

What's new – PRAG 2021.1

Ch	Title	Subject matter	Modification	Cross-reference section/annex
1	Introduction	Economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community	It is clarified that the Directorate-General for Structural Reform Support (DG REFORM) – instead of the Structural Reform and Support Service (SRSS) – is in charge of the instrument of financial support for encouraging the economic development of the Turkish Cypriot community.	Chapter 1 , p. 4, Footnote 3
2	Basic Rules	Communication and visibility	The provisions on communication and visibility have been amended in the procurement and grant contracts as well as in the respective guidelines (i.e. visibility obligations remain, a communication plan becomes optional and communication funds have to be pooled and implemented via separate contracts on the basis of similar geographical or thematic scope).	Chapters 2,3,4,5,6 Annexes b8c, b8d, b8e, b8f, b8o2, c4d, c4e, d4o, d4p, ds4o, e3a, e3b, e3h2, chap 2 – Prospect guidelines and application form
		Declaration on Honour (DoH)	Clarification that there is no need to request the original paper version of the DoH signed in blue ink or with QES for eSubmission procedures.	Chapters 2,3,4,5 Sections 2.10.1, 3.4.12.1, 4.3.9.7, 5.3.9.7 Annexes a10a, b3, b11a, b8o5, b8o7, c4b, c4l, c7a, d7a, ds4b, ds4c
		Change of terminology	The notion of “ <i>Additional services and works</i> ” is replaced by “ <i>Repetition of similar services and works</i> ” in the contract notice in order to align the heading of section II.2.14 with its description.	Chapter 2 Annex A5e
		Procurement threshold	The ceiling for Events 2020 is corrected from “<EUR 300 000” to “<EUR 999 999”	Chapter 2 Section 2.6.1

		Opening and evaluation committee	<p>Further guidance in case of procedures managed via eSubmission:</p> <p>§ 1: In case of eSubmission there will be an opening and evaluation committee for the tender opening sessions and evaluation sessions. It is recommended that the opening committee is made up of the same members as the evaluation committee.</p> <p>§ 7: There is an exception for the opening session meeting in case of eSubmission, whereby the technical opening can be done by the Chair and Secretary on behalf of the opening committee.</p> <p>§ 9: In case of a negotiated procedure using eSubmission, it is recommended to appoint an evaluation committee to allow the evaluation committee members to access the offers.</p>	<p>Chapter 2 Section 2.9.1</p>
		Electronic opening	Clarification that proceedings can be done using videoconference systems in case of <i>electronic opening through PPMT MyWorkplace</i> and in duly justified cases.	<p>Chapter 2 Section 2.9.2</p>
		Terminology	The terms “accepted costs” and “in kind contributions” are defined in the glossary.	Annex a1a
3	Services	Alignment of terminology	<p>In order to align with other PRAG provisions terminology is changed as follows:</p> <p>EN: 'opening report' to 'opening record'. FR: 'rapport' to 'procès-verbal'. ES: 'informe' to 'acta' de apertura de plicas. PT: 'relatório' to 'registo'.</p>	<p>Chapters 3,4,5 Annexes b5, b9, b10, b11a. C5, c6, c7a. D5, d6, d7a</p>
4				
5	Works	Ineligible costs	<p>Following ineligible costs are added to the guidelines for grant applicants in order to align with the GC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -in kind contributions (except for volunteers' work); -bonuses included in costs of staff; -negative interest charged by banks or other financial institutions. 	<p>Annexes e3a, Prospect e3a1 (open and restricted) Section 2.1.5</p>
6				

	Framework Partnership Agreement	Deletion of annex e12b - Standard grant contract (e3h1) to be used instead.	Annex e12b
	Alignment of application form and logframe templates	There is no need to refer to “possible intermediary outcomes” in the grant application form. The respective passage is deleted in order to be consistent with the work done in other key docs (such as the AD template) by INTPA and NEAR, but also in OPSYS structure, etc.	Annexes e3b + Prospect annex A2 Section 2.1.1.
	Clarifications on SCOs	It is clarified that with regard to the rules applicable to SCOs, the authorising officer can: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In case of “output or result-based SCOs”, formally approve and state in the contract lump sums and unit costs if recommended to be accepted by the evaluation committee. There is no need for the authorising officer anymore to authorise them “first in the guidelines of a call for proposals” – the latter passage is deleted accordingly. - Allow the use of “other SCOs”, if the beneficiary's cost accounting practices have been positively assessed by an independent external auditor. “Other SCOs” are applicable to pillar assessed entities and, in case of grants awarded with or without a call for proposals, also to grant beneficiaries provided that they have been previously authorised by national authorities under comparable funding schemes. 	Chapter 6 Section 6.2.1
		It is clarified that SCOs are applicable also for grants awarded without a call for proposals and a clean-up of the text has taken place, as follows: In chapter 6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - addition of "grants awarded without a call for proposals" and the sentence "Please note that in case of grants awarded without a call for proposals, output or result-based SCOs, or if applicable, other SCOs, may be admissible only if an evaluation committee has been appointed." - deletion of the text "The authorisation decision must contain at least the following [...]" to "Specific guidelines [...] in due time." In annex K (e3a2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - deletion in the title "awarded through calls for proposals" 	Chapter 6 Annex e3a2 (Annex K)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - addition at the beginning of para.1 "For all grant procedures (calls for proposals and direct award)" - addition in page 2 of the sentence "Please note that in direct award grants, output or result-based SCOs, or other SCOs, if applicable, may be admissible only if an evaluation committee has been appointed." - deletion of the entire para.2 as obsolete. 	
		<p>Article 14.6 of the General conditions is modified - in order to clarify that for non-pillar assessed entities other SCOs can be admissible only if previously accepted by national authorities under comparable funding schemes – as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “Simplified cost options embedded in the cost accounting practices of the beneficiary and that are not result based can be authorized only if they have been accepted by national authorities under comparable funding schemes in accordance with Annex K to the guidelines of applicants.” - Deletion of the sentence in article 14.5 "the information used...[...] objective information". 	Chapter 6 Annex e3a2
	Evaluation carried out by assessors	The sentence "It is however not possible to have different assessors within the same lot." in footnote 54 is deleted.	Chapter 6 Section 6.5.7.2