awarding funding to address exceptional price increases contributes to the results of the programme to a greater extent?</p> <p>(Elimination criterion - if the answer is no, funding will not be provided to cover the price increase)</p> | <p>Select an item.</p> | <p>An overall assessment will be made by the Programme Operator that there are no better alternatives in the programme for the use of additional resources, i.e. that programme results could not be enhanced more by providing additional funding to projects that can implement additional activities (taking into account, of course, the negative impact on results of not providing funding to projects at risk of price increases); that there are no other projects in the programme that are at risk of exceptional price increases and that could benefit more from additional funding or have a greater chance of successful project completion. In other words, the Programme Operator must make this decision for the benefit of the Programme as a whole. Failure to achieve project results takes priority over funding additional activities, but the threat must be real and must be adequately demonstrated.</p> |
| <p>5. Has the Programme Operator verified that the project grant rate has been set at a level that complies with Article 6.4.2 of the Regulation and other relevant programme rules?</p> | <p>Select an item.</p> | <p>The maximum project grant rate set out in the Programme Agreement and the relevant call for the type of entity may not be exceeded.</p> |
| <p>6. Is the award of additional funding compatible with the relevant State aid and public procurement rules?</p> | <p>Select an item.</p> | <p>In particular, it shall be verified that the allocation of additional funds does not exceed the maximum amount of aid under the State aid scheme or de minimis aid. It is also verified whether the additional aid can be granted (i.e. whether the scheme is still valid and whether additional funds can be granted under the scheme). In the area of public procurement, it is verified in particular that the allocation of additional funds (cumulatively) would not increase the value of the contract by more than 50% compared to the original value.</p> |