



Selection criteria

AGRI.J.4 perspective

Horea TODORAN
Head of Unit AGRI.J.4



Agenda

- Why are selection criteria important?
- Legal basis used for 2007-2013 programming period
- Figures from audits on 2007-2013 expenditure
- Typology of findings
- Principles behind an effective selection system



Why are selection criteria important?

- *Selection of projects must take place in a **transparent** way*
- *Selection of projects must guarantee an **equal treatment of the applicants***
- *The selected projects are those that **better comply with the objectives of the measure**, as described in the RDP*



Legal basis for 2007-2013 period

Council Regulation (EC) No 1698/2005

- Article 71.2: "*Expenditure shall be eligible for an EAFRD contribution only where incurred for operations decided on by the Managing Authority of the programme in question or under its responsibility, **in accordance with the selection criteria** fixed by the competent body*".
- Article 75.1: "*the Managing Authority shall be responsible for managing and implementing the programme in an efficient, effective and correct way and in particular for: (a) ensuring that **operations are selected for funding in accordance with the criteria applicable to the rural development programme***".



Legal basis for 2007-2013 period

Commission Regulation (EU) No 65/2011

- Article 24.2 - "*administrative checks on applications for support shall in particular include a verification of:[...] (b) **compliance with the selection criteria** set out in the rural development programme*".
- Article 24.3 - "*administrative checks on payment claims shall include in particular, and where appropriate for the claim in question, verification of:[...] (c) **the completed operation compared with the operation for which the application for support was submitted and granted.***"

Figures from audits on 2007-2013 expenditure

- *2009-2013 – DG AGRI \approx 70 enquiries on investment measures*
- *9 enquiries led to proposing financial corrections related to deficiencies in the selection of projects*
- *several other enquiries found weaknesses in the selection of projects, but didn't lead to financial corrections*
- *Deficiencies related to selection of projects in \approx 22% of enquiries*

Typology of findings

- Complete absence of selection criteria
- Selection criteria exist but are not applied
- "First come – first served" approval – lack of competition
- Non-transparent "pre-selection" phase
- Selection criteria decided after the end of the application period

Typology of findings

- Selection criteria applied by PA \neq those decided by MA
- Selection criteria modified during the approval process
- Selection criteria impossible to control at the moment of the selection (commitments) and not controlled before final payment
- Groups of selection criteria that contradict each other
- Scales of points (1-10), but no guidance to assessors on how to assign a certain number of points

Typology of findings

- Weighting not appropriate – high scores for insignificant parts
- Absent or ineffective minimum thresholds
- Points given even for "negative performance" (answer NO)
- Selection criteria mixed with or duplicating eligibility criteria
- Absent, non-transparent, or uneven criteria to decide between projects with the same number of points

Auditor's "wish list"

Transparent + equal treatment of applicants

- defined by the competent body prior to the application process and published in due time
- clear and easy to understand by all applicants
- clear and easy to apply by assessors
- verifiable at the moment of project selection
- applied correctly and homogenously across applications

Quality of selected projects

- scoring system includes points for each criterion, appropriate weights, and a minimum threshold
- linked to the objectives of the measure



European
Commission

Thank you for your attention!