



Republic of Serbia

MINISTRY OF FINANCE

Department for Contracting and Financing of EU Funded Programmes (CFCU)

Belgrade, 15 January 2026

### CONTRACTING AUTHORITY'S CLARIFICATIONS NO.1

**1st Call for Proposals under Cross - border Cooperation programme Serbia – Montenegro for 2021-2027 under the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance (IPA III), allocations 2022 and 2024**  
**EuropeAid/185585/ID/ACT/Multi**

No.	Question	Answer
1.	<p>Poštovani,</p> <p>Obraćam Vam se u ime firme Y doo, kojoj je osnivač Opština Z, sa širokim dijapazonom djelatnosti. Kao pioniri u apliciranju za EU grantove, a kao neko ko sprovodi velik broj projekata u svojoj ustanovi, možete li nam pomoći sa informacijom da li postoji neka baza podataka ili spisak eventualno partnera sa kojima bi mogli ostvariti saradnju.</p> <p><i>Unofficial translation:</i></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing to you on behalf of the company Y, founded by the Municipality of Z, with a wide range of activities. As pioneers in applying for</p>	<p>There is no official database of potential applicants. However, within the official website of the Serbia–Montenegro Cross-Border Cooperation Programme <a href="https://cbcserb-mne.org/">https://cbcserb-mne.org/</a>, there is a “Partner Search” section that needs to be filled in with the relevant information in order to look for potential partners (<a href="https://cbcserb-mne.org/me/trazenje-partnera-2/">https://cbcserb-mne.org/me/trazenje-partnera-2/</a>).</p> <p>Also, the info sessions for presenting the <b>1st Call for Proposals under Cross - border Cooperation programme Serbia – Montenegro for 2021-2027 under the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance (IPA III), allocations 2022 and 2024</b>, held in Prijepolje on 3 December 2025 and in Berane on 9 December 2025, served, among other purposes, to facilitate the acquaintance of potential project partners</p>

	<p>EU grants, and as an institution that implements a large number of projects, could you please assist us with information on whether there is a database or a list of potential partners with whom we could establish cooperation.</p>	
2.	<p>Dobar dan, ja sam g-dja X, magistar ekonomije ,zapošljen au opštini XX, i zanimam se za ove projekte prekogranične saradnje Srbija -Crna Gora 2021-2027, i htela bih i žejlela da udjem u tu priču,, već imam jedan projekat, ... Poslaću vam i moj kontakt pa ako vam je lakše da ostavrimo komunikaciju, XXX-XXXXXXX Hvala na saradnji,</p> <p><u><i>Unofficial translation:</i></u></p> <p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>My name is Ms X, I hold a Master's degree in Economics and I am employed by the Municipality of XX. I am interested in the Serbia–Montenegro Cross-Border Cooperation Programme 2021–2027 and would like</p> <p>to get involved in this field. I already have one project idea... I will send you my contact number if it is easier for you to make a contact, XXX-XXXXXXX.</p> <p>Thank you for your cooperation.</p>	<p>If your organization meets the requirements set out in <b>Section 2.1.1 Eligibility of applicants (i.e. lead applicant, co-applicant(s) and affiliated entities)</b> of the Guidelines for grant applicants, you may submit a project concept in accordance with the conditions of the <b>1st Call for Proposals under Cross - border Cooperation programme Serbia – Montenegro for 2021-2027 under the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance (IPA III), allocations 2022 and 2024</b>, prescribed by the PRAG Version 2025 and published Guidelines for grant applicants.</p>
3.	<p>Poštovani,</p> <p>Obraćamo se u vezi sa zahtevom da razmotrite proširenje rezultata 2.1.3. <i>Increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers and</i></p>	<p>Under IPA III, the cross–border cooperation programme Serbia–Montenegro 2021–2027 is implemented on the basis of an approved programme strategy, including a defined intervention logic with specific objectives, expected results and output indicators. For thematic priority 5 “Encouraging</p>

<p><i>organic agricultural producers to jointly contribute to further tourism development, na sledeći način: Increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers and <b>organic and traditional agricultural and handcrafts products</b> to jointly contribute to further tourism development.</i></p> <p><b><u>Obrazloženje :</u></b></p> <p>Rezultat 2.1.3, definisan kroz povećanje saradnje između turističkih operatera, pružalaca usluga i proizvođača organskih poljoprivrednih proizvoda, u postojećem obliku, ne odražava realnost programskog područja i tržišne dinamike turističkog sektora. U prekograničnom regionu Srbija – Crna Gora postoji relativno mali broj sertifikovanih organskih proizvođača, dok proces sertifikacije, konverzije i redovne resertifikacije predstavlja dug, administrativno složen i finansijski zahtevniji postupak. To praktično znači da bi u krug potencijalnih korisnika ušao ograničen broj subjekata, uglavnom specijalizovanih udruženja i pojedinačnih proizvođača čija primarna tržišna orijentacija često nije usmerena ka turističkom tržištu.</p> <p>Zadržavanjem isključive odrednice o organskoj proizvodnji narušava se princip jednakog tretmana potencijalnih aplikanata I korisnika (proizvođača I udruženja), jer bi se u povlašćen položaj doveo veoma mali broj njih (uglavnom svega nekoliko kategorija – med, pljevaljski sir, određene žitarice i voće, koje se u najvećoj meri izvozi sveže ili smrznuto, te kojem je turizam marginalna tržišna niša) I dva</p>	<p>tourism and cultural and natural heritage” from Programme Document, specific objective 2.1 (“To enhance and promote commonly coordinated cross-border tourism offer based on a protected cultural and natural heritage”) includes, <i>inter alia</i>, Result/Output 2.1.3 in its current wording, together with indicators which explicitly target organic farms, organic food producers and businesses producing organic products.</p> <p>The Programme Document explains that the selected thematic priorities, specific objectives and results “take into account common challenges and needs shared by the border area” and were established through an extensive joint programming and consultation process (Joint Task Force, public consultations, discussions with the European Commission). Any substantial change to results such as 2.1.3 would therefore have to follow comparable formal procedures (including Commission approval and, where applicable, amendment of the Financing Agreement), and such a procedure cannot run in parallel with an already published call based on the unamended programme text.</p> <p><b>Equal treatment and legal certainty in the current call</b></p> <p>Maintaining the current formulation of result 2.1.3 for the duration of the ongoing call is necessary in order to respect the principles of equal treatment, transparency and legal certainty for all potential applicants. The call has been launched on the basis of the already approved programme document, including the precise scope of Result 2.1.3 and its indicators (e.g. number of organic farms included in cross-border tourist products; number of networks related to organic agriculture; number of businesses that produce organic products included in tourism supply chains). Changing the substantive scope of an expected result after publication of the call, by expanding it to “traditional agricultural and handcraft products”, would retrospectively alter the eligibility focus and selection parameters and could place applicants who have already prepared or submitted</p>
--	--

<p>nacionalna udruzenja proizvodjaca organskih proizvoda. Na taj način, najveći broj lokalnih proizvođača i stvaralaca tradicionalnih prehrabbenih proizvoda i rukotvorina bio bi nepravedno isključen, iako upravo oni poseduju najveći potencijal da se integrišu u lanac vrednosti turističkog proizvoda. Ovi proizvodi imaju dokazan potencijal za turističku valorizaciju kroz očuvanje nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa, prezentaciju lokalnog identiteta, razvoj destinacijskog brenda i povećanje potrošnje turista. U praksi, upravo su ovi proizvođači najaktuelniji partneri turističkog sektora: prisutni su na manifestacijama, lokalnim tržištima, u ugostiteljskim objektima i u okviru regionalne turističke ponude. Njihova ponuda je često prepoznatljiva i jedinstvena: od tradicionalnih prehrabbenih specijaliteta i proizvoda sa zaštićenim geografskim poreklom, do zanatskih i umetničkih predmeta karakterističnih za određene zajednice i područja.</p> <p>Ističemo da broj sertifikovanih organskih proizvođača, kao i složenost procesa konverzije, ulaska u sistem, sertifikacije i resertifikacije, ne korespondira u dovoljnoj meri sa ciljevima poziva. Takođe, njihovo primarno ciljno tržište neretko je van lokalnog turističkog sektora. Nasuprot tome, <b>lokalni tradicionalni proizvodi i rukotvorine predstavljaju elemente nematerijalnog kulturnog nasleđa područja i direktno doprinose razvoju turističke ponude, lokalnog brendiranja i povećanju potrošnje turista.</b></p>	<p>proposals at a disadvantage or advantage, which would be contrary to the principle of equal treatment.</p> <p>The Programme Document itself notes that the programme area is “one of the most culturally diverse” and that sustainable, inclusive and green tourism should mobilise both natural and cultural heritage and human and community potentials, including diversified forms of tourism such as eco and ethno tourism and linking tourism with local food and crafts. However, this broader recognition is reflected at the level of the specific objective 2.1 and other results under this objective, while Result 2.1.3 remains narrowly defined around organic agriculture for reasons of intervention logic, indicator design and coherence with the Green Agenda.</p> <p>While the wording of Result 2.1.3 must remain unchanged for the current call, the Programme Document provides room for the participation of producers of traditional food and handicrafts under other results and activities within specific objective 2.1. In particular:</p> <p>Result/Output 2.1.1 (“Commonly developed touristic offers commercialised”) explicitly refers to creation, improvement and connection of local offers (including food and crafts), community based tourism offers, and complementary thematic products, with a specific focus on women led providers.</p> <p>Result/Output 2.1.2 (“Improved common protection and promotion of cultural and natural heritage”) covers investments and activities related to cultural heritage, cultural cooperation events, promotion of intangible heritage and thematic routes, where traditional local products and handicrafts can be integrated into tourism value chains and destination branding.</p> <p>Within these results, eligible activities include, for example, small scale investments in visitor infrastructure, development and promotion of thematic routes, community based tourism products,</p>
---	---

	<p>Na nacionalnom nivou, u Srbiji postoji samo jedno specijalizovano udruženje za organsku proizvodnju, dok u Crnoj Gori deluje udruženje <b>Organska proizvodnja Crne Gore (orgcg)</b>. Uprkos njihovom značaju, ukupni kapaciteti ovih organizacija i broj proizvođača nedovoljni su da obuhvate širi spektar potencijalnih korisnika koji bi mogli doprineti ciljevima poziva kroz razvoj turističkog lanca vrednosti.</p> <p><b>Stoga molimo da razmotrite uvođenje mogućnosti apliciranja i za lokalne tradicionalne prehrambene proizvode i rukotvorine</b>, kako bi se osigurali osnovni principi javnog poziva – jednak tretman, uključivost i ravnopravna šansa za sve potencijalne korisnike iz programskog područja.</p> <p>Stojimo na raspolaganju za dodatna objašnjenja i argumentaciju.</p> <p><i><u>Unofficial translation:</u></i></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We are writing in connection with the request to consider an extension of Result 2.1.3 Increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers and organic agricultural producers to jointly contribute to further tourism development, in the following manner:</p> <p>“Increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers and <b>organic and traditional agricultural and handicrafts products</b> to jointly contribute to further tourism development.”</p> <p>Rationale:</p>
--	--

	<p>Result 2.1.3, as currently defined through increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers, and organic agricultural producers, does not fully reflect the reality of the programme area nor the market dynamics of the tourism sector. In the Serbia–Montenegro cross-border region, the number of certified organic producers is relatively small, while the processes of certification, conversion, and regular re-certification are lengthy, administratively complex, and financially demanding. In practice, this means that only a very limited number of potential beneficiaries would be eligible—primarily specialized associations and individual producers whose primary market orientation is often not focused on tourism.</p> <p>Maintaining an exclusive focus on organic production undermines the principle of equal treatment of potential applicants and beneficiaries (producers and associations), as it places a very small number of actors in a privileged position (mainly a few product categories such as honey, Pljevlja cheese, certain cereals and fruit, which are largely exported fresh or frozen and for which tourism represents only a marginal market niche), as well as two national associations of organic producers. Consequently, the majority of local producers and creators of traditional food products and handicrafts would be unjustifiably excluded, despite the fact that they possess the greatest potential to be integrated into the tourism value chain.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>These products have a proven potential for tourism valorisation through the preservation of intangible cultural heritage, the presentation of local identity, destination branding, and increased tourist spending. In practice, these producers are the most active partners of the tourism sector: they are present at events, local markets, hospitality facilities, and within the regional tourism offer. Their products are often distinctive and unique—ranging from traditional food specialties and products with protected geographical origin to handicrafts and artistic items characteristic of specific communities and areas.</p> <p>We would also like to emphasize that the number of certified organic producers, as well as the complexity of the conversion process, entry into the system, certification, and re-certification, does not sufficiently correspond to the objectives of the Call. Moreover, their primary target markets are often outside the local tourism sector. In contrast, local traditional products and handicrafts represent elements of the area's intangible cultural heritage and directly contribute to the development of the tourism offer, local branding, and increased tourist consumption.</p> <p>At the national level, there is only one specialized association for organic production in Serbia, while in Montenegro the association <i>Organic Production of Montenegro</i> (orgcrg) operates. Despite their importance, the overall capacities of these organizations and the number of producers involved</p>
--	--

	<p>are insufficient to cover a broader range of potential beneficiaries who could contribute to the objectives of the Call through the development of the tourism value chain.</p> <p>Therefore, we kindly request that you consider introducing the possibility for local traditional food products and handicrafts to be eligible, in order to ensure the fundamental principles of the Call—equal treatment, inclusiveness, and equal opportunity for all potential beneficiaries from the programme area.</p> <p>We remain at your disposal for any additional explanations or further argumentation.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	
4.	<p>Regarding section Number of applications and grants per applicants, the question is if Entity XY applies in Priority 1 as lead applicant, and in Priority 2 as Co-applicant, can both applications be approved?</p>	<p>In line with the Guidelines for grant applicants, <b>Section 2.1.3 Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made:</b></p> <p><b>“ Number of applications and grants per applicants/ affiliated entities</b></p> <p>The lead applicant may not submit more than 1 application per thematic priority under this call for proposals.</p> <p><b>The lead applicant may not be awarded more than 1 grant under this call for proposals.</b></p> <p>The lead applicant may not be a co-applicant or an affiliated entity in another application of the same thematic priority at the same time.</p> <p>A co-applicant/affiliated entity may not be the co-applicant or affiliated entity in more than 1</p>

		<p>application per thematic priority under this call for proposals.</p> <p><b>A co-applicant/affiliated entity may not be awarded more than 1 grant under this call for proposals.</b></p> <p>..."</p> <p>Also, in the footnote 21 is stated: "<i>In case that one legal entity, being lead applicant, co-applicant or affiliated entity, is placed on both lists for financing, the award criteria will be better overall score of the project proposal, regardless of the ranking position on the particular list for financing.</i>"</p> <p><b>To conclude:</b> Since this call for proposals includes two thematic priorities, a legal entity may participate in only one application per thematic priority, in any role, and may receive only one grant under this call. Therefore, if a legal entity is proposed for contract award under both thematic priorities, the grant will be awarded to the proposal with the higher overall score, regardless of the ranking position.</p>
5.	<p>What does constitute „small scale investment“, as there is no specific instruction in the Guidelines? Could you provide more guidance in the call, so there is no misunderstanding during evaluation of the proposals? Could you provide specific instructions in terms of what percentage of the budget could be dedicated to small scale investments, for example, or some more specific limitation or frame within which applicants can design the proposals?</p>	<p>In the Guidelines for applicants, <b>Section 2.1.3 Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made</b>, Types of activities, the small scale investments are listed as indicative types of activities which may be financed under this call for proposals, with examples of small scale investments:</p> <p><b>Result 1.1.1. Enhanced quality of and access to health services for marginalised groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small scale investments in equipment and/or renovation/adaptation/accessibility of facilities for provision of services</li> </ul> <p><b>Result 1.1.2. Upgraded quality of social services for marginalised groups</b></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale investments in equipment and/or renovation/adaptation or accessibility of facilities for provision of services</li> </ul> <p><b>Result 2.1.1. Commonly developed touristic offers commercialized</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale investments in conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites, related to infrastructure for visitors and its accessibility (e.g. walking paths, equipping visitor centres, cycle routes, signing and lighting, health paths...), development of tourist attractions accessible to persons with disabilities (e.g. stairs, restrooms, access points...)</li> </ul> <p><b>Result 2.1.2. Improved common protection and promotion of cultural and natural heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot small scale interventions (e.g. building flood defence canals, sanitations of riverbanks, afforestation) on cultural and natural sites of touristic relevance.</li> </ul> <p>The percentage of the budget which could be dedicated to small scale investments or specific limitations are not defined in the Guidelines for applicants.</p> <p>Furthermore, in line with the <b>Section 2.1.3. Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made</b> in the Guidelines for grant applicants, in the subsection Types of action, it is stipulated:</p> <p>“The following types of action are ineligible:</p> <p>...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Actions concerned only or mainly at the upgrading of infrastructure and equipment in privately owned facilities...”</li> </ul> <p><b>To conclude:</b> Small scale investments are indicative activities outlined in the Guidelines and may include equipment, facility renovations, or accessibility improvements, depending on the specific result area.</p>
--	--

		<p>The Guidelines do not define a specific budget percentage or quantitative limits for these investments. Actions that focus solely or primarily on upgrading infrastructure or equipment in privately owned facilities are considered ineligible.</p>
6.	<p>If a project XY proposes an innovation in tourism sector, which would result in new tourism products, improved services, new itinireries and other indicators prescribed in the Guidelines, but that innovation would require small scale investments in a number of micro businesses in tourism sector, would that be considered eligible? Please note that this question is not related to the activity itself, which you of course cannot comment on, but eligibility of costs.</p>	<p>In line with Guidelines for grant applicants, <b>Section 2.2.4 Further information about concept notes:</b> <i>“To ensure equal treatment of applicants, the contracting authority cannot give a prior opinion on the eligibility of lead applicants, co-applicants, affiliated entity(ies), an action or specific activities.”</i></p> <p>In line with Guidelines for grant applicants, <b>Section 2.1.3 Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made</b>, Types of activities, the small scale investments are listed as indicative types of activities which may be financed under this call for proposals:</p> <p><b>Result 1.1.1. Enhanced quality of and access to health services for marginalised groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• small scale investments in equipment and/or renovation/adaptation/accessibility of facilities for provision of services</li> </ul> <p><b>Result 1.1.2. Upgraded quality of social services for marginalised groups</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale investments in equipment and/or renovation/adaptation or accessibility of facilities for provision of services</li> </ul> <p><b>Result 2.1.1. Commonly developed touristic offers commercialized</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small scale investments in conservation of natural and cultural heritage sites, related to infrastructure for visitors and its accessibility (e.g. walking paths, equipping visitor centres, cycle routes, signing and lighting, health paths...), development of tourist attractions</li> </ul>

	<p>accessible to persons with disabilities (e.g. stairs, restrooms, access points...)</p> <p><b>Result 2.1.2. Improved common protection and promotion of cultural and natural heritage</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pilot small scale interventions (e.g. building flood defence canals, sanitations of riverbanks, afforestation) on cultural and natural sites of touristic relevance.”</li> </ul> <p>Furthermore, in line with the <b>Section 2.1.3. Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made</b> in the Guidelines for grant applicants, in the subsection Types of action, it is stipulated:</p> <p>“The following types of action are ineligible...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• actions concerned only or mainly at the upgrading of infrastructure and equipment in privately owned facilities...”</li> </ul> <p>In line with the Guidelines for Applicants, <b>Section 2.1.4. Eligibility of costs and eligibility of results/conditions</b>, in the subsection Eligible direct costs is defined: “<i>To be eligible under this call for proposals, costs must comply with the provisions of Article 14 of the general conditions to the standard grant contract (see Annex G of the guidelines)</i>”. For the eligibility of costs, please also refer to Annex II-General conditions applicable to European Union financed grant contracts for external actions, Article 14- Grant in the form of reimbursement of costs, published as Annex of the Guidelines for applicants, Documents for information.</p> <p>In line with the Guidelines for Applicants, <b>Section 2.1.3. Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made:</b></p> <p><b><i>Financial support to third parties</i></b></p> <p>“Applicants may not propose financial support to third parties.”</p>
--	---

7.	<p>In the section related to ineligible actions there is this bullet point: „actions concerned only or mainly at the upgrading of infrastructure and equipment in privately owned facilities” are ineligible. Would you please clarify what “mainly” constitutes?</p> <p>Does “mainly” mean: a) no upgrade possible in privately owned facilities, b) some upgrade in privately owned facilities is possible, but there is no clear instruction and decision will be made by evaluators, or c) some upgrade is possible, if it is in line with programme objectives, indicators and if the purpose of the project is not solely infrastructure upgrade, but new capacities, products and services of legally established businesses. Or there is some other interpretation of this rule?</p>	<p>The term “mainly” refers to actions where the primary focus of the project is the upgrading of infrastructure and equipment in privately owned facilities. Some minor upgrades in privately owned facilities are permissible, provided that the overall project objectives focus on creating new capacities, products, or services, and the investment is clearly in line with the programme objectives and expected results. Projects cannot be primarily or solely aimed at infrastructure or equipment upgrades in privately owned facilities; such projects would be considered ineligible. Nevertheless, the final decision regarding the acceptability of the proposed actions will be made by Evaluation Committee.</p>
8.	<p>In Result 2.1.3. Increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers and organic agricultural producers to jointly contribute to further tourism development there are couple of issues. This result belongs to tourism objective, while all but one listed eligible activity are purely agricultural, not belonging to tourism objective. It is very important for both territories to better link agriculture and tourism, and limiting this result to organic producers only, meaning those who are holders of certificate, is narrowing the pool of potential beneficiaries to the point where it would be difficult to implement an action. Though this has been defined in this manner in programme document,</p>	<p>As stated in the Programme Document for the CBC Programme Serbia–Montenegro IPA III, Result 2.1.3 is explicitly defined as “Increased cooperation among tourist operators, service providers and organic agricultural producers to jointly contribute to further tourism development.” The Programme Document clearly specifies organic agricultural producers as the target group for this result, thereby setting a precise thematic and eligibility framework that applicants are required to follow.</p> <p>While we recognize the importance of broader linkages between tourism and different types of agricultural producers (such as producers of typical products or those with geographical indications), any expansion of the scope beyond certified organic producers would constitute a deviation from the approved Programme Document. Consequently, both the result definition and the related eligible activities</p>

	<p>we believe that this result should be expanded to include other types of agricultural producers, such as producers of typical products, geographic indication producers etc. If that is done, then also eligible activities should be expanded to be more connected to tourism objective.</p>	<p>must be interpreted and implemented strictly in accordance with the Programme Document and the published Call for Proposal.</p> <p>Therefore, project proposals under this Call should maintain a clear focus on cooperation between tourism stakeholders and certified organic agricultural producers, ensuring that proposed activities, even when agricultural in nature, demonstrably contribute to tourism development objectives, as envisaged by the Programme.</p>
9.	<p>Poštovani,</p> <p>Planiramo da apliciramo na <u>poziv</u>, te ču zamoliti da potvrdite da li ispunjavamo uslove za prijavu. Sedište nam je u Beogradu, a imamo kancelarije, koje nisu zasebna pravna tela u Kragujevcu, Kraljevu i Rumi. Isto pitanje uputili smo i za <u>Hungary–Serbia call</u>, a od kontakt osobe smo dobili potvrdu da možemo da se prijavimo i da je naša institucija kvalifikovana za učešće u programu, jer smo na navedenim lokacijama prisutni i aktivni od 1999 godine.</p> <p>U prilogu dostavljamo statut. Naše aktivnosti planiramo da implementiramo u Kraljevu, u saradnji sa jednim lokalnim partnerom i jednim partnerom iz Crne Gore.</p> <p>Unapred se zahvaljujemo na odgovoru.</p> <p>Srdačan pozdrav,</p> <p><i>Unofficial translation:</i></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We are planning to apply under the Call for Proposals and would kindly ask you</p>	<p>Please be reminded of the requirements specified in 2.1.1 of GfA: “At least two legal entities in the partnership, one per each participating country, being the lead applicant or the co-applicant, must be public institutions that are effectively established and/or have territorial competence for the programme eligible area”; “In order to be eligible for a grant, the lead applicant must: be a legal person”, and “The lead applicant and co-applicant(s) must represent different legal entities.”</p> <p>In line with Guidelines for grant applicants, Section 2.2.4 Further information about concept notes: “To ensure equal treatment of applicants, the contracting authority cannot give a prior opinion on the eligibility of lead applicants, co-applicants, affiliated entity(ies), an action or specific activities.”</p>

	<p>to confirm whether we meet the eligibility requirements for submission.</p> <p>Our headquarters are located in Belgrade, and we operate offices—which are not separate legal entities—in Kragujevac, Kraljevo, and Ruma. We submitted the same inquiry regarding the Hungary–Serbia Call, and the designated contact person confirmed that we are eligible to apply and that our institution qualifies for participation in the programme, as we have been present and actively operating at the above-mentioned locations since 1999.</p> <p>Please find our Statute enclosed. We plan to implement project activities in Kraljevo, in cooperation with one local partner and one partner from Montenegro.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your kind response.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>	
10.	<p>Dear CFCU team,</p> <p>I am looking forward to submitting the application for IPA III 1st call.</p> <p>Please advise methods for submissions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- physical location address for in person and if any alternative methods are possible</li> <li>- postal mail submission, and/or</li> <li>- electronic submission etc.</li> </ul>	<p>In line with Guidelines for grant applicants, <b>Section 2.2.2. Where and how to send concept notes:</b></p> <p>“The Concept notes must be submitted in a sealed envelope by registered mail, private courier service or by hand-delivery (a signed and dated certificate of receipt will be given to the deliverer) to the address below:</p> <p><b>Postal address:</b></p> <p>Ministry of Finance Department for Contracting and Financing of EU Funded Programmes (CFCU)</p>

	<p>Thank you kindly,</p>	<p>Division for Tender Evaluation and Contracting 53 Balkanska Str, ground floor/ registry office 11000 Belgrade, Republic of Serbia</p> <p><b>Address for hand delivery</b></p> <p>Ministry of Finance Department for Contracting and Financing of EU Funded Programmes (CFCU) Division for Tender Evaluation and Contracting 53 Balkanska Str, ground floor/ registry office 11000 Belgrade, Republic of Serbia</p> <p><b>Concept notes sent by any other means (e.g. by fax or by e-mail) or delivered to other addresses will be rejected.</b></p>
11.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We kindly request your formal clarification regarding the interpretation of the section "<i>Number of applications and grants per applicants / affiliated entities</i>" under the Call for Proposals, including footnote 21.</p> <p>We are seeking this clarification as, during the information sessions, it was mentioned that one organisation might not be able to be awarded a project as Lead Applicant and another one as Co-applicant under the same Call but under different thematic priorities. However, we are unable to identify such a restriction in the Guidelines for Applicants, which we understand to be the only legally binding reference for applicants.</p> <p>Specifically, we seek confirmation on the eligibility for project approval and funding in the following scenario:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The same legal entity is ranked on the financing list <b>as Lead Applicant under one Thematic Priority</b>, and</li> </ul>	<p>please see answer no. 4</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The same legal entity is ranked on the financing list as <b>Co-applicant (or affiliated entity) under a different Thematic Priority</b>.</li> </ul> <p>Based on our reading of the Guidelines for Applicants, the limitations on the number of applications and grants per applicant/affiliated entity appear to apply <b>per thematic priority</b>. Consequently, we understand that <b>both project proposals may be approved and awarded for funding</b>, provided that they belong to different thematic priorities and that all other eligibility and evaluation requirements are fulfilled.</p> <p>We fully understand that each Contracting Authority within cross-border cooperation programmes has the discretion to define specific eligibility and award rules for a given Call for Proposals. However, we would also like to note that the wording of this provision is almost identical across several CBC programmes in which we have been participating for many years (including Bosnia and Herzegovina–Montenegro, Montenegro–Albania, and Montenegro–Kosovo). In all of these Calls, it has been possible for the same organisation to be awarded more than one project under the same Call, provided that the projects were submitted under different thematic priorities or measures (e.g. as Lead Applicant in one and as Co-applicant in another). This established practice is an additional reason why we seek clarification in the present case.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>We would kindly ask that, prior to issuing a formal reply, the <b>EU Delegation to Serbia</b> and the <b>EU Delegation to Montenegro</b> be consulted on this matter, in order to ensure a shared and consistent interpretation. For transparency and coordination purposes, we will include both EU Delegations in copy of this email.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your time and support.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	
12.	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We kindly request clarification regarding the visibility and communication-related costs under the <b>CBC Call for Proposals Serbia – Montenegro</b>, Publication Ref. EuropeAid/185585/ID/ACT/Multi.</p> <p>In particular, could you please clarify the footnote related to the budget line <b>5.8 – Communication activities (only if specifically requested by and agreed with the contracting authority)</b>, which states that “<b>as a rule, partners are not requested to implement communication activities for the purpose of promoting the action and/or the EU. Only if specifically requested by and agreed with the contracting authority, communication activities should be properly planned and budgeted at</b></p>	<p>The footnote related to budget line 5.8 should be understood in the sense that, as a general rule, applicants are not required to plan or implement separate communication activities aimed at promoting the action and/or the European Union. However, this does not exempt beneficiaries from complying with the general visibility obligations laid down in Article 6 of the General Conditions. All beneficiaries are required to ensure basic visibility of EU financing, in line with the applicable Visibility requirements for EU-funded external actions (e.g. use of EU logos, references to EU support on project materials, websites, events, etc.). Such mandatory visibility measures are considered an integral part of project implementation and are normally expected to be covered within the project’s overall budget, without the need for planning separate or extensive communication activities.</p> <p>Budgeting under line 5.8 is therefore foreseen only in cases where specific communication activities go beyond the mandatory visibility requirements and are explicitly requested by and agreed with the Contracting Authority. In the absence of such a</p>

	<p><b>each stage of the project implementation.”</b></p> <p>In this context, is it possible to budget certain funds for visibility and communication under this budget line in order to comply with <b>Article 6 of the General Conditions</b>, in particular paragraph <b>6.1</b>, which states: “<b>Unless the European Commission agrees or requests otherwise, the beneficiary(ies) shall take all necessary steps to publicise the fact that the European Union has financed or co-financed the action. Such measures shall comply with the latest Communication and Visibility requirements for EU-funded external actions, as laid down and published by the European Commission, or with any other guidelines agreed between the European Commission and the beneficiary(ies).</b>”</p> <p><i>Thank you very much in advance.</i></p> <p><i>Best regards,</i></p>	<p>request, applicants are advised to limit themselves to the mandatory visibility measures required under Article 6 of the General Conditions.</p>
13.	<p>Poštovani,</p> <p>zamolila bih Vas za informaciju da li može jedna organizacija da se pojavi jednom u ulozi vodećeg partnera, a drugi put u ulozi partnera?</p> <p>Hvala i srdačan pozdrav,</p> <p><i>Unofficial translation:</i></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p>	<p>please see answer no. 4</p>

	<p>I would like to kindly request information on whether the same organization can appear once as a lead partner and a second time as a co-applicant/partner.</p> <p>Thank you very much for your assistance.</p> <p>Best regards,</p>	
14.	<p>Poštovani,</p> <p>Da li imamo povratnu informaciju u vezi našeg upita?</p> <p>Srdačan pozdrav,</p> <p><i>Unofficial translation:</i></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We would like to kindly ask if there is any feedback regarding our previous inquiry.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>	<p>All information will be officially published together with other questions related to the <b>1st Call for Proposals under Cross - border Cooperation programme Serbia – Montenegro for 2021-2027 under the Instrument of Pre-accession Assistance (IPA III), allocations 2022 and 2024.</b></p>
15.	<p>Poštovani,</p> <p>Molimo Vas za pojašnjenje da li su, u okviru Tematskog prioriteta 1: <b>Zapošljavanje, mobilnost radne</b></p>	<p>In line with Guidelines for grant applicants, <b>Section 2.2.4 Further information about concept notes:</b>  <i>“To ensure equal treatment of applicants, the contracting authority cannot give a prior opinion on</i></p>

<p><b>snage i socijalna i kulturna inkluzija</b>, prihvatljivi projektni predlozi koji se odnose na podršku zapošljavanju, uzimajući u obzir da je Specifični cilj 1.1 definisan kao: poboljšanje kvaliteta usluga javnog zdravstva I socijalnih usluga za inkluziju marginalizovanih grupa u programskom području.</p> <p>Srdačan pozdrav,</p> <p><i>Unofficial translation:</i></p> <p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We kindly request clarification on whether, within Thematic Priority 1: Employment, labour mobility, and social and cultural inclusion, project proposals related to supporting employment are considered eligible, taking into account that Specific Objective 1.1 is defined as: Improving the quality of public health services and social services for the inclusion of marginalized groups in the programme area.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	<p><i>the eligibility of lead applicants, co-applicants, affiliated entity(ies), an action or specific activities.”</i></p> <p>In line with the Guidelines for grant applicants, <i>Section 2.1.3 Eligible actions: actions for which an application may be made</i>, Types of activities:</p> <p>“ Indicative types of activities which may be financed under this call for proposals are given below. <b>The following list, extracted from the IPA III CBC programme document, is not exhaustive and appropriate innovative activities that are not mentioned below may also be considered for financing when they can clearly contribute to the achievement of the call’s priorities.</b></p> <p><i>Result 1.1.1. Enhanced quality of and access to health services for marginalised groups</i></p> <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities aiming at improvement of existing health services and their accessibility, diversity, and inclusiveness</li> <li>- small scale investments in equipment and/or renovation/adaptation/accessibility of facilities for provision of services</li> <li>- joint capacity building of public service providers, based on needs assessment and professional learning and development plan</li> <li>- pilot initiatives focusing on the joint development of new solutions (services, tools, programmes, e.g. joint services delivery, strengthening of health care for vulnerable groups, inter-municipal approach, development and implementing ICT solutions beneficial to improve public health services), including, but not limited to: mobile teams, hot lines, intersectional approach; pilot initiatives encouraged to include relevant CSOs working directly with vulnerable groups”</li> </ul> <p><i>Result 1.1.2. Upgraded quality of social services for marginalised groups</i></p> <p>Activities</p>
--	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Activities aiming at improvement of existing or introducing new gender and diversity sensitive and inclusive social services and their accessibility</li> <li>- Youth-driven activities promoting social innovation related to social and active inclusion</li> <li>- Pilot initiatives focusing on the joint development of new solutions for social inclusion (services, tools, programmes, e.g. joint services delivery, strengthening of social care for vulnerable groups, intermunicipal approach, development and implementing ICT solutions beneficial to improve access to and quality of social care services, intersectional mobile teams, community-based services, hot lines);</li> <li>- Joint capacity building of service providers for delivering quality services for marginalised groups</li> <li>- Small scale investments in equipment and/or renovation/adaptation or accessibility of facilities for provision of services</li> <li>- Cross-border identification and exchange of good practices in the field of social/active inclusion</li> <li>- Exchanging knowledge, best practices, and information between participating institutions, CSOs and volunteers</li> </ul>
--	--