

CEF Transport – 2014 CALLS FOR PROPOSALS

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS – General

1. SCOPE OF THE CALLS AND PRIORITIES
 2. DEFINITIONS
 3. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA - APPLICANTS
 4. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA - PROJECTS
 5. MEMBER STATES' SUPPORT
 6. COMPLIANCE WITH EU LAW
 7. SELECTION CRITERIA: FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY
 8. FUNDING SOURCES / FINANCIAL INSTRUMENTS
 9. ELIGIBLE COSTS / CO-FUNDING RATES
 10. SUB-CONTRACTING / IMPLEMENTATION CONTRACTS
 11. APPLICATION FORMS
 12. GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION
 13. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS
 14. eSUBMISSION MODULE / SUBMISSION PROCEDURE
 15. GRANT AGREEMENT PREPARATION / MANAGEMENT
 16. SELECTION PROCESS
 17. MISCELLANEOUS
 18. SUPPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF ONGOING ACTIONS
-

1. SCOPE OF THE CALLS AND PRIORITIES

1.1 Can you confirm that Cohesion Funds are not available under the 2014 annual call for proposals?

The 2014 Annual Work Programme does not make available Cohesion Funds. Therefore no proposal under the 2014 annual call for proposals can benefit from the Cohesion Fund allocation to the CEF Transport. This allocation is only available for proposals submitted under the multi-annual call addressing the Cohesion Fund allocation under the CEF.

1.2 The annual call text states in section 9.2 'Eligible Actions' that "(...) 'Actions for which some parts are entitled to funding under cohesion fund envelope and other parts under the general CEF transport envelope (...) must be submitted separately under either the cohesion call or the general CEF call as appropriate (...)'. Does this imply that proposals under the annual call may be eligible for funding of the Cohesion Fund envelope?

No, this is not the case. This is a generic formulation included in all annual and multi-annual call texts. The 2014 Annual Work Programme does not make available Cohesion Funds (see question 1.1).

1.3 Under which transport mode should I present my proposal which is planning to build an interconnection between two transport modes?

Each call text stipulates in its section 6.1 'Application Form' 3rd paragraph concerning the choice to be made by applicants between different call priorities if a proposal is addressing several: "(...). Proposals that include elements of more than one priority have to be submitted in the priority to which their content has the comparatively highest relevance. In this respect, it is up to the applicant(s) to assess which priority is better served by the content and nature of the proposal."

The same principle applies *mutatis mutandis* to the choice of transport mode under which a proposal will be submitted. It is up to the applicant(s) to assess which transport mode is more relevant to the content and nature of the proposal.

1.4 Our project concerns an intermodal exchange (rail/road/bus) in an urban node. What priority should we apply for and can design and construction be funded under the current calls?

Determining the priority under which a proposal could be eligible is the responsibility of an applicant. You may wish to consider whether Priority 5 "Actions implementing transport infrastructure in nodes of the Core Network, including urban nodes" under the multi-annual call, Funding Objective 3 or Priority 9 "Actions implementing transport infrastructure in nodes of the Core Network, including urban nodes" of the annual call are the appropriate priorities for your proposal. The type of actions that can be funded under these calls are described in the respective annexes. The eligibility criteria can be found in section 9 of the respective calls for proposals.

1.5 *I would like to have an appointment with someone at INEA to prepare a proposal.*

For reasons of equal treatment of all applicants, INEA does not provide tailored advice to potential applicants on the preparation of their proposals. Any questions related to the ongoing calls can only be addressed in writing to the helpdesk. The replies to questions received on the helpdesk are made available to all potential applicants through Frequently Asked Questions, to facilitate the preparation of proposals.

For some Member States eligible for the Cohesion Fund, JASPERS (Joint Assistance to Support Projects in European Regions) provides advice during project preparation, to help improve the quality of the major projects to be submitted for grant financing under the Structural and Cohesion Funds. More information is available at the following website: <http://www.jaspers-europa-info.org/>.

The current multi-annual Work Programme also foresees possibilities of technical assistance under the Programme Support Actions (PSAs), for example to Member State eligible to Cohesion Fund. The PSAs are managed by the Commission.

1.6 *If our proposal for a feasibility study receives CEF financing, would it be possible to receive CEF financial assistance for the realization of the project later?*

Yes, as long as CEF financial assistance is not requested again for the same activities covered under the feasibility study.

1.7 *Our project addresses several objectives as it directly affects a Core Network corridor (Funding Objective 1, Priority 1), improves Rail Interoperability (Funding Objective 1, Priority 3), is itself an innovation (Funding Objective 2, Priority 1) and contributes to Safe and Secure Infrastructure (Funding Objective 2, Priority 2). Under which priority should we submit the proposed Action?*

It is possible that one proposal addresses several funding objectives. It is the responsibility of the applicant(s) to make a determination to which priority the proposal is most relevant. Such decision could take into account, for example, which priority the majority of the activities in the proposal are related to.

1.8 *A new railway line's starting point will be on the so-called "Other Sections on the Core Network" as defined by the CEF Regulation, Annex I, Part I, Section 3. To apply for funding for this action, which of the present calls would be relevant for such an application?*

Projects located on the Other Sections of the Core Network (Annex I Part I.3 of the CEF Regulation) are eligible under the annual call, Funding Objective 1, Annex 1. However, if a part of the project is located on pre-identified sections of the Core Network, the eligibility of the proposal under the multi-annual calls will have to be determined on a case-by-case basis taking into consideration the share of the route which is on the Core Network.

1.9 *Are airports financed through the 2014 CEF Transport calls? In our case, the runway is almost ready, but there are a lot more investments to be done.*

There is no specific priority targeting construction of airports. However, your proposal, depending on the exact nature of its activities, may correspond to some funding objectives and priorities in the annual or multi-annual calls, for example regarding connections between airports and the rail network or air traffic management.

1.10 *Are actions on the comprehensive network eligible under the 2014 CEF Transport multi-annual call, Funding Objective 3 (ITS for Roads) or is the eligibility limited only to actions on the Core Network?*

Under the call for Funding Objective 3, only Actions which can be identified as projects of common interest as defined in the TEN-T Guidelines and listed in Part I of Annex I of the CEF Regulation may receive EU financial assistance.

In addition, it is stated in Annex 3 of the call for proposals for Funding Objective 3 available on the call webpage that works-proposals submitted under ITS for road shall concern the deployment along Core Network Corridors.

It is possible to submit proposals located on the Comprehensive Network under the annual call funding priorities.

1.11 *When will there be a dedicated multi-sectoral work programme/call for proposals exploiting synergies between the CEF sectors: transport, energy and telecoms?*

Such a work programme/call for proposals are foreseen. However, at this point in time there is no information available on when they would be adopted/issued.

1.12 *Is an action related to a city that is listed under Annex II, point 1 'Urban nodes of the core network' of the TEN-T Regulation eligible under the multi-annual call addressing Funding Objective 3, Priority Core Network Nodes, despite the fact it is not connected to a Corridor?*

To be eligible under a multi-annual call it needs to be included in Annex I, Part I of the CEF Regulation. Urban Nodes which are not covered by this annex should apply under the annual call, irrespective if they are classified as Core or Comprehensive urban nodes.

1.13 *To what extent will the outcomes of the on-going Core Network Corridor studies be reflected in the CEF 2014 calls evaluation?*

The 2014 calls do not include any reference to the on-going Core Network Corridor studies and their outcomes.

1.14 *Is there already an indicative call planning for 2015 and 2016, in particular for multi-annual calls for proposals or in specific fields like Motorways of the Seas or Innovation and the respective available funding?*

There is currently no formal decision on the Work Programmes and calls for the years 2015 and 2016 and the potential funding envelopes.

1.15 *Is it possible that a certain mode of transport or a priority is covered by the special call for Cohesion countries but an individual Member State eligible to the call does not foresee funding for this mode of transport or priority in its respective Operational Programme or significantly limits it?*

Yes, this is possible.

1.16 *Is there an average or otherwise fixed financial allocation per Member State in the current calls or by calls (AP v. MAP)?*

There is no financial allocation per Member State under the general CEF Transport envelope or under the current calls for proposals.

However, national envelopes for the Member States eligible to the Cohesion Fund are applicable until the end of 2016 under special calls for Cohesion countries. As of 1 January 2017, unused national allocations will be available for all applicants from the Member States eligible to the Cohesion Fund.

2. DEFINITIONS

2.3 *Which kind of projects could be classified as "interconnections" in the sense of the use of this term in Annex I, Part I.2 of the CEF Regulation?*

These would be projects addressing the better connections of different modes of transport, usually connections of the mode listed for the pre-identified section in question to other modes.

2.4 What is the definition of pilot activities eligible for funding under the CEF Transport?

The CEF Transport calls (Section 2 of the 2014 AP and MAP Calls) define pilot activities eligible for funding as part of studies, as follows:

"In addition to Article 2(6) of the CEF Regulation, studies may include pilot activities that will serve at least one of the following objectives:

- *to develop, improve or adapt a new technology or an innovative solution and implement it in order to test its feasibility and suitability as well as its added value before deploying it on a larger scale.*
- *to deploy an existing technology, infrastructure or service (i.e. already in use elsewhere but new to a particular sector, system or geographical area) in order to gain experience and/or create market conditions for deployment on a larger scale.*

The pilot activities of a study may include the deployment of a certain type of infrastructure or technology but on a limited scale and at a reasonable price and with the objective of testing and validating the viability of the innovative Actions proposed for future scale up and roll out.

Pilot activities of a study should be of an experimental nature and designed to test the feasibility of an innovative Action and its usefulness for future large scale implementation. They should not be associated with research activities that are not eligible under this type of Action."

Pilot activities of a study supporting the deployment of any type of infrastructure or technology that would be defined as works under any priority of the multi-annual Work Programme in line with Article 2(5) of the CEF Regulation and do not fall under at least one of the two objectives above-mentioned will not be supported under this type of Action.

In addition, pilot activities of a study supporting the deployment of a commercial network do not fall under the scope of the CEF Regulation and will therefore not be supported.

2.5 How can we determine whether our project belongs to one of the Core Network Corridors?

Core Network Corridors as well as their pre-identified sections can be found in the Annex I, Part I of the CEF Regulation (Regulation 1316/2013) that is available for download on each call page.

2.6 How can we determine whether our port is a Core Network or a Comprehensive Network port?

Annex II, Part 2 of the TEN-T Guidelines (Regulation 1315/2013) specifies the airports, maritime ports, inland ports and rail-road terminals of the Core and Comprehensive Networks by Member State.

2.7 Is it possible to receive CEF financial assistance for a study evaluating feasibility of the project?

Under the CEF Regulation studies are defined as "activities needed to prepare project implementation, such as preparatory, mapping, feasibility, evaluation, testing and validation studies, including in the form of software, and any other technical support measure, including prior action to define and develop a project and decide on its financing, such as reconnaissance of the sites concerned and preparation of the financial package".

Feasibility studies may thus be supported under the CEF, provided they comply with the requirements as provided for in the call for proposals. In particular, please note that the type of action and/ or studies that can be covered under the respective calls will also depend on the specific priority under which the proposal is submitted.

2.8 TEN-T Guidelines, Chapter II, Section 6 specifies that freight terminals shall have 800,000 tons of yearly transshipments. Must this volume already exist before the action starts or can the action lead to an increase to this value?

In line with section 9.2 of the 2014 CEF-Transport Calls for proposals on eligible actions, "*projects [of common interest] have to comply with Chapter II and for core networks, Chapter III of the*

TEN-T Guidelines". Applications for CEF-Transport funding must be in line with the relevant provisions of the TEN-T Guidelines at the moment of the application.

As far as freight terminals or logistic platforms are concerned, Article 27 of the TEN-T Guidelines (section 6 of Chapter II) specifies that they "shall comply with at least one of the following criteria:

- (a) their annual transshipment of freight exceeds, for non-bulk cargo, 800 000 tonnes or, for bulk-cargo, 0.1 % of the corresponding total annual cargo volume handled in all maritime ports of the Union;
- (b) where there is no freight terminal or logistic platform complying with point (a) in a NUTS 2 region, the terminal or platform in question is the main freight terminal or logistic platform designated by the Member State concerned, linked at least to roads and railways for that NUTS 2 region, or in the case of Member States with no rail system, linked only to roads."

2.9 Are geotechnical soundings considered physical intervention?

Without knowing the specific technology used in geotechnical sounding or further details about the proposal, it is hard to provide a definite answer. However, it is very likely that geotechnical soundings involve physical intervention, particularly if a license from the local authorities is required.

2.10 What deliverables are acceptable to prove the actual completion of works of the proposed Action?

Deliverables confirming the completion of works between the project owner and the contractor (e.g. completion report, pictures, formal acceptance of the works) would be suitable. Please note that the grant agreement will further define the milestones and means of verification and that a regular monitoring of the progress is foreseen, notably through Annual Status Reports. The Agency will also be conducting site visit of the actions it funds to verify the completion of the works.

2.11 Is urban node the same as a core urban node?

No. A core urban node is an urban node located on the Core Network. The list of Core Network urban nodes is included in Annex II.1 of the TEN-T Guidelines.

2.12 Does a project, which is located between two cities (both not listed in Annex II of the TEN-T Regulation) in two different Member States fit within the definition of a cross-border section?

Projects eligible for funding from the CEF as cross-border sections should comply with the following conditions:

- a) there should be a written agreement between the Member States concerned or between the Member States and third countries concerned by the completion of the cross-border section, as set out in article 7(2) of the CEF Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013),
- b) in line with the definition of cross-border section and urban nodes in article 3 of the TEN-T Guidelines Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013), the cross-border sections must ensure the continuity of a project of common interest from the border to the first urban area of economic importance, which includes or is close to at least one of the following infrastructures: ports, including passenger terminals, airports, railway stations, logistic platforms and freight terminals, and
- c) the action to be financed must include at least the cross-border point and should, in principle, be a joint project of the two Member States concerned (or Member State and third country).

2.13 Our project concerns a reconstruction of a road section near the border between Member State A and Member State B, with construction taking place in two stages. The proposal for the first stage, to be submitted under the current calls, would address the construction only on the part of the section to be reconstructed. Can the proposed Action be considered as addressing a bottleneck?

According to Article 2 (15) of the CEF Regulation, a bottleneck means a physical, technical or functional barrier which leads to a system break affecting the continuity of long-distance or cross-

border flows and which can be surmounted by creating new infrastructure, or substantially upgrading existing infrastructure, that could bring significant improvements which will solve the bottleneck constraints.

If your proposal fulfils the conditions of the above definition, the overall Global Project comprising both stages would be considered as a removal of a bottleneck.

2.14 Application Form Part A2.4 allows an applicant to designate affiliated entities to be involved in the implementation of the proposed Action. Can the affiliated entity execute the entire implementation of the proposed Action or is there a maximum threshold in this sense?

There is no such threshold contained regarding the extent of the implementation that an affiliated entity can undertake in the definition of the affiliated entity (please see the "Glossary" of the Guide for Applicants available on the calls websites).

2.15 Is there a conclusive list of the third countries that can take part in CEF Transport supported actions?

Any third country other than a neighbouring country may participate on its own costs and without receiving CEF Transport financial assistance, subject to having received the endorsement of the concerned Member State.

Pursuant to Article 8 of the TEN-T Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013), third countries can only participate and also receive CEF Transport financial assistance provided that they are neighbouring countries in the sense of Article 3 of the TEN-T Regulation and Article 2 of the CEF Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013) (please see next question (2.16) on this issue), and provided that Annex III to the TEN-T Regulation contains an indicative map covering their country or mutual cooperation with the Commission is on-going with a view to agreeing on such indicative maps and that their participation is necessary and indispensable for the completion of a project of common interest.

2.16 Which are the neighbouring countries in the sense of Article 3 of Regulation (EU) No 1315/2013 on Union guidelines for the development of the trans-European transport network and Article 2 of Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013 establishing the Connecting Europe Facility?

These are countries falling in the scope of the European Neighbourhood Policy including the Strategic Partnership, the Enlargement Policy, and the European Economic Area or the European Free Trade Association.

2.17 If we submit a proposal under the current call but do not succeed in being selected for funding, does this jeopardise a second submission under any future call for proposals?

No, it does not. Any proposal can be re-submitted under a subsequent call for proposals, subject to still matching its objectives and priorities which may change from call to call.

2.18 Can two different applicants indicate the same affiliated entity?

It appears unlikely that one entity could be affiliated to two different parent entities within one proposal. If this is the case there is no withstanding reason. However, there will be no benefit as this affiliated entity could declare its costs incurred for implementing the action only once.

There is no restriction to for now entity to be affiliated to different parent entities in different proposals, subject to their relationship is providing sufficient ground for such affiliation.

3. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA - APPLICANTS

3.1 Can an applicant participate in a proposed Action, even though the proposed Action is not taking place in the country of this applicant?

Yes. There is no restriction for entities to participate only in Actions implemented in the country where they are established. In any case, the approval of the Member State on the territory of which the proposed Action takes place is compulsory.

3.2 Can a proposed Action be submitted by a private company without involving public entities or as coordinating applicant with other public entities?

Yes. Private entities can submit proposals without involving public entities or in a **multi-applicant proposal** with other private and/or public entities, provided that they can demonstrate the agreement of the concerned Member State(s).

3.4 Can a non-profit organisation submit a proposal?

Proposals may be submitted by international organisations, joint undertakings, or public or private undertakings or bodies established in Member States with the agreement of the Member States concerned. Therefore, non-profit organisations are in principle eligible, subject to obtaining the required Member State agreement that has to be demonstrated in Application Form Part A2.3. Non-profit organisations established in neighbouring countries may also submit proposals, provided that they can demonstrate they have received the support of the EU Member State(s) concerned (Application Form Part A2.3).

3.6 Can a private entity be the single applicant of a proposed Action?

Yes. This is possible provided that it obtains the approval of the concerned Member State(s) and complies with other applicable provisions, notably in respect of its operational and financial capacity. This is without prejudice to the minimum number of applicants required under specific calls and/or priorities (e.g. ITS, MoS and SESAR).

3.7 Under how many priorities can the same organization apply?

There is no limitation for the number of applications that can be submitted by the same organisation, provided of course it is eligible to apply under the respective calls and has the financial and operational capacity to carry out all proposed Actions. However, the same application cannot be submitted under several priorities.

3.8 Is it possible to submit a proposal with several applicants (i.e. in the form of an international consortium)?

Yes, it is possible to submit a multi-applicant proposal. In filling out the Application Form, in particular its Part A, please follow the instructions set out in the Guide for Applicants.

3.10 Can a county or other types of local and regional authorities be applicants for one of the calls?

Yes, in line with section 9.1 of the calls, local and regional authorities in the EU can be applicants, provided they have secured the agreement of the Member State(s) concerned by the proposed Action.

3.11 Are neighbouring countries eligible for funding under the CEF-Transport 2014 calls for proposals, notably in the field of telematics applications?

Yes they are. Priority 3 of the 2014 annual call explicitly addressed applicants from neighbouring countries "PROJECTS TO CONNECT THE TRANS-EUROPEAN TRANSPORT NETWORK WITH INFRASTRUCTURE NETWORKS OF THE NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES, IN PARTICULAR RELATED TO CROSS-BORDER SECTIONS (RAILWAYS, INLAND WATERWAYS, ROADS, MARITIME AND INLAND PORTS)". It states among others:

"Priority will be given to proposed Actions addressing:
(...)

- traffic management systems in neighbouring countries, except for River Information Services and Single European Sky (SESAR) (...)"

However, they have to obtain the agreement of a Member State and demonstrate it in Application Form Part A2.3.

3.12 Is it possible for an international company aiming to develop brake, brake system, safeguard system, compressor, driver assistance systems to apply under the Annual Call, Priority Innovation or priority Telematic Applications? Could it be developed as a separate project or does it have to be integrated into a wider development project by the government?

Pursuant to Section 9 of the Annual Call, proposals may be submitted by private undertakings established in the EU with the agreement of the Member States concerned. The proposal must also meet the criteria for the eligibility of actions, i.a. be identified as a project of common interest as defined in the TEN-T Guidelines, and respond to the objectives of the priority under which it applies. It is not necessary for this project to be integrated into a wider development programme of a Member State government.

3.13 Under the Multi-Annual Call, Funding Objective 3 Annex 6 ("Connections to and Development of Multimodal Logistics Platforms") is cooperation between at least two countries required?

No, there is no such requirement. Applications under this priority may be submitted by applicants from one Member State only.

3.14 Would an applicant established in a Member State that is not eligible for the Cohesion Fund be entitled to receive CEF Transport assistance with Cohesion Fund co-financing rates, if the action it is implementing is located in a Member State that is eligible for the Cohesion Fund?

No, this is not possible. Only entities legally established in Member States eligible for the Cohesion Fund can receive Union assistance at Cohesion Fund rates for actions taking place in the Member States eligible to the Cohesion Fund.

3.15 Could a Member State apply with more than one proposal under MAP?

Yes, there is no limitation for the number of applications that can be submitted with the support of the same Member State or with the same Member State as an applicant under either the Annual or the Multiannual calls for proposals.

3.16 Are concessionaires eligible for CEF Transport funding and can they be beneficiaries in a grant agreement?

Yes, provided they have the agreement of the Member States concerned by the proposed Action. Special attention must be paid to the fact that in principle the beneficiaries of the Actions are owners of the results of the Action.

3.17 The proposed Action concerns transport infrastructure partly located in a Member State and partly in a third country. It will be fully built, paid for and operated by the infrastructure manager of the Member State concerned. Is such project eligible for funding under the multi-annual call, Funding Objective 1?

A proposal which partly takes place in a third country but is being implemented and financed by an EU Member State may be eligible under this call, provided other eligibility criteria are fulfilled. The proposal should explain the specific situation and why it is indispensable to achieving the project of common interest. Please note that the annual call for proposals, Annex 3 is a priority specifically targeting projects to connect the Trans-European Transport Network with infrastructure network of the neighbouring countries.

If such proposal includes any applicants from a third country, they should also provide approval of the Ministry in the EU Member State concerned and approval of the Ministry in the third country (application form part A2.3).

3.18 Is an affiliated entity eligible for financial support under the CEF?

Any affiliated entities designated by the applicants are not considered beneficiaries in the context of the grant Agreement. However, costs incurred by the affiliated entities designated by the applicants are considered as eligible costs, provided they meet general requirements related to cost eligibility.

3.19 What is the quality of relationship between two entities that is required for one of them to qualify as affiliated entity of the other?

Please see the glossary of the Guide for Applicants for a definition of affiliated entities. Due to the principle of equal treatment of applicants, INEA cannot provide upfront conclusion on individual cases and these remain subject to a case by case analysis based on detailed information provided by applicants of proposals selected for funding.

3.20 We are an applicant from a third/neighbouring country. What is the role of a partner Member State and when should we contact this Member State?

Each applicant from a third/neighbouring countries is required to provide the explicit endorsement of an EU Member State concerned by the proposed Action in the application form part A2.3 in order to participate in the Action applying for the CEF funding. The applicants should contact the competent authorities of the respective Member State when preparing the application. Please see also related FAQs 2.15, 3.11 and 5.2.

3.21 Is it possible that a state owned enterprise submits a proposal as the sole applicant or it should it be designated as an Implementing Body by the relevant Member State Ministry?

It is perfectly possible for such an enterprise to act as applicant subject to having obtained the approval by the respective Member State and to complying with other relevant eligibility criteria.

4. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA - PROJECTS

4.1 Can proposed Actions be submitted without having legally secured all matching funding to cover the estimated total eligible costs or is this a necessary pre-condition to be eligible?

Matters related to the financial soundness of a proposal, such as the availability of the required match funding, are not part of the eligibility criteria. However, information on the availability of the required financial resources is an important element to assess the proposed Action's maturity and has to be provided in Application Form Part D, section 4.8.

Not being able to demonstrate that all required financial resources have been secured at the time of submission might affect a proposal's chances to be selected for funding. If a proposed Action selected for funding and for which a grant agreement has been signed cannot start within one year (studies) or two years (works), the financial aid will be cancelled and any payment made will be recovered.

4.2 Does the fact that a pilot activity is located on a secondary network (i.e. not on the Core or Comprehensive Network) because of less traffic density, make it ineligible for the 2014 CEF Transport funding? If it is not directly replicable in the Core Network mean that it is ineligible for these calls?

Each 2014 CEF Transport call text stipulates in its section 9.2 'Eligible Actions':

"(...). The projects must comply with the following provisions of Article 7 of the TEN-T Guidelines, namely to:

- 1) contribute to the objectives falling within at least two of the four categories set out in Article 4 of the TEN-T Guidelines
- 2) comply with Chapter II and, for core networks, Chapter III of the TEN-T Guidelines
- 3) be economically viable on the basis of a socio-economic cost-benefit analysis
- 4) demonstrate European added value. (...)"

Therefore, activities that are not located on the Core or Comprehensive Network are ineligible.

4.3 Should a rail road terminal (RRT) that is defined as a Core Network RTT in the TEN-T Regulation but not part of the pre-identified projects in Annex I, Part 1 I of the CEF Regulation apply under the annual or multi-annual Priority addressing multimodal logistic platforms?

Proposed Actions addressing multimodal platforms of the Core Network but which are not listed in Annex I Part I of the CEF Regulation should be submitted under the annual call for proposals.

4.4 One applicant wants to fund a global project and another project which is part of the global project. Both of these projects are eligible under two different calls but the costs of both projects are difficult to separate. Would it be possible not to dissociate the costs of both projects and to be eligible for the call corresponding to the global project, so both projects could be funded?

Proposals that address different activities but which contribute to the same indivisible objective or Global Project may be eligible under the same call for proposals and can be addressed in a single application. In addition, several proposed Actions (i.e. submitted in separate proposals) may relate to the same Global Project, for instance addressing different implementation phases or sections of the Global Project.

In cases where the Global Project and an action implementing the Global Project contribute to different objectives, they may still be submitted as a single application under one objective. A determination of how relevant the proposal is to the call and objective it is submitted under will be subject to a case-by-case evaluation in view of the clarification and substantiation provided by the applicant. If the bulk of activities does not address the objectives under which they are submitted, the scoring of the proposal against the relevance criterion may be affected.

4.5 *We are developing a proposal on modernisation of railway infrastructure and creation of a missing link between Member State A and Member State B. In Member State A, the infrastructure is located on the Comprehensive Network. In Member State B, the connection is actually missing and not indicated on the maps included in Annex I of the TEN-T Guidelines. Would a proposal addressing feasibility studies on the territory of both Member States be eligible under the current calls?*

Only the part of the project in Member State A which is located on the Comprehensive Network may be eligible under the annual call, in accordance with the eligibility criteria described in section 9.2 of the annual call, provided it complies with other eligibility requirements specified in the call and the priority under which it is submitted.

4.6 *Annex 9 (Priority Actions implementing transport infrastructure in nodes of the Core Network, including urban nodes) of the Annual Call notes that "Proposed Actions to be selected under this priority can be works or studies and shall be in line with Chapter II of the TEN-T Guidelines". Chapter II of the TEN-T Guidelines concerns the Comprehensive Network. Actions on which network (Core or Comprehensive) can be covered under this priority?*

According to section 9.2 of the Annual Call, actions that fall under the definition of project of common interest according to Article 7 of the TEN-T Guidelines are eligible to apply under the call.

4.7 *Are airports also included in the Funding Objective 1 of the annual call for proposals (Annex 2: Projects on the comprehensive network)?*

Yes, as far as they are specified in the Annex II, Part 2 of the TEN-T Guidelines (Regulation 1315/2013) that specifies the airports, maritime ports, inland ports and rail-road terminals of the Core and Comprehensive Networks by Member State (see also FAQ 1.9). Priority will be given to connections between airports and the rail network.

4.8 *Is it possible to get funding for an action that is not listed in the Corridor Work Plan, but is situated on and related to developing the corridor?*

Yes. In different parts of the application form the information provided by the applicant about the impact of the Action on the development of the specific corridor is scrutinised. For example, in the questions 2.2 of the application form part D, information on relation of the proposed Action relates to a Global Project must be described.

4.9 *Can a single proposal address several corridors?*

In principle this is possible. However, to justify a joint submission in a single proposal the activities addressing different corridors should have a close functional or geographical relationship. Otherwise, it is strongly recommended that distinct activities addressing different corridors are submitted as separate proposals.

4.10 *Are the minimum thresholds of CEF-T funding for works and studies respectively mandatory?*

Proposals should respect these strongly recommended thresholds. However, no proposal will be excluded from evaluation for not respecting a minimum CEF financing threshold. Such situations will be considered during the final selection of proposals and proposals may exceptionally and only in duly justified cases be selected for funding despite not meeting a minimum threshold.

5. MEMBER STATES' SUPPORT

5.1 Which Member State has to approve a proposal made by a private entity? In particular, if the Member State in which the applicant is based does not participate in the proposal (the Action will be implemented in another Member State(s)), which Member State has to approve the application?

As stated in Article 9 of the CEF Regulation, "Proposals shall be submitted [...] with the agreement of the Member States concerned". 'Member State concerned' should be understood as the Member State in the territory of which the Action is planned to be implemented.

5.2 What is the national contact point or the national public body involved in the selection of proposals?

According to the section 9.1 of the calls, all proposals submitted under CEF Transport calls for proposals must receive an agreement of a Member State concerned by the proposed Action. Generally, such approval is given by the national ministry responsible for transport.

A list of contact points in Member States for the agreement on the submission of proposals (Application Form part A.2.3) according to Article 9 of the CEF Regulation has been added to the calls websites and can be found at the following link:

http://inea.ec.europa.eu/download/calls2014/cef_transport/cef_transport_contact_persons.pdf

5.3 In case of a proposed Action which starts in one EU Member State and ends in another one, is a letter of interest or endorsement of the second Member State sufficient?

For proposed Actions that take place on a territory of more than one Member State, agreements from all Member States concerned by the proposed Action are necessary and should be provided in the Application Form Part A2.3.

5.4 We are preparing a multi-applicant proposal assembling a large number of private and non-profit organisations. How should we deal with the support of the Member State concerned for the following three scenarios and how do we identify the Member State concerned in the first place?

a) a private entity/non-profit organisation will implement activities in a Member State other than the place of its registration, and

b) a private entity/non-profit organisation that will participate in activities in several Member States.

For the purpose of the proposal submission, all Member States on the territory of which the proposed Action will be implemented have to be considered as 'Member States concerned'. Please note that for multi-applicant proposals, section A2.3 must be signed for each applicant (even if there is more than one applicant from a single Member State – in which case, the Member State should provide its support to all applicants concerned as relevant).

In view of the above, the nature and location of the proposed activities would determine the identification of the concerned Member State.

Concerning the specific scenarios referred to above:

- Scenario a): the applicant should be supported by the Member State where the activities to be performed by this applicant are expected to take place

- Scenario b): the applicant should be supported by each of the Member States concerned.

5.5 Please could you also describe the necessary relationship between the lead Member State and all other Member States who will participate in the project?

There is no concept of a "Lead Member State" in the CEF Transport Programme. Applications for CEF financial assistance may be submitted by more than one applicant, regardless of their legal status, these are referred to as multi-applicant proposals. A coordinating applicant must be indicated for multi-applicant proposals. This coordinating applicant leads and represents all the

applicants and acts as the point of contact during the application phase. It is not necessary for the coordinating applicant to be a Member State.

Multi-applicant proposals should clearly describe and explain the organisational structure of the proposal, including how the coordination between the applicants takes place in the Application Form Part D, question 6.1.

5.6 *We are a private company with global operations and subsidiaries in various Member States. We intend to participate in a multi-applicant proposal with activities to take place in multiple Member States. The agreement of which Member State should we obtain?*

This depends whether the holding company will be an applicant or whether its subsidiaries will apply as separate applicants.

If a holding company applies (and designates its subsidiaries as affiliated entities), it usually needs to request an approval of the Member State in which it is registered. If this Member State is however not concerned by the proposed Action (i.e. none of the activities of the proposed Action will be taking place there), the holding company should seek approval of each of the other Member State(s) concerned by the proposed Action.

If subsidiaries registered in individual Member States participate as applicants in a proposal, each subsidiary should seek the approval of the Member State where it is registered, provided this Member State is concerned by the activities the subsidiary will be implementing.

5.7 *How should an applicant handle the electronic submission of the Member State's approval once the document has been signed by the Member State's representative?*

Once the Member State's representative has signed and stamped the application form part A2.3, applicant should scan the original form and include it among the electronic documents uploaded into TENtec eSubmission module and include the original form in the hard copy of the proposal.

It is not a problem if the validation of the Member State is provided on a draft version of the application form A2.3 or a Word version of the application form part A2.3. The applicant will then have the responsibility to upload the draft form into TENtec eSubmission module. Once the final proposal code is obtained, the applicant should mark this code (by hand) on the original hard copy to be submitted.

5.8 *Is there a further electronic validation for the application form part A2.3 once it is uploaded into the TENtec eSubmission module?*

There is no such electronic validation once the scanned version of the application form part A2.3 is uploaded in the TENtec eSubmission module.

5.9 *If the route of the proposed Action involves multiple Member States, is it necessary to get the approval of each Member state involved?*

Yes. For the purpose of the proposal submission, all Member States on the territory of which the proposed Action will be implemented have to be considered as Member States concerned by the Action. Please note that for multi-applicant proposals, the application form part A2.3 must be signed for each applicant (even if there is more than one applicant from a single Member State – in which case, the Member State should provide its support to all applicants concerned as relevant).

5.10 *If the route of the proposed Action involves several Member States, is it necessary to get all documents related to the application form for each of the Member State involved?*

When filing a single application for an Action which concerns activities in several Member States, the application form A, B and D should be common for all activities covered by the application. However, where necessary and relevant (e.g. related to compliance with environmental law, supporting documents), can be completed and provided per activity in a particular Member State rather than for the whole proposal.

5.11 *Who is the person responsible to sign an application form on behalf of a Member State? Does this signature have to be delivered on the level of a national minister?*

It is the sole responsibility of each Member State to define the person authorized to endorse proposal by signing Application Form Section A2.3. There is no requirement or guidance in this respect as INEA is not competent on this matter under Member State's responsibility.

6. COMPLIANCE WITH EU LAW

6.1 Within a Global Project, preliminary activities have received funding from the Structural Funds or other EU funding instruments. Can we apply for CEF Transport financial aid for subsequent activities?

The same costs cannot be supported more than once under the EU budget (section 14.1.1 on 'Other sources of financing' in each call text): *"Pursuant to Article 129 of the Financial Regulation, no Union financial aid shall be awarded to Actions receiving funds from other sources of EU financing. In no circumstances shall the same costs be financed twice by the Union budget."*

It is possible however that a Global Project receives funding from different EU sources for different activities to implement it. However, such activities have to be operationally and financially managed and reported in a separate Action to exclude any ambiguity of double funding.

6.2 When submitting a proposal under the CEF Transport Calls, should a state aid notification be sent to the European Commission or is it sufficient that the notification has been checked and approved by the relevant national competition institution?

Applicants have to notify the Commission whether their national co-financing granted for the proposed Action is considered as state aid under Article 107(1) of the Treaty. According information must be provided in Application Form Part C, chapter III.

In case state aid is involved, the applicant is required to explain if a notification pursuant to Article 108(3) to the Commission (DG Competition) has taken/will take place and set out possible grounds for compatibility with state aid rules.

6.3 Are there any other sections in the Application Form other than Part C, chapter III to inform about the compliance with state aid rules?

No. This is the only appropriate section of the application form for which information on the compliance with state aid rules is to be provided.

6.4 Which type of supporting evidence should be provided on state aid compliance and should any Commission service be informed to obtain feedback on such compliance?

Supporting evidence strongly depends on each individual case. Copies of formal notifications or replies of the respective Commission services, if available, would be useful.

No specific contacts with Commission services for the purpose of submitting an Action for funding under these calls is required. The competent Commission services will be involved in the evaluation of proposals and the information provided in the above-mentioned sections of the Application Form Part C, chapter III will be made available to them for this purpose.

6.5 If the answer to the Section I/Question 6 in Application Form Part C is 'yes', is it sufficient just to attach the statement of the relevant authority or must this statement be confirmed by a study/assessment?

As noted in the application form, the applicants should explain "the assessment of the impacts on the water body and a detailed explanation of how the conditions under Article 4(7) of the Water Framework Directive were/are fulfilled". The full assessment itself does not need to be provided. The reply to this question must be confirmed by the authority responsible for water management by the signature and stamp in the space provided under the question. Other statements from the authority in question are not necessary.

6.6 A proposal has a roll-on/roll-off (Ro-Ro) aspect to it. Does it mean that Section IV of Application Form Part C must be filled in?

Section IV of the Application Form Part C concerns road actions only, where compatibility with the EU law on road charging must be verified. A proposal addressing, for example, port infrastructure

even if it has a minor road component, would not require to confirm its compatibility with EU law on road charging.

6.7 *It is our understanding that by the date of submission of the application under the current calls for proposals, it is not mandatory to prove that a decision on state aid has been taken but only that the steps have been carried out to notify the state aid and the justification of grounds for complying with state aid rules. Is this understanding correct?*

Yes, this understanding is correct (please see also FAQ 6.2 and 6.4). However, the proposal should indicate the expected timeline by when the decision on state aid will be obtained. In the event that such a proposal will be selected for funding, the decision on state aid will have to be obtained before a grant agreement can be signed.

6.8 *What may be the impact of an open infringement procedure (related to EIA) on the selection of the proposals?*

Compliance with the applicable EU environmental law is a fundamental condition for any EU funding and is therefore thoroughly checked for each proposal. Any significant issues in this respect may affect the selection of proposal for funding or may lead to specific conditions regarding the fulfilment of environmental legislation before the individual grant agreement is signed, if there are any doubts in this regard. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that any pending issues are clarified before the submission of the proposal and the relevant information is included in the proposal.

6.9 *In case of a cross-border project is it obligatory to submit the declaration from the Water Management Authorities bearing the signature of both countries relevant authority?*

Yes.

6.10 *Is it possible to submit one application form part C for each partner in case of multi-applicant proposal? If yes, can it be written on the front page which partner is submitting the specific form?*

Normally, one application form part C per proposal must be submitted. However, it is also possible to submit the parts of the application form part C relating to environmental compliance in several documents rather than for the whole proposal, especially in cases of multi-applicant proposals where the activities take place in several countries..

6.11 *In case of repeating activities in several locations, is it sufficient to have one declaration of a competent authority which assessed the proposed Action (e.g. regarding EIA Directive)?*

A proposed Action may include different activities in different locations or countries that might require approvals from different authorities. Therefore, the respective sections of the application form part C should be completed as many times as the number of the respective environmental authorities to be consulted, notably if these are located in different countries. However, if repetitive and almost identical activities are located within one Member State it may be sufficient that the responsible environmental authority validates these activities in a single document.

6.12 *The application concerns several activities with differences as far as EIA requirements (need for some activities, but not for others) and obtaining the development consent. Should the declaration of the competent authority be provided for the project as a whole or in relation to the separate activities, since there are differences between them?*

In such case, it is possible to complete the respective sections of the application form part C per activity rather than for the whole proposal.

6.13 *Does Section I of the application form part C relating to compliance with EU environmental policy only need to be completed by proposals involving physical works affecting the Natura 2000 zones and the Water Framework Directive (WFD)?*

As described in the application form part C and the Guide for Applications, the section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy" must be completed only for works proposals and for those study proposals that entail physical interventions (e.g. excavations for testing the ground, destructive tests, etc.).

If a proposal is a study without physical interventions, only the box "a study without physical interventions" must be checked in the first question of the section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy" of the application form part C. In such case, the other questions of this section, including in the annexes, do not need to be completed.

6.14 *Is it acceptable to provide a letter signed by our environmental corporate governance to certify that the proposal takes into consideration all the possible environmental impacts?*

The section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy" of the application form part C must be completed only for works proposals and for those study proposals that entail physical interventions (e.g. excavations for testing the ground, destructive tests, etc.). All necessary signatures and declarations must be provided by the competent environmental authorities.

6.15 *We are preparing a proposal for works to perform hydrographic surveys (depth measurements). Do we need to fill in the first chapter of Application Form Part C?*

Based on the provided information INEA is not in a position to reply. Please be reminded that the section on compliance with EU environmental policy in the application form part C must be completed by all proposals for works or proposals for studies which entail physical interventions. We recommend applicants to contact the competent environmental authority for advice on whether the activities of a proposal need to demonstrate compliance with EU environmental policy.

6.16 *In the application form part C, question 2.1 the applicant has to indicate whether development consent has already been given to the Action. How is it to be handled when several authorities are concerned?*

If all necessary authorities have given their development consent, then the latter date (consent date given by the last authority) should be indicated in question 2.1. In case there is a development consent missing, please indicate relevant details for the missing consent in the respective questions.

Please note that if environmental approvals are needed from different authorities for one Action, the respective sections of the application form part C should be completed as many times as the number of the respective environmental authorities to be consulted, notably if these are located in different countries. However, if repetitive and almost identical activities are located within one Member State it may be sufficient that only one environmental authority validates these.

6.17 *Does question 6 of the application form part C, section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy", need to be completed only if a proposal is located in protected water as defined in Article 1 of the Water Framework Directive or is it always necessary?*

Question 6 on "Actions with potential impact on water" needs to be completed for all proposals for works or proposals for studies with physical interventions.

6.18 *In section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy" of the application form part C, it is stated that ERTMS proposals only need to fill this section if the proposed Action includes physical works (e.g. installation of antennas) affecting a site designated as protection zone under the "Habitats" (92/43/EC) and Birds (2009/147/EC) Directives. If the proposal concerns placing ETCS equipment on the trackside in the existing signalling cabins or directly on the tracks, do we have to consider those operations as "physical works"?*

Such activities are considered as works, however section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy" of the application form part C only needs to be completed if any of the affected sites are designated as protection zone under the "Habitats" (92/43/EC) and Birds (2009/147/EC) Directives.

Definition of works can be found in Article 2 of the CEF Regulation or in the Guide for Applicants, section 6 "Glossary".

6.19 *In a Member State, there are different competent authorities for EIA and SEA Directives. Which authority should provide its declaration in question 3.4 of the application form part C, section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy"?*

The Declaration of the Competent Authority in question 3.4 of the application form part C, section on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy" is only regarding the EIA Directive. Therefore the authority competent for the EIA Directive should validate the information provided.

6.20 In application form part C (question 3.4), which authority is called "the Competent Authority"?

This can differ depending on the Member State, national legislation and the distribution of powers between national or regional authorities. Typically, this would either be by a national environmental authority of a Member State or a regional authority.

6.21 In question 5 of the application form part C, section I on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy", should the phrase 'likely to have significant effects' be interpreted as before or after taking mitigation measures?

In the context of the impacts on Natura 2000 sites, significant effects refer to those effects before any mitigation measures are undertaken.

6.22 Does the Annex C-1 need to be provided, if an Action is likely to have significant effects on sites included or intended to be included in the Natura 2000 network (question 5 of the application form part C, section I on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy")?

No, the Annex C-1 declaration is only needed for those cases where an action is not likely to have significant effects on sites included or intended to be included in the Natura 2000 network.

6.23 Is there guidance as to minimal requirements on the decision of the competent authority providing confirmation that the action will not adversely affect the integrity of the Natura 2000 sites?

Such decisions of competent authorities must follow the procedures and guidance as established within the context of the Habitats and Birds Directives. No specific guidance in the context of the CEF Regulation is available. Please consult the website of DG ENV for further information: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/environment/index_en.htm.

6.24 Which box should be ticked in question 3.1 (application form part C, section I on "Compliance with EU Environmental Policy") when the proposed Action is covered by neither of the two annexes of the EIA Directive and when an environmental impact assessment should be carried according to the national law (i.e. when national law is more stringent than the EIA Directive).

Option "Neither of the two annexes" should be ticked and the declaration in section 3.4 of the form must be signed by the Competent Authority. The Competent Authority should also include any relevant comments regarding the specific case and the EIA carried out under this point.

6.25 In the case in which works will take place in two Member States, is there a requirement for to complete application form part C, sections 3 – 6 (on compliance with EU law on state aids, road charging, public procurement and other sources of financing) for each of the Member State?

When filing a single application for a proposed Action which concerns activities in several Member States, the application form A, B and D should be common for all activities covered by the application. However, where necessary and relevant (e.g. related to compliance with environmental law, supporting documents), the information can be completed and provided per Member State rather than for the whole proposal.

The information in the application form part C must reflect the situation in all of the Member States concerned by the proposed Action. Therefore, replies must refer to the situation in a specific Member State, where relevant. There is no need to fill out separate application form part C per Member State, except if the validation of compliance with EU environmental law requires the involvement of competent authorities from different Member States.

6.26 Which proposals should fill in section II "Compatibility with EU policy on interoperability" of the application form part C?

This section must only be filled in for proposals including construction of rail infrastructure or deployment of ERTMS, whether on conventional or high speed lines. Since the construction of rail

infrastructure or ERTMS is of limited applicability under the freight transport services priority, the application form part C, section on "Compliance with EU Policy on Interoperability" has to be completed only in case the proposed Action is bound by Directive 2008/57/EC (see also the *Guide for Applicants*, page 17).

6.27 Does section III "Compatibility with EU law on State Aids" of the application form part C need to be filled in by all proposals?

Yes, this section of the application form part C must be filled in for all proposed Actions, regardless of the priority or whether they concern works or studies.

6.28 Which proposals should complete section IV "Compatibility with EU law on road charging" of the application form part C?

This section of the application form part C must be completed for all road actions. Directive 2011/76/EU amending Directive 1999/62/EC on the charging of heavy goods vehicles for the use of certain infrastructures is available at the following link: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=OJ:L:2011:269:TOC>.

6.29 Does section V "Compatibility with Union law on Public Procurement" of the application form part C need to be filled in by all proposals?

Yes, this section of the application form part C must be filled in for all proposed Actions, regardless of the priority or whether they concern works or studies.

6.30 Does section VI "Other Sources of EU Financing" of the application form part C need to be filled in by all proposals?

Yes, this section of the application form part C must be filled in for all proposed Actions, regardless of the priority or whether they concern works or studies.

6.31 Do we have to submit the technical summary which is required under point 4.2 of Application Form Part C concerning the SEA Directive in English or can this be submitted in the mother tongue of the concerned Member State?

If available, it is recommended to submit the technical summary in English. Alternatively, it may also be submitted in the language of the respective Member State.

7. SELECTION CRITERIA: FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY

7.1 Does an applicant's contribution to a proposed Action have to be proven by a bank guarantee or a sworn statement?

Each call text stipulates in section 10.1 'Financial Capacity':

"The requirement for applicants to demonstrate their financial capacity does not apply to Member States, public bodies established in the EU and European Economic Interest Grouping (EEIG), which are 100% owned by public body(ies)."

Only if an applicant does not fall in the above-mentioned category must it demonstrate its financial capacity by filling the Financial Capacity Check Form (Annex B-III to Application Form Part B). Should the result of the financial capacity check be unsatisfactory, the applicant must submit a letter of support from a third party (its parent company for instance) or by another applicant of the proposed Action. The letter of support should be accompanied by the financial viability check template completed by the third party, including the relevant annexes (financial statements for the last two years) and showing 'satisfactory' or 'good' as the result of the ratio analysis. Such a letter of support cannot be replaced by a bank guarantee.

The financial guarantee (not necessarily a bank guarantee) will only be requested if the project is selected for funding and if the beneficiary, with a weak financial capacity, opts for a pre-financing payment. In this case, the responsible Authorising Officer may, on the basis of a risk assessment, require the beneficiary to lodge a guarantee in advance, for up to the same amount as the pre-financing (Art. 206 Rules of Application (RAP)). The financial capacity check form includes additional information on guarantees under the "Procedure – Guarantee" tab and includes model templates for guarantees from a parent company, a bank/financial institution or a Member State.

7.2 Are neighbouring countries exempted from the financial capacity check?

Yes, neighbouring countries are exempted from financial capacity check (see application form part B, section 3 and the Guide for Applicants on page 14).

7.3 What kind of documents must be uploaded in relation to the operational capacity check?

As described in the Guide for Applicants, applicants must submit documents attesting that they have the technical and operational capacity to complete the Action for which the funding is sought. These may include proof of adequate professional qualifications of the team responsible for implementing the Action, proof of recent experience in carrying out similar or related projects, evidence of previous cooperation with European or international bodies, annual reports, and similar documents.

7.4 Do affiliated entities have to provide the completed financial capacity check form?

No, financial capacity of the affiliated entities is not checked at the moment of application. Financial capacity check form is therefore required for the applicants only, not their designated affiliated entities. Compliance of affiliated entities with the selection criteria will be checked only for the proposals that are selected for funding. However, failure to provide the required information might jeopardise their possibilities to incur eligible expenditure on behalf of a beneficiary.

8. FUNDING SOURCES

8.1 Will INEA or the European Commission provide guidance on combining CEF grants with PPPs (public-private partnerships)? Such guidance or standard framework for blending EU grants with transport PPPs as referred to in the CEF Regulation (Regulation 1316/2013) would be essential for future transport PPP-projects for which CEF grants will be requested.

INEA is currently developing guidance on combining CEF grants with PPPs. However, at this stage it is not possible to give a precise indication of when this guidance will be available.

8.2 May the contingency reserves be included in the budget of a proposal?

Yes, however the external evaluators will assess whether the foreseen costs are reasonable.

8.3 What kind of agreement is needed between the financiers and the coordinator of a proposed Action? Does the funding model have to be described in the application?

Information on funding sources and financing of the proposed Action is one of the aspects that are evaluated under the maturity criterion. While applicants are not requested to provide any supporting documents regarding other sources of funding, the maturity of a proposal might be affected if the funding sources of the proposal are not clear in the application.

9. ELIGIBLE COSTS / CO-FUNDING RATES

9.1 Will personnel costs be eligible?

Personnel costs can be considered eligible costs provided they comply with the provisions of the model grant agreement (Article II.19 – Eligible Costs).

9.2 Is it possible, in the same proposal, to have different activities with different co-funding rates?

Yes. In Application Form A3.3 applicants are requested to enter the indicative breakdown of the estimated eligible costs of the proposed Action (i.e. the Action for which a financial contribution from the CEF Transport is requested) per activity and year, as well as the co-financing rate requested.

Please note that the total eligible cost must match the total of funding sources for the proposed Action (Form A3.2). The total requested CEF Transport financing must match the amount specified for the proposed Action in Form A3.2.

9.3 Will there be any maximum percentage cost of transversal activities (management, dissemination, evaluation) in the eligible costs? If yes, what will it be?

There are no cost ceilings for certain types of transversal activities. However, please bear in mind that during the evaluation processes the proportionality of proposed activities and estimated costs will be thoroughly analysed and inconsistencies may lead to low scoring against the criterion of quality.

9.4 Is acquisition of land an eligible cost under CEF Transport?

Land acquisition may be eligible only under the MAP call addressing the Cohesion Fund allocation, within the following limits:

- up to 10% of the total eligible costs of the Action for costs of purchase of land not built on and land built on
- up to 15% of the total eligible costs of the Action for costs of purchase of derelict sites and purchase of sites formerly in industrial use which comprise buildings.

In exceptional and duly justified cases, the limit may be raised above the above-mentioned percentages for operations concerning environmental conservation.

Costs of land acquisition are not eligible under the other 2014 CEF Transport Calls for proposals.

9.5 If a proposed Action begins before the grant agreement is signed, what is required to justify this in view of the eligibility of costs incurred prior to the signature of the grant agreement?

The implementation timetable of each proposed Action needs to be explained in the Application Form, notably Part D. This information should include explanations on the start date of the proposed Action. As this will depend on each individual case, no general reply can be provided on the required type or level of detail of such justification.

9.6 How "flexible" can the Agency be with the support to on-going activities given the fact that some will start before the signature of the grant agreements, which are only expected as of September 2015?

All call texts state in section 14.2.2 that costs incurred between 1 January 2014 and the completion date of the Action may be considered as eligible.

9.7 The 2014 CEF Transport calls stipulate in section 14.1.3 Non-retroactivity: "Pursuant to Article 130 of the Financial Regulation, no grants may be awarded retrospectively for Actions already completed. A grant may be awarded for an Action which has already begun provided that the applicant(s) can demonstrate the need for starting the Action prior to the signature of the grant agreement." What would be the start date for the eligibility of costs in this respect?

The start date for the eligibility of costs corresponds to the start date of the Action as specified in the application form. In any case, this date cannot be earlier than 1 January 2014, in line with section 14.2.2 of the calls.

9.8 What co-funding rate applies to proposals submitted under Annex 8 of the annual call for proposals addressing accessibility?

Referring to the 2014 Annual Work Programme Annex, C(2014) 1919 final adopted on 26 March 2014 available on the annual call website, the amount of EU financial assistance in the form of grants shall not exceed:

- a) 50% for studies
- b) with regard to grants for works: for better accessibility to transport infrastructure for disabled persons: 30% of the eligible cost of adaptation works, not exceeding in any case 10% of the total eligible cost of works.

Activities addressing accessibility should be part of a wider proposal addressing works and should not be submitted as individual proposals.

Please refer to the 2014 Annual Work Programme Annex, section 9, for more specific information on co-funding rates.

9.9 What will be the co-funding rate for the costs related to pilot activities within "studies" Actions?

Each call text defines pilot activities to be part of studies (see question 2.6). Studies can benefit from CEF Transport funding to a maximum of 50% of the eligible costs (up to 85% under the Cohesion Fund allocation).

Please note that in accordance with section 2 of the Calls, pilot activities of a study supporting the deployment of any type of infrastructure or technology that would be defined as works under any priority of the multi-annual or annual Work Programme in line with Article 2(5) of the CEF Regulation and do not fall under at least one of the two objectives mentioned in the definition of pilot activities specified in the Calls (see also question 1.8 of the general FAQ) will not be supported under this type of Action.

9.10 Is financial support to 'third parties' in the sense of Article II.11 'FINANCIAL SUPPORT TO THIRD PARTIES' of the model grant agreement possible under both the annual and multi-annual calls? If yes, which are the conditions?

The annual and multi-annual Work Programmes do not provide for the possibility for future beneficiaries to provide financial support to third parties. Therefore, this possibility is not open under the 2014 CEF Transport Calls.

9.12 Both the Work Programmes and the call texts stipulate 1 January 2014 as the earliest possible date of eligible expenditure. However, in the Guide for Applicants Glossary it is stated under 'Eligible Costs' that "(...) For Actions supported under the multi-annual work programme adopted in 2014, expenditure may be eligible as from the date the application is lodged at the earliest." Which information is correct?

The information in the Guide for Applicants was wrong and the information in the Work Programmes and the call texts applies: costs can be considered eligible as of 1 January 2014. The error in the guide has since been corrected.

9.13 Would it be beneficial to demonstrate some synergies between different CEF sectors under this call (e.g. if the Global Project is related to the energy sector as well)?

In principle it would always be beneficial being able to demonstrate synergies with the other two CEF sectors as this will be examined during the final selection process, in accordance with section 13 of the 2014 CEF Transport calls. However, no general *ex-ante* answer can be given whether this might lead to granting additional 10% co-funding based on these synergies. Each proposed Action claiming synergies with the other CEF sectors will be analysed on a case by case basis during the evaluation to determine if the additional 10% may be justified.

9.14 What is the period of the eligibility of costs?

The period of the eligibility of costs corresponds to the proposed Action's duration, as specified by the applicant(s) in the application form.

The conditions on the eligibility of costs are included in section 14.2.2 of the calls. Under the multi-annual calls, costs incurred between 1 January 2014 (at the earliest) and the completion date of the action may be considered as eligible.

For proposals submitted under the annual call, costs incurred between 1 January 2014 (at the earliest) and the completion date of the action may be considered as eligible. The maximum duration of an action selected under this call for proposals is 3 years, with the possibility of a 12 months extension in duly justified and exceptional cases.

9.15 Could you clarify what is the eligibility period for costs under the Annual Call: a) costs are eligible between 1 January 2014 and 31 December 2016 or b) the maximum duration of an action is 3 years and the action should start after 1 January 2014?

It is the option b. The duration of the action is 3 years from the start of the action, which must be on or after 1 January 2014. If a proposed Action starts on 1 July 2015, the eligibility period of costs would therefore be until 30 June 2018.

9.16 *Our proposal for works is expected to last four years and will have an overall budget of about €1,100,000. Is the Annual Call appropriate for a project of this size?*

According to section 14.2.1 of the annual call, it is strongly encouraged that the total requested Union contribution to the eligible costs of the action is no less than €1,000,000 for works. However, this is not an eligibility criterion and proposals requesting smaller amounts from the CEF will not be excluded from evaluation.

Please note that according to section 14.2.2 of the Annual Call, the maximum duration of an action selected under this call is three years, with the possibility of a 12-month extension in duly justified and exceptional cases.

9.17 *Considering that under the current calls costs may be eligible as of 1 January 2014, does this mean that the costs associated with the preparation of application are eligible?*

Costs related to the preparation of the application are not eligible since they do not comply with Article II.19.1 of the model grant agreement, namely that they are not necessary for the implementation of the action which is the subject of the financial aid and that they do not comply with the definition of works or studies as laid down in the CEF Regulation.

9.18 *Can the costs of already finished projects be reimbursed? What if the project is in its final stages but not yet finished?*

Pursuant to Article 130 of the Financial Regulation, no grants may be awarded retrospectively for actions already completed. A grant may be awarded for an action which has already begun provided that the start of the action is no earlier than 1 January 2014, in line with section 14.2.2 of the calls.

9.19 *Indirect costs are not eligible according to section 14.2.2 of the calls. Does this mean that there will be no indirect costs/flat top up rate for any project in the grant agreements that are based on applications from this call?*

Yes. No indirect costs will be included in the grant agreements for the proposals selected under the current calls for proposals.

9.20 *In a proposal to be submitted under the call addressing the Cohesion Fund allocation, land purchase is needed during the preparatory phase of a construction project as some preparatory activities (ammunition release and excavation) presume the possession of the land concerned. Could you please clarify that the basis of the 10% threshold for purchase of land (Article 69 of the Regulation (EU) 1303/2013) is applied on the total eligible expenditure of the Global Project (referred to in Annex I of the CEF Regulation) or to the total eligible costs amount of an action aiming only at the preparation for the construction of such action?*

The 10% threshold applies to the total eligible costs of the proposed Action, and not to a project as defined by the Annex I of the CEF Regulation.

9.21 *What is the co-financing rate for freight transport services projects?*

Pursuant to Article 10.2(c)(vi) of the CEF Regulation (EU) 1316/2013), the funding rate for actions in connection to freight transport services is maximum of 20% of the eligible costs of the action.

9.22 *With regard to grants for works on road networks, Article 10 of the CEF Regulation (Regulation (EU) 1316/2013) indicates the funding rates for road actions in the case of Member States with no railway network or with an isolated network without long-distance rail freight transport and for actions supporting cross-border road sections. What funding rates should be applied in the case of road actions (works) in Core Network urban nodes in Member States which have railway networks established?*

In all Member States, proposals addressing road works are considered eligible only for cross-border sections. Only for Cyprus, Malta and Ireland will road works on the entire road TEN-T network

(Core and Comprehensive network) be considered eligible according to Article 10.2 (b) (i) of the CEF Regulation.

9.23 Are audit expenses eligible and under which conditions?

In line with Part B, article II.19.2 (e) of the model Grant Agreement for CEF funded actions all costs arising directly from requirements imposed by the Grant Agreement are eligible for funding, including audit costs. For being co-funded, audit costs must comply with the conditions for the eligibility of costs as set out in Part B, article II.19.1 of the model grant Agreement and be included in the estimated budget of the action (annex III of the model Grant Agreement). Related services have to be in line with the 1st paragraph of article II.9.1 of the model Grant Agreement.

9.24 Can an anticipated bottleneck be considered as a bottleneck and therefore get an increased funding rate of maximum 40% of the eligible costs?

No. "Bottlenecks" in the sense of Article 3 (q) of the TEN-T Regulation concern only already existing bottlenecks.

9.25 What is the amount (if any) of the average financial support provided for each Member State under CEF? Is there a fixed financial support for every country under MAP/AP?

There is no earmarking of funds per Member State in CEF, with the exception of the funding available under the specific call for cohesion countries, where only those countries can take part.

9.26 Are the costs of running aircrafts eligible? Such costs may be (not exhaustively) depreciation of the aircraft, cockpit, console acquisition costs, maintenance costs, hangar and administrative follow-up by our service provider.

The co-funding of the purchase and operation of aircrafts is not an eligible cost under CEF Transport funding.

9.27 Within which distance from the border are the cross-border infrastructural investment project costs eligible? Can the costs starting at the Schengen border crossing point be covered by the CEF funding?

The definition of the cross-border sections in the TEN-T Guidelines does not include precise distance from the border. The proposals will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Projects eligible for funding from the CEF as cross-border sections should comply with the following conditions:

- a) there should be a written agreement between the Member States concerned or between the Member States and third countries concerned by the completion of the cross-border section, as set out in article 7(2) of the CEF Regulation (Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013),
- b) they should be in line with the definition of cross-border section and urban nodes in Article 3 of the TEN-T Guidelines (Regulation (EU) No 1316/2013), the cross-border sections must ensure the continuity of a project of common interest from the border to the first urban area of economic importance, which includes or is close to at least one of the following infrastructure: ports, including passenger terminals, airports, railway stations, logistic platforms and freight terminals, and
- c) the action to be financed must include at least the cross-border point and should, in principle, be a joint project of the two Member States concerned (or Member State and third country).

9.28 Do we understand correctly that according to Annex 2 of the annual call costs related to super structure, maintenance, dedicated infrastructure and facilities for cruise ships is not eligible but may be eligible for other vessels?

INEA: The answer to this question will be updated shortly.

9.29 The maximum duration of an Action selected under the annual call for proposals is 3 years, with a possibility of a 12 months extension in duly justified and exceptional cases. Where in the application form should such extension be requested and justified?

A possibility for such extension may arise during the period of the implementation of the Action, not at the stage of the application. Actions applying under the annual call should have their planned activities limited to three years.

9.30 *Are activities and related expenditure that have started before the start date mentioned in the grant agreement eligible and do they fall under the definition of "incurred" in the grant Agreement?*

No, if costs have been incurred before the start date of the Action mentioned in the grant Agreement, they would not be eligible.

Please note however that according to Article 8 of the CEF Regulation and section 14.2.2 of the calls for proposals, costs incurred between 1 January 2014 at the earliest and the completion date of the action may be eligible, provided they also incur in the period after the start of the Action to be mentioned in the grant Agreement.

Please also see FAQs 9.5 and 9.6.

9.31 *The explanation of "incurred costs" does not make any reference to activities from an entity's own staff. Are staff costs eligible costs?*

According to the model grant Agreement, staff costs are eligible costs provided that they comply with the general criteria related to costs eligibility as described in Article 126 of the Financial Regulation (e.g. are incurred during the implementation period of the Action).

9.32 *In which cases is it possible for an applicant from a Member State eligible to the Cohesion Fund to receive financial support that exceeds the maximum co-financing rates under the Cohesion Fund?*

This is not possible under any circumstances.

9.33 *What would be the consequences if an action starts before or after the signature of the respective grant Agreement?*

Please see related FAQs 9.5 and 9.6. Furthermore, there will be no consequences if the action's actual starting date falls within the eligibility period as stipulated in the call for proposals and if it is aligned with the duration of the action.

9.34 *Our proposal entails activities with different co-funding rates. Having encoded these in Form A3.3 the total values do not match those in Form A3.2. Is there a possibility to manually correct the figures in Form A3.2 that are generated automatically by the eSubmission Module?*

No, there is no possibility to manually modify the figures generated in Form A3.2 by the values encoded in Form A3.3. The automatic transfer has been designed to increase data consistency. It is strongly recommended to design activities with single co-funding rates as the eSubmission module allows for encoding individual funding rates per activity.

9.35 *We intend to include an activity into our proposal that has already ended. Will the costs of an activity already completed at the time of submission be considered eligible?*

No, it will not be considered eligible.

10. SUB-CONTRACTING / IMPLEMENTATION CONTRACTS

10.1 *Is there a ceiling for the maximum share of contracts to be awarded for the implementation of the proposed Action?*

There are no ceilings for the share of activities to be contracted within a proposed Action.

10.2 *A project on the expansion of a port container terminal will be developed by the concessionaire. The concessionaire is a private company and part of a group of companies that is able to develop the necessary works under this project. Is a public tender for the expansion of the port necessary?*

If the concessionaire is considered as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directives 2004/18/EC and 2004/17/EC, it should follow the public procurement procedures as laid down in these Directives and/or any applicable national regulations. If the concessionaire is not considered as a contracting authority within the meaning of Directives 2004/18/EC and 2004/17/EC, it has to respect the rules of sound financial management in regards to tender procedures and demonstrate that the principle of best value for money has been applied.

10.3 Is there an obligation for tendering if the proposed Action is co-funded through CEF? Can the contract for the building be granted to a partner in the consortium without tendering?

Any service that needs to be contracted by public entities needs to follow public procurement procedures as laid down in Directives 2004/18/EC and 2004/17/EC and/or in any applicable national regulations.

As regards private entities, in case the provisions of the Directives 2004/18/EC and 2004/17/EC are not applicable, the principle of sound financial management should be respected when implementing the grant agreement in question (in particular regarding best value for money and efficiency). The beneficiary shall justify that the contract in question was awarded to the tenderer offering best value for money (e.g. competitive tendering procedure took place or several offers were requested).

10.4 If an applicant chooses to involve affiliated entity in the implementation process, is there a need for a procurement process or can the affiliated entity invoice the beneficiary for their services?

If an applicant chooses to involve an affiliated entity in the implementation of the proposed Action, there is no need to follow a procurement process. Even more so, establishing a service contract between a beneficiary and its affiliated entity must be considered exceptional and has to be duly justified for each case. The costs incurred by an affiliated entity are considered directly eligible, provided they meet the general conditions for the eligibility of costs as stipulated in the grant agreement.

11. APPLICATION FORMS

11.1 Where can I find the application forms to be used for submission under the 2014 CEF Transport calls?

All call relevant documents can be accessed on the individual calls websites:
http://inea.ec.europa.eu/en/cef/cef_transport/apply_for_funding/cef_transport_call_for_proposals_2014.htm

11.2 Should proposals for works and studies submitted under the same call priority be combined into one single proposal or kept separated as two separate proposals, even if they are closely related?

Each call text stipulates: "A proposal submitted to this call must address either works or studies (including studies with pilot activities) within the meaning of Article 2(5) and (6) of the CEF Regulation. Proposals may combine studies and works as long as the respective activities and related budget are clearly defined and separated. **However, it is strongly recommended that the works activities do not depend on the execution/completion of study activities within the same Action.**"

In such cases it is strongly recommended to submit separate applications for studies and works in order to minimise the risk of implementation delays which could arise from the works' dependency on the preliminary studies.

11.3 The applicant in the proposal is a public sector body. Could we leave the Application Form Part B blank?

No. While some of the information requested in the Application Form Part B is indeed not applicable to public sector bodies, the proposal submitted by a public sector body must nonetheless contain the duly filled out Application Form Part B, including all applicable annexes.

11.4 A Global project is located on a cross-border section between two Member States, however, the proposed Action addressing part of this global project is only located in one Member State. How should we respond to the question in the Application Form, Part D, Section 3.7?

This section aims at verifying whether or not any section of the proposed Action corresponds to the definition of cross-border sections in Article 3 (m) of the TEN-T Regulation. Question 3.7 in the Application Form Part D concerns the proposed Action and not the Global Project. Therefore in the case described above, the answer will be 'No' under point A as the proposed Action does not require construction works on both sides of the border between two Member States. However, the answers to subsequent points should reflect the fact that the Action relates to a cross-border section, and related possible coordination with the other Member State.

11.5 The financial identification form (Application Form Part A4.3) requests the name and number of a bank account for the possible transfer of the EU assistance. The applicant in the proposal is a public sector body with its main bank account established in the National Bank. Under the applicable national legal system, it is not possible to receive any EU-originated funds on this bank account. Under the TEN-T Programme, a new dedicated account was set up to serve a given intervention. Can we assume that the same rule shall apply to CEF projects and that we would have to open a new account for the purposes of the call?

There are no specific requirements under the CEF Programme regarding the type of bank account that the CEF funding is to be transferred to. If the national legal system does not allow for the EU funds to be transferred to the main bank account of the public sector body, then a dedicated account opened for the purposes of the call would be acceptable.

11.6 In Section I.6 of the Application Form Part C (application of the Directive 2000/60/EC) should the authority responsible for water management sign and stamp the form only when the answer to question is "Yes" or in both cases ("Yes" and "No").

In both cases the signature from the competent authority under this section is required to confirm the reply to the question.

11.7 When choosing "transport mode" in the application, is it possible to mark the proposal as relating to two transport modes?

The transport mode that can be chosen in Application Form Part A depends on the priority under which the proposal is submitted. Only one mode of transport can be selected per proposal. For some priorities, such as "Pre-identified projects on the Core Network corridors" of the multi-annual call, Funding Objective 1, it is possible to choose 'combined transport' or 'multimodal/intermodal/co-modal' as the transport mode. For other priorities, the choice may be predefined: for example under the ERTMS priority, it is only possible to choose 'rail' as the transport mode.

11.8 How can I generate additional Forms A2.3 if there are more Member States concerned by the proposed Action than applicants?

It is not possible to generate additional A2.3 forms in the eSubmission module if there are more Member States concerned by the proposed Action than applicants in the proposal. Therefore, please use Word version of the Application Form Part A available on each call's website page in order to obtain the approvals of additional Member States necessary for your proposal. Once these additional Member States have provided the completed, signed and stamped A2.3 forms, please scan and upload them in the eSubmission module. You must also include the originals (with stamps and signatures) in the hard copy application.

11.9 Can activities addressing different Specific Objectives (e.g. on-board deployment and training) be submitted in a joint proposed Action under the ERTMS Priority? If they should be separated, how would this relate to the recommended minimum threshold of €500,000 EU contribution for studies?

Different Specific Objectives (SO) of the ERTMS Funding Priority should primarily be presented in separate applications. Nevertheless, the submission of applications combining different SOs is allowed (except for SO 1 and 2) provided that an applicant can demonstrate significant added value of such an approach in the proposal. Applicants of such proposals are strongly encouraged to separate activities covered by different Specific Objectives in view of their proper evaluation.

The calls addressing the ERTMS Priority (MAP Call Funding Objective 1 and MAP Call addressing the Cohesion Fund allocation) state that "on-board and track side ERTMS deployment/upgrade cannot be submitted together in one application". On this basis, it is required to submit proposed Actions for these first two specific objectives separately from the other four specific objectives.

It is possible to submit proposals for only one of the Specific Objectives 3-6 of the ERTMS Priority. The above recommendation would be taken into account during the final selection, if it implied in some cases that the general minimum threshold stipulated in section 14.2.1 of the Calls 'Co-funding rates' cannot be met. Please see question 2.6 for complementary information.

11.10 According to what rules/principles should the Action be divided into activities?

There are no formal rules covering the division of Action into activities. This should be done on a case-by-case basis taking into account the various characteristics and technical aspects of individual Actions. The logical structure and clarity of the proposal (including its division into activities) is evaluated under the quality criterion. Similarly, it is up to the applicants to decide on a case-by-case basis whether a Global Project should/could be split into several Actions to be submitted as separate proposals.

11.11 How to generate additional Forms A2.3 if there are more Member States concerned by the proposed Action than applicants?

It is not possible to generate additional A2.3 forms in the eSubmission module if there are more Member States concerned by the proposed Action than applicants in the proposal. Therefore please use the MS-Word version of the Application Form Part A that is available on each call page in order to obtain the approvals of additional Member States necessary for your proposal. Once these additional Member States have provided completed, signed and stamped A2.3 forms, please scan and upload them in the eSubmission module as well as include the originals (with stamps and signatures) in the hard copy application.

11.12 Do affiliated entities need to submit any other sections of the application forms besides A2.4, Annex B-II, and legal entity form?

No. This is a complete list of documents that affiliated entities have to provide in the Application Form.

11.13 The link identified in the application form part B, section 1 to download the Legal Entity Form does not work.

The legal entity form can be downloaded at the following link:
http://ec.europa.eu/budget/contracts_grants/info_contracts/legal_entities/legal_entities_en.cfm.

11.14 Is section of the application form part A3.1 "Contribution of the action to TEN-T policy objectives" applicable for the Single European Sky priority/PCP?

Yes. However, for proposals under this priority it is not necessary to list all previous Actions relating to SESAR deployment. However, where the current Action is a continuation of a previously-financed Action, the information should be provided.

11.15 Where should means of verification of milestones of the proposed Action be mentioned? Should they be integrated in question 2.3 of the application form part D or elsewhere?

The application form part A3.1 provides a specific table where milestones of the action, their expected completion dates and means of verification should be included. The means of verification for the milestones can also be entered in questions 2.3 of the application form part D, which deals with the description of activities. Furthermore, question 2.5 of the application form part D asks for a graphic representation of the activities of the proposed Action and its milestones, including any interdependencies.

11.16 Application forms parts B, C and D are to be uploaded as separate documents into TENtec eSubmission module before the proposal submission. However, the final proposal code is not available until the application is submitted. Should the draft TENtec number be used on the front page of the application form parts B, C and D in the section as proposal number?

Yes, the draft proposal TENtec number (a number appearing next to "draft" mention when a draft application is printed) should be entered on the front page of the application form parts B, C and D, if possible, to allow for their easier identification.

11.17 According to the calls for proposals, "selected proposals subject to CBA may be designated on the basis of a sampling method to perform an ex-post climate change impact assessment of the action. For this purpose, applications for works should include an estimate of the costs of such climate change impact assessment." Should the study activity to perform the climate change impact assessment be included in the proposal as a separate activity with its own budget?

Yes, such climate change impact assessment should be included in the proposal as a separate activity with its own costs that will benefit from a co-funding rate of 50%.

11.18 Where can the point on absence of distortion of competition for freight services be addressed in the application form part D?

Please address this point in question 5.8 of the application form part D.

11.19 Is it correct to conclude from FAQ 11.2 that a proposal may be submitted including works which depend on studies that are part of the same proposal, subject to these studies are already being carried out or close to completion and the works starting in the very near future?

This would be possible.

11.20 Is the signature of a partnership/consortium/association agreement a necessary prerequisite before submitting multi-applicant proposals?

No, such agreements are not a formal requirement for submitting a proposal. However, it is strongly recommended to start preparing these jointly with an application in order not to delay the start of an action should it be selected for funding. Furthermore, demonstrating a high level of preparedness of such an agreement may underline the maturity of a proposal.

12. GEOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

12.1 In the Guide for Applicants it is specified that each action (works/studies) shall annex a detailed map of at least 1:100.000 scale. How do we apply this rule for actions along the Core Network Corridors where we have routes of 1.000 km or more? What scale shall be sufficient for "non-pure" infrastructure actions?

The map indicating the location of the proposed Action should be submitted in digital form only. For larger areas, a conclusive list of NUTS codes corresponding to the proposed Action's geographical coverage can be supplied as an alternative to a polygon vector file.

13. SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS

13.1 Will INEA publish any guidance for the private sector about applicable cost-benefit analysis (CBA) methodology?

No. No distinction of approaches in terms of the applicable cost-benefit methodology is expected between the public and private sector. Therefore no specific guidance is foreseen to be published for the private sector.

13.2 Usually a CBA is carried out prior to starting a project. If the result is positive, the project can start to be developed - including its financing. How could a CBA for a major infrastructure project already take into account the EU co-funding requested in a later stage? Furthermore, is it expected that an additional note on the financial viability or financial closure of the project needs to be added to the CBA?

A CBA undertaken to assess the viability of a given project should remain valid disregarding whether or not the project receives CEF Transport funding. Ultimately, the source of funding should

be irrelevant to calculate the overall socio-economic benefit and the result of a CBA should not differ whether the project receives European or any other financial assistance. In this sense there is no need to add complementary information to a CBA, provided that this has been carried out according to appropriate standards.

13.3 In what cases can a cost-effectiveness analysis replace a cost-benefit analysis?

The priorities under which a proposal must be accompanied by a cost-effectiveness analysis instead of a CBA are identified in the section 9.2 of the calls. Please note that the submission of the CBA or a cost-effectiveness analysis is required for proposals for 'works' or proposals including both 'studies' and 'works' in the same proposal. It is not required for 'studies' proposals.

13.4 Would it be obligatory to recalculate the CBA and modify the supporting documents such as feasibility study if some elements of the project are considered not eligible or costs change during project implementation? How will cost developments be considered after the Commission adopts the selection Decision?

No, it is not necessary to recalculate the CBA if some costs of the proposed Action are considered not eligible or if costs change during the implementation of the selected action. During the lifetime of the project, INEA may agree to adjust the grant agreement only to take into account certain changes for example in the implementation period, timing of milestones, and when these are justified and they do not put into question the award of the financial aid. In any case, the amount of the awarded financial aid cannot be increased.

13.5 What is the main guidance regarding the Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA)?

There is no specific guidance available or foreseen at this stage for CBA requested under these calls for proposals. However, the methodology used must be accepted by the respective national rules and Member States are asked to confirm this in the application form. For proposals for works eligible under the special call for Cohesion countries, we recommend that you please follow the Cohesion Fund CBA methodology in order to simplify the process of project preparation under CEF and ESIF funds.

13.6 Will the cost-benefit analysis (CBA) be used to show the viability of the action or the need for co-funding (funding gap)?

In case of proposals under the Cohesion Fund envelope covering works projects, calculation of the funding gap should be based on DG REGIO Working Document 4 which is based on DG REGIO CBA Guide. Both documents provide detailed information on the rules to be applied when performing the CBA and consequent calculation of the funding gap, including identification of the scope of the analysis, as well as recommended discount rates.

13.7 Is there any standard or requested format for the feasibility study/CBA/market study etc. for works proposals submitted under the CEF Transport?

For projects submitted under the Cohesion Call envelope, it is strongly recommended that the Cohesion Policy CBA methodology is used, in order to simplify the process of project preparation under the CEF and ESIF funds. While the Cohesion Policy Guide for the CBA methodology is under review (new text expected to be adopted in December 2014), project proponents may already use the present methodology (see http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/guides/cost/guide2008_en.pdf).

13.8 Are any guidelines available for the cost-effectiveness analysis which has to be included in the application?

Please see question 13.9 below.

13.9 Where can we find the definition of the cost-effectiveness analysis?

According to section 9.2 of the calls for proposals, proposals for 'works' or including both 'studies' and 'works' submitted under the ERTMS priority of the MAP call Funding Objective 1 and of the MAP call addressing the Cohesion Fund allocation and under the Single European Sky (SESAR) priority of the MAP call Funding Objective 3 must be accompanied by a cost-effectiveness instead of a cost-benefit analysis. Furthermore, proposals for 'works' or including both 'studies' and 'works' that address implementation of standards laid down in the existing EU legislation and are submitted under the River Information Services and Intelligent Transport Services for Road priorities of the

MAP call Funding Objective 3 must be accompanied either by a cost-benefit or a cost-effectiveness analysis.

In cases where the benefits of a major project are very difficult or impossible to quantify but where costs can be predicted with reasonable confidence (notably for major projects driven by necessity to ensure compliance with EU legislation) a cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA) can be performed. In such cases, the appraisal should focus on verifying that the project is the most efficient solution for the society to supply a given, necessary service at the pre-defined conditions set out. In addition, a qualitative description of main economic benefits should be provided.

The CEA is carried out by calculating the cost per unit of 'non monetised' benefit and is required to quantify benefits, but not to attach a monetary price or economic value to the benefits.

The conditions for applying CEA are as follows:

- the project produces only one project output which is homogenous and easily measurable
- this output is crucial for the development of the project, entailing that action to secure this output is essential
- the aim of the major project is to achieve the output at minimal cost
- there are no significant externalities
- there is a wide evidence of benchmarks to verify that chosen technology meets the minimum required cost performance criteria.

13.10 Does the applicant need to update the CBA provided that the latter is not actualized for the last four years?

There is no "best before" date on the Cost-Benefit Analysis, but the fact that it might be out of date might become relevant in the evaluation phase of the proposal, where the experts assess the quality and maturity of the proposal based on the accompanying documents.

13.11 For which kinds of projects is the CBA required?

The submission of the CBA or a cost-effectiveness analysis is required for proposals for 'works' or proposals including both 'studies' and 'works' in the same proposal. It is not required for 'studies' proposals.

13.12 Would it be obligatory to recalculate the Cost-Benefit Analysis and to modify the supportive documents such as feasibility study, if according to the selection decision some project elements are considered non-eligible?

The evaluation is carried out based on the documents submitted by the deadline of the call. Should there be activities or costs in the proposal that are considered ineligible during the evaluation, these details would be addressed during the grant agreement preparation phase. Generally, the revision of the cost-benefit analysis and feasibility study would not be necessary for the conclusion of the grant agreement.

13.13 Article 7.2 of the CEF Regulation, requires a written agreement between the Member States concerned or between the Member States and third countries concerned relating to the completion of the cross-border section. What kind of written agreement should it be?

Neither the CEF Regulation nor the TEN-T Guidelines stipulate a specific format for the written agreement between the Member States concerned or between the Member States and third countries concerned relating to the completion of the cross-border section.

13.14 By signing the application form part A2.3, Member State representatives have to confirm that a nationally recognised methodology was used for carrying out the CBA. Does this mean the Commission and INEA put the responsibility for checking the methodology used with the Member State?

Yes, indeed, the responsibility for checking whether the CBA has been prepared using a nationally-recognised methodology is with the Member State concerned by the proposed Action, which is providing its agreement to the proposal.

13.15 A CBA for the project was prepared recently for the EIB. Are EIB standards valid in the framework of the submission of a CEF proposal?

If such CBA follows a nationally-recognised methodology and the Member State provides confirmation in this regard in the application form part A2.3, such CBA would be acceptable.

13.16 The Cohesion Policy CBA methodology for the new programming period 2014-2020 is not yet adopted. Is it acceptable that the CBA uses rates set out in the final draft of the new methodology, i.e. financial discount rate of 4% and social discount rate of 5%?

Given that the Commission Implementing Regulation establishing the methodology for carrying the CBA under the Cohesion Policy has not yet been adopted, it is acceptable that rates set out in the final draft of the methodology are used. Please note that the new "Guide to Cost-benefit Analysis

of Investment Projects" was published in December 2014 at the following link: http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/studies/pdf/cba_guide.pdf.

13.17 If a CBA has been prepared for a specific rail link, can the proposal related to a sub-section of the rail link, use the CBA results of a wider project?

Yes, that is possible. The calls for proposals stipulate in section 9.2 that "a proposed Action which concerns a part or a section of a large project of common interest may be covered by a socio-economic CBA for this larger project of common interest."

13.18 As far as additional documents that need to be provided with the Legal Entity Form, is it acceptable to provide a simple copy or a certified copy? Is it acceptable to provide such documents in national language?

There is no need to provide a certified copy for the additional documents accompanying the Legal Entity Form (e.g. statutes of the organisation, etc.). Likewise, it is acceptable if such documents are submitted in the national language.

13.19 The Legal Entity Form (LEF) template has changed on 22 January 2014. However, we already completed and validated these forms on based on the previous template. Do we have to redo the forms or can we submit the already validated ones based on the previous template?

Submitting proposals including LEFs based on the previous template will have no impact whatsoever on the admissibility, eligibility or the evaluation of your proposal. However, proposals having used the previous template and which are selected for funding may have to provide (a) new validated LEF(s) upon request by INEA prior to concluding individual grant agreements.

13.20 Can you please confirm that only the Application Form Part A and its annexes have to be submitted in hardcopy (paper version)?

This is correct. Only Application Form Part A and its annexes have to be sent in hardcopy to the address and before the deadline specified in the call text. Applications Form Parts B, C and D should be uploaded in electronic version into the eSubmission module. Any sections of these forms that require validation by means of a signature must be scanned and uploaded. The applicant should store the originals and be able to produce these upon request.

13.21 Which are the annexes of Application Form Part A that have to be included in the hardcopy version to be sent?

Not all documents that have to be uploaded in the eSubmission module have to be submitted in hardcopy. For the Legal Entity Form and the Financial Identification Form electronic versions of the validated originals (scans) are sufficient. Also the CBA does not need to be sent in hardcopy version.

13.22 Application Form Part B states on the bottom of page 2: "All required supporting documents must be attached to the application submitted both on paper and electronically via the TENtec e-Submission module." Is this not in contradiction with the information of other FAQ?

The above quoted statement in Application Form Part B is erroneous. The correct statement should be: "All required supporting documents must be attached to the application submitted electronically via the TENtec e-Submission module. Sections that require validation by signature have to be completed on paper and scanned to be uploaded electronically. Applicants have to store the originals and be able to produce these on requests."

14. eSUBMISSION MODULE / SUBMISSION PROCEDURE

14.1 How can a group of stakeholders apply for funding? Should there be a joint proposal submitted or must each applicant of a joint Action fill in the Application Form separately?

The Application Form should only be filled and submitted once per proposed Action. A proposed Action can have a single or multiple applicants. However, the Application Form includes certain sections that must be completed per applicant: notably the administrative information in Application Form Part A and in particular Form A2.3 that must be validated by the competent Member State per applicant, if applicable. Part B needs to be completed by each applicant whereas Part C needs to be completed for the proposed Action.

14.2 I have unsuccessfully applied under a previous call for proposals. Do I have to resubmit administrative information that has not changed since then (for example on compliance with environmental law or the legal entity and financial identification forms)?

Yes. Such information must be re-submitted. To be considered eligible, an Application Form has to be submitted complete, including all of its parts A, B, C and D. This is consistent with the principle of equal treatment of all applicants. Please note that if any annex or information is missing, the outcome of the evaluation of the proposal may be jeopardized.

Furthermore, the section of the Application Form on compliance with EU environmental law has been simplified and the documents relating to previous calls may no longer be appropriate. Lastly, the submission of possibly updated information will ensure that the project has not been subject to substantial changes that may impact its compliance with EU law (e.g. on environmental protection, etc).

14.3 In the Application Form Part A4.2, what does "contributor panel" refer to?

The TENtec eSubmission module provides the possibility to give access to the same application to several users, either in read-only mode or with rights to edit the application. Granting of access to additional users is done through "Contributors Panel" tab.

It is recommended that the owner of application (for example, coordinating applicant in case of a multi-applicant proposal) creates the application in the first place. Access to the application can then be granted to other users. This allows several users to work on a single application, although only the application owner can submit the application. If the owner wishes to share an application with someone who is not yet a TENtec user, the latter will need to register in TENtec.

14.4 Which documents should be sent as originals to INEA in the paper version of the application? Is there a need to send Application Form Part C which also includes documents that must be signed by the competent national authorities?

According to the call for proposals, the paper version of the proposal must contain only the original, signed and stamped version of Application Form A and its annexes. For other parts of the application where signatures are necessary (namely the annexes of Application Form Part B and Part C), it is not necessary to send the original hard copies.

Please note however that the call requires that applicants must be able to provide the original documents and send them upon request.

14.5 For multi-applicant proposals, is it acceptable that the relevant Member State(s) sign and stamp the Application Form part A2.3, scan this form and send it by email to the applicant, which includes the print-out of the scanned form in the paper version of the proposal?

No, this is not acceptable. The paper copy of Application Form Part A must bear original signatures and stamps of Member States on the respective forms A2.3.

14.6 What is the character limit in the text boxes?

There is a limit of 4,000 characters in most text boxes of the eSubmission module.

14.7 Can the supporting documents be attached in zip-format?

Yes, zip files (both .zip and .7z) can be uploaded, but there is a limitation of 30MB for uploading documents.

14.8 Is it possible to add a new applicant without losing all the data and information already uploaded? Or should the application be started over?

As long as the proposal is not submitted, applicants can be added without any problem. Already encoded data will not be lost, only new data will need to be added. Therefore it is enough to add a new applicant and only add the new related information.

14.9 The legal status of an applicant was not correctly entered in the application form part A2.1. Is it possible to modify the legal status?

The legal status can indeed only be changed by recreating the profile of the applicant in section A2.1 of the application form.

14.10 Is it possible to change the order of added activities in the eSubmission tool?

It is not possible to change the order of activities and they will appear in the chronological order based on when they are created.

14.11 Is it possible to correct any issues in the proposal after "submit" button has been clicked?

Pressing the "submit" button submits the proposal and no editing is possible after this step in the eSubmission module.

14.12 For any parts of the application where signatures or stamps are required (such as the application form parts A2.2 and A2.3), the signed, stamped and dated originals have to be scanned and uploaded into TENtec. However, there is no specific document type related to these documents.

Application form parts and supporting documents can be uploaded through the "Supporting Documents" tab of the eSubmission module. For application form parts B, C and D, cost-benefit analysis, legal entity form and financial identification form, please select the relevant document type among the available list. For all other documents, there is no need to indicate the document type. Please make sure to name all documents uploaded in a way that makes it easy to identify the contents.

For further details on modalities of uploading documents, please see the eSubmission manual provided on each of the calls website:
http://inea.ec.europa.eu/download/calls2014/cef_transport/2014_guide_for_applicants_esub_transport_manual_150116.pdf.

14.13 Has a checklist for the submission of proposals been published as for the past TEN-T calls?

Yes, such a checklist has been published on the website of each call and can be found at the following link: http://inea.ec.europa.eu/download/calls2014/cef_transport/checklist_final.pdf.

14.14 The addendum to the Guide for Applicants stipulates that "In case of proposals addressing works the required Cost Benefit Analysis/ Cost Effectiveness Analysis must also be part of the translated documents." However, our CBA is very big in volume and it appears disproportionate in timing and costs to translate the entire document.

The contents of a CBA must be available in EN language to be considered during the evaluation process of works proposals. This does not imply that a full CBA must be translated in all cases. For this purpose it may be sufficient to only translate its executive summary or other key summarising chapters provided that they give sufficient insight into its key assumptions and findings.

14.15 Is the deadline for submissions of 26 February 2015 applying on the date of sending or the date of arrival at the address specified in the call text?

The deadline applies to the date of sending the proposals to the address specified in its section 6.2.2 'Paper Submission'. Each call text states in this section: "A paper version of the application

form A and its annexes (one original, signed and stamped where applicable) must be submitted no later than 26 February 2015".

Hand deliveries have to respect the opening times of the the Commission's Central Mail Department who accepts delivery of the documents. The Central Mail Service is open from 7h00 to 17h30 Monday to Fridays and closed on Saturdays, Sundays and Commission holidays.

14.16 *Translating a full CBA will be very time consuming. Can the deadline for submitting translations be extended?*

No, this will not be possible. Please also see FAQ 14.14 in this respect which clarifies that not necessarily an entire CBA will have to be translated and that its executive summary may be sufficient provided it entails enough detailed information to take into account during the proposals evaluation.

14.17 *The translation of our proposal might not be available by the official deadline of 5 March 2015. Could we already submit it a week later?*

It is strongly recommended to respect the deadline for submitting translations of proposals in order not to jeopardise the evaluation process. Only in exceptional and duly justified cases translations may be submitted shortly later. However, the eSubmission will no longer be available for uploading additional files and these would have to be sent as e-mail attachments to the 2014 call for proposals helpdesk.

14.18 *How can we upload additional supporting documents in the TENtec eSubmission module that do not match the categories of documents that have to be uploaded?*

You can upload multiple documents including the required supporting documents and annexes, simply without indicating them to one of the required categories. They will be displayed and accessible for evaluators during the evaluation.

14.19 *Does the threshold of 30MB for uploading documents in the eSubmission module applies to all documents of a proposal or to single files?*

This threshold applies to the maximum volume of an individual file to be uploaded. There is no ceiling for the total number or volume of files to be uploaded per proposal.

14.20 *Do the translations of proposals also have to be signed and stamped in the relevant sections such as the original forms?*

No, there is no requirement for the translations to also be validated.

14.21 *We intend uploading Application Forms B, C and D including all relevant annexes and supporting documents in the eSubmission module prior to submission. However, this implies that we can only indicate the draft proposal code and not the final one generate after submission. Is this an acceptable procedure?*

Yes. The unique draft proposal code allows linking the files to a specific proposal without ambiguity.

14.22 *Does an exact electronic copy of the paper version of Form A needs to be included in the e-submission by means of uploading the file into the module?*

No, this is not required and technically not foreseen. The information entailed in the Application Form Part A is accessible via the TENtec tool during the evaluation period.

14.23 *Can you confirm that a draft submission remains confidential and has no binding value as long as it has not been submitted?*

Yes, both assumptions are correct.

14.24 *In our proposal one region is participating as an applicant. The guidelines state in section 4.2.1 that "All applicants except Member States, regions (...) need to provide the Legal Entities Form. However, we are blocked from submitting our proposal in the eSubmission module by an error message "Form SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS : Applicant Region XXX does not have legal entity form". How should we address this situation?*

Please upload any blank document as a placeholder. This will resolve the error message and allow you submitting your proposal.

14.25 *We have successfully submitted a proposal in the eSubmission module. However, we realised errors in our submission and want to reopen and correct the submitted proposal. How can we do this?*

The Guide for Applicants, Section 5.3 'Paper Submission, Correcting or revising the proposal' states:

"It is not possible to make changes to a proposal once it has been submitted. If you wish to make changes, you must submit a new proposal before the deadline, which will replace the previous version.

If more than one copy of the same proposal is received, only the most recent eligible version will be evaluated. If you re-submit a proposal, to avoid complications during the evaluation, please inform INEA through the call helpdesk.

Applicants who have submitted a proposal must inform INEA as soon as possible through the call helpdesk of any change of an operational or financial nature that might affect them or the proposal."

14.26 *We have already submitted a proposal and are planning to re-submit it electronically as a new proposal, which will replace the previous version. Can we use the originals/ paper copies with validation signatures (Forms A2.2 and A2.3 for example) established for this new submission despite they already bear the proposal code of the initial submission?*

Yes, this is possible. In this case please i) bar the initial proposal code and manually add the proposal code generated after submitting the new proposal and ii) inform INEA by sending a message to the call helpdesk indicating which proposal should be disregarded by quoting the respective proposal codes of both the initial and the new submission.

14.27 *Will the deadline for submission of translations be extended accordingly to the extension for the submission of proposals?*

No, this is not the case, as we assume that applicants have worked for the initial submission deadline and made according planning for the submission of translations. However, please see the related FAQ 14.17 which states that "(...) in exceptional and duly justified cases translations may be submitted shortly later (than 5 March 2015). However, the eSubmission will no longer be available for uploading additional files and these would have to be sent as e-mail attachments to the 2014 call for proposals helpdesk."

15. GRANT AGREEMENT PREPARATION / MANAGEMENT

15.1 *What would be the disbursement rate if my proposal would be selected for funding?*

Please see in any call text section 14.2.3 "Payment arrangements" for the payment modalities applicable to proposals selected to receive funding under the respective call.

15.2 *Article 12 'Cancellation, suspension and termination' of the grant of the CEF Regulation states: "1. Except in duly justified cases, the Commission shall cancel financial assistance granted for studies which have not been started within one year following the start date laid down in the conditions governing the granting of aid (...)"*

What is meant by: "the start date laid down in the conditions governing the granting of aid"? Does this mean that the study should start within one year from the start date of the Action, or from the start date of the Study/Pilot Activity?

This provision refers to the start date of the entire Action as laid down in the grant agreement for the respective Action - not the start dates of any activity within the Action.

15.3 *We are planning a multi-applicant proposal in the context of managing a rail freight corridor. To this end we are preparing to establish an EEIG (European Economic Interest Group) which however is unlikely to have legal personality before the submission*

deadline. In case our proposed Action (submitted as a classic multi-applicant proposal) would be selected for funding and if the EEIG would be successfully be set up in the meantime, could it become the sole beneficiary and signatory of the grant agreement?

This would in principle be possible, subject to all applicants of the proposal would provide their written agreement and that the scope and objectives of the Action remain unchanged. In addition, please note that entities without legal personality may be eligible for funding under certain conditions as laid down in section 9.1 of the Calls. Namely, their representatives shall have the capacity to undertake legal obligations on their behalf and offer guarantee for the protection of the Union's financial interests equivalent to that offered by legal persons.

15.4 At which level should the grant agreement be signed?

The grant agreements will be signed by the Executive Director of INEA. The authorised representative of the beneficiaries or coordinator will be empowered to represent respectively the beneficiary/coordinator for the purpose of the grant agreement signature. The designation of the authorised representative is an internal matter to each applicant, and the beneficiaries/coordinator may designate their representative at the level they consider appropriate.

15.5 May the authorised representative signing the grant agreement be different from the authorised representative signing the proposal?

Yes.

15.6 In case of partial completion of activities at a given target date (i.e when a milestone is not met) is the grant to be calculated as a pro rata of the percentage of completion? How is the percentage of completion to be assessed?

The grant agreement will specify the starting and completion dates of the action and also the activities it contains. The beneficiary will be required to report on the progress of the implementation of the action on an annual basis, including any delays in the implementation of activities of the action. Significant delays may warrant the revision of the grant agreement including potential reductions of the financial assistance following a case by case analysis.

Please note that, aside from pre-financing payment, any interim payments and payment of the balance are linked to the activities carried out and actual costs incurred. Objectives actually realised will be assessed at the time of the balance payment. Additional information on the calculation of the final amount of the grant as well as any reduction is detailed in the Article II.25 of the model grant agreement.

15.7 How is the grant agreement different from a grant Decision previously used in TEN-T. Do all beneficiaries need to sign the grant agreement?

According to the model grant agreement used for CEF Transport, all beneficiaries must either be signatories or be represented by the coordinator by virtue of a mandate (Annex IV of the model grant Agreement). On the first page of the model grant agreement specifies the options for signing the agreement in cases where a coordinator is designated and in cases where no coordinator is designated for the proposal.

Both grant agreement and grant decision serve the same purpose, however their legal nature is different. As a bilateral act, requiring explicitly the acceptance of the beneficiary, the grant agreement is suitable for any types of beneficiaries independently of their nationality or place of establishment. The funding Decision, as a unilateral act of an EU institution, has a legal force only within the Union. Therefore it could not be enforced against beneficiaries established outside the EU, which CEF Regulation provides for.

15.8 If the association agreement between participants in an action clearly stipulates the role and attributions of each party, including the empowerment of the leader to act on behalf of the proposal partners, is this sufficient enough for demonstrating the capacity of the proposal partners representative to undertake legal obligation on behalf of the proposal partners?

For the purposes of the signature of the grant agreement under CEF, all beneficiaries have to either be signatories themselves or be represented by the coordinator by virtue of a mandate (Annex IV of the model grant Agreement) to be completed for each represented beneficiary. Therefore, existing association agreement between participants in a project cannot be used for this purpose.

15.9 What are the reporting formalities for Actions selected for funding?

The conditions on reporting are described in the model grant agreement, Article 4 and Annex II.23, available on the calls websites.

15.10 What happens in case of delay of the milestones originally introduced in the proposal?

The timing of milestones corresponds to the best possible estimate at the time of signing the grant agreement. Delays on delivery of milestones may occur during an action's lifetime and may be accommodated subject to remaining within its eligibility period. However, delays on meeting an action's objectives and deliverables beyond its agreed end date may lead to reductions of the CEF Transport assistance.

15.11 What kind of measures will be applied in case there is an irregularity identified in the public procurement process? Will INEA apply corrections similar to ERDF/CF programmes?

The Agency performs thorough ex-ante checks of the public procurements for each financed Action. Results are assessed and measures are identified on a case-by-case basis. If irregularities are detected, this may lead to reductions of the CEF Transport assistance or even to declaring the related costs claimed as ineligible, leading to a loss of financial assistance for these costs.

15.12 What is the language of the grant agreement?

The language foreseen for the grant agreement is English.

15.13 How long will it take to designate actions that should perform climate change impact assessment in line with section 9.2 of the calls' texts, keeping in mind that such a study will extend the duration of the proposed Action?

If the proposed action is selected to carry out a climate change impact assessment in line with section 9.2 of the calls texts, this will be taken into account during the grant Agreement preparation phase.

15.14 When will the grant agreements for proposals selected for funding under the 2014 CEF Transport calls be concluded?

All grant agreements for actions selected under these calls have to be signed before 31 December 2015.

16. SELECTION PROCESS

16.1 Who are the independent experts conducting the external evaluation of proposed Actions, how many will be recruited, what is their professional background and will there be a country balance applied?

The experts are recruited for the evaluation of each call based on their skills, competence and experience. They are drawn from the EMI database that is maintained by DG Research for the purposes of the Horizon 2020 Programme. (Please see the related news item for further information:

http://inea.ec.europa.eu/en/news_events/newsroom/independent_experts_needed_for_evaluation_of_proposals_for_cef.htm.)

A minimum of three experts evaluate a proposed Action. Their professional background varies, they can be independent consultants, academics or otherwise employed. INEA follows the general Commission guidelines on the balance of gender and origin. Each expert must sign a declaration of absence of conflict of interest and of confidentiality before starting to work on proposals.

16.2 What are the award criteria against which proposed Actions will be evaluated?

The award criteria are listed in section 12 'Award Criteria' of each call for proposals. Several questions in Application Form Part D correspond to each of these criteria. Proposed Actions will be evaluated on the basis of the information provided in view of the objectives and priorities of the respective calls priority. Please see the Guide for Applicants

(http://inea.ec.europa.eu/download/calls2014/cef_transport/application_forms/2014_guide_for_applicants_transport_draft_final_draft_clean.pdf) section 3.2 'External Evaluation' for complementary information.

16.3 How is the minimum threshold of each assessment criterion determined during the external evaluation?

During the consensus meeting the external experts assigned to the respective proposed Action agree on a score between 0 and 5 points. This is a qualitative judgement based on the experts' opinion at the end of their discussion and not a mathematical average of the individual assessment results. The minimum acceptance threshold for an individual block of award criteria is 3 points. However, subject to appropriate justification, the Commission may deviate from the opinion given in the external evaluation.

16.4 Are there terms of reference or any other guidelines for experts for the consensus meetings?

Briefings on the evaluation process, including consensus meetings, are provided to external experts upon their taking up of duty. In addition, they are required to comply with a code of conduct, which provides for confidentiality and professionalism requirements.

16.5 Will a proposal submitted by an entity other than a Member State be evaluated according to the same criteria as if it was submitted by the Member State? Will proposals submitted by the Member States be prioritized above other proposals?

Proposals that are submitted by the Member States are not given any priority or preferential treatment over those submitted by other entities. All proposals that are found eligible proceed to the following phases of evaluation and are equally evaluated based on the criteria specified in each call text irrelevant of the category of the applicant.

16.6 How can I access the Individual Assessment Form?

The Individual Assessment Forms document the first evaluation step of individual assessments by the external experts in the evaluation of proposals under the CEF Transport. They are only used as input to the consensus meeting and are neither disseminated nor can usually be accessed, given the exception provided by Article 4 of the Regulation 1049/2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents.

16.7 During the assessment of the application, is it possible to get information about the status of the application?

No. All applicants receive information on their proposals once the selection decision is adopted at the end of the evaluation process. In cases where an application is not admissible or not eligible, applicants are notified as soon as these assessment stages are completed in the beginning of the evaluation process.

16.8 If the proposal is not selected for funding under the current Call, may it be submitted under the next call?

Yes, provided that it addresses the priorities of the future work programme and call for proposals.

16.9 What percentage (out of 100) is available for each of the four award criteria? Are there marks/weightings for sub-sections of the four main award criteria?

There are no specific weights assigned to the four award criteria, nor to their sub-sections.

16.10 If the Application Form Part D exceeds the recommended 40 pages, would this constitute a reason for rejection of the proposal?

The extension of the recommended 40 pages of Application part D does not constitute a reason for excluding a proposal from being evaluated. However, disrespecting the recommended length might be considered by external experts under the Award Criterion Quality and may negatively impact their evaluation of a proposal.

17. MISCELLANEOUS

17.1 Does a multi-annual work programme define the priorities for a period of several years and will multi-annual calls be published on this basis only every few years?

No, this is not the case. Unlike Horizon 2020, the EU research and innovation programme, a new multi-annual Work Programme under the CEF Transport programme may be adopted each year making additional funding available for specific priorities. Usually each Work Programme under the CEF Transport programme is followed by one call for proposals or one set of calls running in parallel. At this point there is no information available about the timing, content or financial envelope of Work Programmes for after 2014.

17.2 Will the budget which is available under the 2014 multi-annual calls be spent on the Actions which will be proposed in response to these calls?

Yes in principle. However this is subject to a sufficient number of high quality proposals being submitted to consume the entire available funding. Additional funding will be made available by subsequent Work Programmes to be adopted by the Commission in the following years of the programme implementation.

17.3 In case one receives a grant for a study, do the results have to be publicly published after Action's completion?

There is no provision in the model grant agreement that foresees the publication of the studies themselves.

However, the results of the Action may be used by the Agency for dissemination purposes in line with Articles 11 and II.8 of the model grant agreement on pre-existing rights and ownership and use of the results (including intellectual and industrial property rights).

17.4 Can we send INEA draft proposals or project outlines to obtain quick feedback if our project idea would be suitable for funding under the 2014 CEF Transport calls?

No. INEA is not in the position to provide assessments of project ideas or outlines in affiliation of the principle of equal treatment of all applicants. It is each applicant's responsibility to analyse the Work Programmes and call texts to identify if a project idea under preparation might successfully address any of the call priorities. No answer would thus be provided to such a request.

However, general advice is being provided by these FAQs. Member States can also benefit from technical assistance by means of Programme Support Actions.

17.5 Is the definition of a multi-annual call that it will be published only every few years? I understand that it is related to a multi-annual work programme which defines the priorities for a period of several years. Is it correct that the budget available will be spent on the projects which will be submitted in response to these calls?

A new multi-annual call can be published every year, subject to the adoption of a respective work programme by the Commission.

The current multi-annual calls for proposals are launched on the basis of the multiannual work programme for 2014 (C(2014)1921 final) adopted on 26 March 2014. This provides the Commission the possibility to allocate 2014 CEF Transport budget under these calls. This, however, does not preclude the Commission from adopting another multiannual work programme nor from launching a new multi-annual call in any of the coming years. The budget allocated to the 2014 multi-annual calls can only be spent in relation to the proposals to be selected under these calls.

17.6 Currently no information on possible reimbursement of translation costs for proposals is available, whereas this was a common practise under the previous TEN-T calls. Will there be any possibility of obtaining this for proposals submitted under the 2014 CEF Transport calls?

Information on the possible reimbursement of translation costs could not be provided when the calls were opened in October 2014. However, an addendum to calls is currently being prepared and will be published shortly. It will introduce the possibility to obtain up to €1500 reimbursement of translation costs per proposal submitted under these calls (subject to certain procedural conditions).

17.7 We are already translating our proposal and might submit it directly in English before the call deadline. Are we nevertheless eligible for the reimbursement of translation costs? What should we indicate in this situation in Application Form A4.1?

All applicants are eligible for the reimbursement of translation costs irrespective whether the proposal is submitted in English directly at the deadline for submission of proposals or whether the translation is submitted afterwards by 5 March 2015. However, this is subject to complying with the requirements for the reimbursement of translation costs as stipulated in the addendum to the Guide for Applicants.

If you submit directly in English but intend requesting the reimbursement of translation costs, please provide appropriate information in A4.1, i.e. indicate that there is no requirement for translation but that the costs will be claimed. This will allow INEA to better monitor the translation reimbursement process.

18. SUPPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF ONGOING ACTIONS

18.1 My project is currently supported by a funding Decision under the 2007-2013 TEN-T Programme. The end date for implementation of the Decision (end of eligibility period) is on 31 December 2015. Can I apply for the continuation of the activities of my project after the end of the eligibility period of the current funding Decision?

In general, it is possible to apply for the continuation of an action which is currently supported by the previous TEN-T Programme. It is however mandatory that the application clearly describes and provides only the costs for the activities or part of the activities that will be implemented after the end date of the current funding Decision.

Therefore, the start date for the action proposed in your application should be the date after the end date of the current funding Decision. For your current project which ends on 31 December 2015, the start date to be proposed in your application for its continuation should be on or after 1 January 2016. The budget and description of the activities should also cover only what is planned to be implemented as from the same date.

18.2 Is there a risk that my application for such project will score low on maturity because it will start only on 1 January 2016?

The implementation plans provided in the application will be assessed on their own merits and your application will not be penalised against the maturity criterion because of the 1 January 2016 start date.

18.3 My project is currently supported by a funding Decision under the 2007-2013 TEN-T Programme. The end date for implementation of the Decision (end of eligibility period) is on 31 December 2015. However, the implementation of the current action faces delays and, as a result, parts of certain activities will not be implemented by the end date of 31 December 2015. Can I apply for financial support for these parts? If so, do I have to request previously an amendment to my current Decision to reduce its scope to what it will be finally implemented within the end of the eligibility period?

It is possible to request funding for parts of activities that you are not able to implement within the eligibility period of your ongoing action as long as, in your application, the description made for and the cost of these parts are in line with the conditions stated in answer 18.1, namely that the application clearly describes and provides only the costs for the part of the activities that will be implemented after the end date of the current funding Decision.

It is nevertheless necessary to make sure that your current action progresses as fast as possible and as complete as possible. Moreover, such efforts will reduce the risk that possible further delays in the current action may negatively impact the evaluation of the application for the continuation of the activities beyond the implementation deadline of the ongoing action. In principle, a modification is not necessary. It has to be certain that there is no overlapping between the eligibility periods and no risk of double financing. Therefore, the start date for the action proposed in your application should be a date after the end date of the current funding Decision.

18.4 In addition to the continuation of my current action, I also intend to apply for some new activities which will start before the end date for implementation of the current Decision (end of eligibility period). In such case, can the new action proposed in my application start before the end of the current action?

It is possible to merge in your application new activities which are not included in an ongoing action with parts of ongoing activities which will not be finally implemented within the eligibility period of your ongoing action under the following conditions: i) the activities which will start before the end date of the ongoing action are not already supported by the ongoing action, and ii) the application describes and includes only the costs for the part of the ongoing activities that will be implemented after the end date of the current funding Decision. Therefore i) and ii) must be presented as separate activities in the application.

18.5 Can I include in my new application an activity or part of an activity of an ongoing action if I do not intend to finally include its cost in my payment claims?

It is not possible for a beneficiary of an ongoing action to withdraw any part of activity that will be implemented within the eligibility of an ongoing action in order to resubmit it in a new application. Only costs incurred after the end of the current eligibility period or costs not included in the current decision may be submitted in the application (see also answers 18.3 and 18.4).