Annex 2 to MC Decision no. 68/10.11.2025

Corrigendum to the Applicant's Guide for the Targeted call for operations of strategic importance (OSI) in the context of Interreg VI-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme

Applicant's guide Call 1 - OSI (amended version according to MC Decision no 18/22.03.2024 and MC decision no 44/2025)	**Revised form for applicant's guide Call 1 - OSI**	**Justification**
Page 47 *MC may decide to give a second chance to the rejected projects (rejected with the proposal to be revised). In this respect, a deadline for submitting the improved application will be set. In case the new application does not receive a score of at least 70 points, the operation of strategic importance shall be proposed to be eliminated from the Programme. However, a clear decision regarding the respective operation should be taken by latest 30th of June 2024.*	*MC may decide to give a second chance to the rejected projects (rejected with the proposal to be revised). In this respect, a deadline for submitting the improved application will be set. In case the new application does not receive a score of at least 70 points, the operation of strategic importance shall be proposed to be eliminated from the Programme. However, a clear decision regarding the respective operation should be taken by latest 30th of June 2024.By exception, MC may decide, in duly justified cases, the give a 3rd chance to DANUBE RISK OSI to rejected with the proposal to be revised.*	The DANUBE RISK OSI addresses a key strategic priority in the Interreg VI-A Romania–Bulgaria Programme area, namely enhancing cross-border risk prevention, preparedness, and management capacities in the context of increasing climate-related and environmental challenges. Its implementation is expected to deliver long-term benefits for both Member States, contributing directly to the Programme specific objectives and to EU policy goals under the Green Deal and the EU Civil Protection Mechanism. The operation involves multiple national institutions with different administrative, technical, and legal frameworks. The complexity of coordinating these partners across borders has required additional time and clarification efforts that were not fully achievable within the initial revision period. Eliminating the operation from the Programme at this stage would result in the loss of an important cross-border initiative already developed and supported by the relevant stakeholders. Granting a final opportunity to improve the proposal would preserve the investments already made in project preparation and maintain the continuity of strategic cooperation efforts in the field of disaster risk management.

Page 77, below B. Documents to be submitted depending on the specificity of the application (the costs related to these documents are reimbursed by the Interreg VI-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme based on real cost principle)	Page 77, below B. Documents to be submitted depending on the specificity of the application (the costs related to these documents are reimbursed by the Interreg VI-A Romania-Bulgaria Programme based on real cost principle) to be added: For any Annexes of type B (BI1-7) related to investments or infrastructure, where the activities concerning the identification of the location, technical solution, or similar preparatory actions are foreseen in the project application, and the corresponding permits, technical and design documents (e.g. feasibility studies, technical documentation, authorizations, certifications, permits, etc.) are defined as outputs of these activities, such annexes are not mandatory to be submitted together with the Application Form. These documents shall instead be provided during the project implementation period, as part of the planned activities.	This exception is introduced to ensure proportionality and coherence in the treatment of all Annexes of type B and to align them with the exceptions foreseen for Annex B2 (Feasibility studies or equivalent technical/design documents elaborated by a licensed designer, containing a description of construction works and Bill of Quantities). In addition, this exception is introduced to ensure flexibility in the treatment of investments (infrastructure/equipment) in where the identification, design or permitting processes are explicitly included as part of the project implementation activities. For such investments, requiring the submission of technical documentation at the application stage would be premature and information would not be available.

Annex 1 - List of application proposed for revision to the MC Decision no.....

Ranking	Jems code	Application title	Lead applicant	Romanian applicant/s	Bulgarian applicant/s	Average score	Approved ~~Requested~~ budget: Project´s aggregate value (euro)	Community Funding ERDF (euro)	Total public contribution (euro)	Private Contribution (euro)	Indicative total allocation (euro)	Recommendations issued during the assessment process	Ammendments of the recommendations proposed by MA & NA, to be reflected in the final comunication adressed to partners*	MA & NA justifications (not to be communcated to partners)
Priority Axis 2 - A greener region Call 1 - Call dedicated to the operations of strategic importance (OSI)														
1	ROBG00221	Danube Risk Prevention	Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests	National Administratio n Romanian Waters Technical University of Civil Engineering Bucharest Alexandru Ioan Cuza University from Iași	Ministry of Environment and Water National Institute of Meteorology and Hydrology Danube River Basin Directorate	N/A	17,501,410.44	14,001,128.31	3,150,253.90	350,028.23	17,500,000.00	**1.** The project partners must revise and improve the Application Form by including all the necessary information and justifications, in order to demonstrate a clear connection between the challenges, needs and proposed actions for their resolving and by ensuring the precise correlation between the proposed project budget and project activities. Thus, the project partners must provide additional information related to the following aspects: a) To demonstrate the cross-border relevance and impact of establishment of the Training Centre in Dorobantu, as well as to describe the needs for training of each project partner shall be clearly described in the AF; b) To fully define the territorial challenges, in particular those related to the needs of the trainings; needs for training of each project partner must be clearly identified, including number of trainees; c) To describe the structures from both countries, authorized to act in emergency and risk situations, their responsibilities and how those organizations can benefit from the current project; d) Cross-border relevance of establishment of the Training Centre in Dorobantu must be assessed on the base of defined cross-border needs for training and annual number of trainees, declared by partners to be sent for training; e) Number of trained people (including periods of program implementation and sustainability period) must be described as result of project implementation; f) To additionally justify whether the equipment to be installed/used outside the Programme area serves exclusively the Programme area or, if not, to determine the share of that equipment which may be linked or which serves the needs of the Programme area; g) Project partners should analyze whether the foreseen to be purchased equipment fulfils all the criteria to be considered as an investment and declare it accordingly. As well, partners must describe/certify were exactly equipment will be installed, the ownership of the premise/building/rooms, and which institution/structure will take responsibility for the service of the equipment, including financial responsibility. The information shall be provided in section C.4 Project work plan (Activities/ Investments). In addition, the project partners shall declare that the equipment will be used exclusively for the purpose of the cross-border area; h) To describe the need for renovation activities on behalf of PP4 and how the planned investment will contribute to the achievement of the main objective of the project. The information shall be provided in section C.4 Project work plan (Activities/ Investments). As well, PP4 shall justify if the planned investment will serve exclusively the Programme area or other areas will also benefit of it; i) PP6 must clearly differentiate the terms "Data Center" and equipment, planned to be purchased for the Data Center and installed in Sofia. Along with the justification of the needs and cross border relevance, detailed specifications of items/components/units to be purchased shall be provided, including estimated unit prices, number of units and estimated value. The information shall be provided in section C.4 Project work plan (Activities/ Investments); j) PP6 must describe where and which institution will install the foreseen to be purchased equipment in order to reach necessary working conditions and which institution/structure will take responsibility for it, including both physical and financial responsibilities for the running, safe-keeping and possible technical failure/s of the equipment; k) Project partners to justify how the proposed 1 (one) pilot action will represent the solution taken by up-scaled organizations, considering the declared contribution of the project to the output indicator RCO84 2.4. Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects, paired to the result indicator RCR104 2.4 Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organisations. In addition, PP7 to justify how the results of the planned studies will be capitalized during or after the project implementation, including the possibility to perform pilot actions on Bulgarian territory demonstrating the results of the envisaged activities. l) The partnership should demonstrate how both territories (Ro and Bg) contribute to indicator RCO26 - Green infrastructure built or upgraded for adaptation to climate change. In addition, in the improved application form, PP7 shall clarify how result of the study will be capitalized during or after project implementation, including clarification on the possibility to perform pilot actions on Bulgarian territory in order to demonstrate the result of the envisaged study. **2.** All the mandatory documents requested by the Applicant's Guide and related to the proposed investment objectives (where it is the case) to be submitted with the revised Application Form. The project partners should pay attention that mandatory documents are requested also in case of equipment installation and not only in case of infrastructure activities (Annex AF_A5. Documents certifying the ownership status of the land and/or building). As regards the investments, which location is expected to be established during the project implementation (for example: investment component I.1.2 Re-connected climate resilient Danube floodplane of PP2), all the mandatory documents as requested by the Applicant's Guide shall be presented during the project implementation - documents proving the rights of property over the land object of investment, non-encumbrances declaration. **3.** If the project proposal is to be approved, declarations for securing funds for the training of staff of partners PP6 and PP7 shall be presented during the pre-contracting phase and if necessary, confirmation of their superior organization - Ministry of Environment and Waters of Bulgaria to be submitted. **4.** Considering that the permanent drilling will be carried out by the LP1 (72 boreholes at the base of the Danube dike at an interval of 5 km and a depth of 15 m, plus 72 boreholes on the crest of the Danube dike at an interval of 5 km and a depth of 30 m) in the area adjacent to the dams belonging to the National Water Management System, areas under the administration of PP2 - NARW according to GEO no. 107/2002, updated, and in this reference, a clarifying document from the beneficiary shall be presented during the implementation period. **5.** The total amount of the current project proposal 17,501,410.44 EUR exceeds the threshold of 17,500,000.00 EUR set for the current project within the Applicant's Guide for the targeted call for operations of strategic importance (OSI), which should be taken into account by the project partners when revising the Application Form. **6.** The calculations of the total amount needed for creation of the Training Center and made by PP2 - NARW are incorrect, because the partner did not use the InforEuro exchange rate of 4.9753 RON, indicated at page 73 of document named "DOC. TEHNICA SF DOROBANTU - ROMANA" and a higher one (5.00 RON). Thus, the total foreseen amount (the budgeted one and the amount of non-refundable costs) is lower than the actually needed one. Therefore, the partner should make correct calculations by using the InforEuro exchange rate indicated within the technical documents, presented by him and to correct the amount of nonrefundable costs in section "Summary" of the Application Form. The document named "Execution- I.1 training center - 2025" and uploaded in JeMS on 25.04.2025 must be corrected as well. **7.** The amount of 14,339.48 EUR of PP4 related to renovation of two rooms within the University should be transferred from the budget category "External expertise and services" to "Infrastructure and works". **8.** The amount of 520,992.00 EUR of PP6 related to creation of Data Center in Sofia, Bulgaria should be transferred from the budget category "External expertise and services" to "Infrastructure and works". **9.** Partner PP2, during pre-contracting must present a general training plan/programme for both - project and sustainability periods justifying the bilateral usage of the Training Centre. **10.** Partner PP6 must submit the following documents: **In relation to the envisaged works** activities (renovations) in the Data center: **10.1** Attachment 5 (the pre-feasibility study/survey based on which the quantities and prices of the works and related services for the renovation of the Data Center are estimated) is missing and has to be presented including non-official translation. **10.2** Annex AF_A5 (documents certifying the ownership status of the land and/or building) need to be presented separately for the Data Center, together with a cadastral scheme and the ownership declaration during the pre-contracting period. **10.3** The costs for the different types of works and related services are presented in the table on p.180-181 of Annex 6. In addition, Public Tender procedures with similar subject are provided in Annex 6 (pages 72-81). For more clarity, it is appropriate all related to works documentation to be presented separately together with the missing Attachment 5, PP6 envisages "engineering" that includes detailed design by licensed designer and works during the implementation of the project therefore related annexes shall be presented during implementation stage. **10.4** The annexes required in case of Infrastructure and Works activities. **In relation to the equipment** planned to be purchased and in installed in the Data Center: **10.5** PP6 must declare: who will install the equipment in order all items to reach necessary working conditions; who will take responsibility for its maintenance, including both physical and financial responsibilities for the running, safe-keeping, service maintenance, including possible technical failures of the equipment; who will take responsibilities for overhead costs (e.g., heating/cooling of the equipment, water supply, electricity, etc.), including running/operating cost. **10.6** The list of Services and Equipment (given on page 182-183 of Annex 6) provides just a reference to the long list of offers and internet marketing researches for similar items. In that respect the table has to be amended, as follows: a) The Services and Equipment have to be presented in separate tables in order to be clear the Budgetary line under which the respective costs have to be included b) For every equipment item: unit price, number of units and total costs to be given in addition to the provided reference. All offers and internet marketing researches to be numbered and attached to the table. c) For the envisaged services a similar approach to be applied, when applicable. **11.** In regard to Investment I.1.1, on the responsibility of PP2 - NARW, as the old Geotechnical Study indicated problems regarding the nature of the foundation soil (wet sensitive), the new Geotechnical Study invoked in the LP1 address dated 24.04.2025 was not found in the JEMS system, the above-mentioned document shall be presented accordingly. In addition, taking into account the administrative reorganizations and budgetary constraints incident at PP2 level, a credible commitment plan should be presented regarding the resolution of the identified risks, during pre-contracting stage. **12.** In regard to Investment I.1.2, on the responsibility of PP2 - NARW, the made calculation of the needed amount of 1,642,036 EUR, included in the project budget is not made in accordance with the provisions of the Applicant's Guide regarding the presentation of 2 similar offers or an independent evaluation of the price. Thus, the applicant shall justify the budgeted amount by providing justification documents as requested by the Applicant's Guide. Further, during pre-contracting stage, to provide a document signed by a qualified natural / legal person / licensed in the field, which would point out technical elements and financial data regarding the budget in question. This document can be considered appropriate according to the provisions of the AG, taking into account and professional assumption of the rules of proportionality invoked.	The following ammendments will be applied to the recommendations issued during the assessment process: b) To fully define the territorial challenges, in particular those related to the needs of the trainings; needs for training of each project partner must be clearly identified, including the estimated number of trainees; e) The estimated number of trained people (including periods of program implementation and sustainability period) must be described as result of project implementation; f) To additionally justify whether investments (works, the equipment or infrastructure) to be realised/installed/used outside the Programme area serves exclusively the Programme area or, if not, to determine the share of that equipment investment which may be linked or which serves the needs of the Programme area; g) Project partners should analyze whether the foreseen to be purchased equipment fulfils all the criteria to be considered as an investment and declare it accordingly. As well, partners must describe/certify were exactly equipment will be installed, the ownership of the premise/building/rooms, and that they which institution/structure will take responsibility for the service of the equipment, including financial responsibility. The information shall be provided in section C.4 Project work plan (Activities/ Investments). In addition, the project partners shall declare that the equipment will be used exclusively for the purpose of the cross-border area; ~~j) PP6 must describe where and which institution will install the foreseen to be purchased equipment in order to reach necessary working conditions and which institution/structure will take responsibility for it, including both physical and financial responsibilities for the running, safe-keeping and possible technical failure/s of the equipment;~~ rephrased as: j) PP6 should declare and take responsibility for all stages of the investment (installation, use, maintenance), by assuming all related costs, including maintenance during the sustainability period; l) ~~The partnership should demonstrate how both territories (Ro and Bg) contribute to indicator RCO26 - Green infrastructure built or upgraded for adaptation to climate change. In addition, in the improved application form,~~ PP7 shall clarify how result of the study ~~can setting up a green infrastructure - floodplain~~ will be capitalized during or after project implementation, including clarification on the possibility to perform pilot actions on Bulgarian territory in order to demonstrate the result of the envisaged study. 4. Considering that the permanent drilling will to be carried out by the LP1 ~~(72 boreholes at the base of the Danube dike at an interval of 5 km and a depth of 15 m, plus 72 boreholes on the crest of the Danube dike at an interval of 5 km and a depth of 30 m)~~ in the area adjacent to the dams belonging to the National Water Management System, ~~areas under the administration of PP2 - NARW according to GEO no. 107/2002, updated, and in this reference, a clarifying document from the beneficiary shall be presented during the implementation period~~ partners should (i) clarify in the application if such works require specific authorisation and (ii) submit during implementation the urban planning certificate or any similar document in relation to these works, as the case may be; Deleted recommendation ~~9. Partner PP2, during pre-contracting must present a general training plan/programme for both - project and sustainability periods justifying the bilateral usage of the Training Centre.~~ 12. In ~~regard to~~ respect of cost justification for Investment I.1.2, ~~on the responsibility of PP2 - NARW, the made calculation of the needed amount of 1,642,036 EUR, included in the project budget is not made in accordance with the provisions of the Applicant's Guide regarding the presentation of 2 similar offers or an independent evaluation of the price. Thus, the applicant~~ the partner in charge (PP2) shall ~~justify the budgeted amount by~~ providing supplementary and up-to-date cost justifications, In line with ~~documents as requested by~~ the Applicant's Guide. ~~Further, during pre-contracting, stage, to provide a document signed by a qualified natural / legal person / licensed in the field, which would point out technical elements and financial data regarding the budget in question. This document can be considered appropriate according to the provisions of the AG, taking into account and professional assumption of the rules of proportionality invoked.~~	Given the timing of future activities, this number represents an estimation. Idem. The situation may also reffer to works, not only to equipment More accurate and simpler recommendation Idem. The Applicant Guide and the Methodological descriptions of indicators do not necessarily require the green infrastructure to be built in both countries. Under RCO84, the only floodplain proposed under the project may still be considered as a 'pilot action' if organisations from both countries were involved in the development and implementation (e.g., in a co-design or co-creation process, including, for example, in peer reviews). Clearer and simpler reqcommendation. Such a requirement is not covered by the Applicant Guide and represents an unnecessary burden on partners. The Applicant Guide allows to justify the costs based on 'similar contracts implemented by the partners' (page 78). That's how partners already justified costs. Still, a more detaile justification would be welcomed, together with updated costs, taking into account the evolution of contruction prices over the last years.

* Recommendations issued during the assessment process which have no corresponding ammendment remain valid, in their initial form.