

**List of the most frequent mistakes made by beneficiaries in the first calls of the measures of Innovative Economy Operational Programme**

**Mistakes common for several measures/sub-measures**

<b>Mistake type</b>	<b>Measure/sub-measure</b>
<b>Formal evaluation</b>	
1. No annexes (or elements thereof) in paper or/and electronic version	1.1, 1.3, 1.4-4.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 5.4 (SME), 8.3
2. Deficiencies or mistakes in the application (e.g. contact data, code of Polish Classification of Activities (PKD) or European Classification of Activity (EKD), registration date, date of consortium establishment)	1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 4.5, 8.1
3. Incorrectly defined PKD or EKD code	1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 4.5, 8.1, 8.2
4. Deficiencies of stamps and signatures in the application form and annexes (deficiencies of institution stamps, deficiencies of stamps of the authorised persons)	1.1, 1.3, 2.3, 8.1, 8.3
5. Application filled out against the instruction	1.4-4.1, 2.3, 5.1, 8.3
6. Mistakes in the indicators or deficiency thereof (e.g. incorrect interpretation or definition of indicators, deficiency in distinguishing between the product and outcome indicator, problems concerning the definition of base and target values, problems concerning the definition of proper product and outcome indicators, incorrect calculation of measurement units)	1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.4 (SME), 8.3
7. Differences in the application and feasibility study in terms of indicators	1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2,
8. Indicators exceed the project implementation period	5.4 (SME), 8.1, 8.2
9. Differences of the paper and electronic documents	1.1, 1.3, 4.5, 8.1, 8.2,
10. Accountancy mistakes (e.g. in the payment schedules, in the table concerning the material and financial process in the application or the table concerning the project financial plan)	1.4-4.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.1, 8.1, 8.3
11. Incorrect calculation of the percentage value of the expenditure subject to cross-financing	8.1, 8.2, 8.3
12. Exceeding of the support intensity	1.4-4.1, 4.2, 8.2
13. Filing of the application after the expiration of the period for application filing	4.4, 8.1
14. Incorrect amounts of the applied co-financing	2.1, 2.2, 4.5
15. Mistakes in the material and financial schedule (e.g. accountancy mistakes, incomplete hard copy, incorrect selection of payment methods: advance payment/refund, incorrect plans of the period of stages implementation, deficiency of detailed descriptions of the	1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.4 (SME)

expenditure categories)	
16. Deficiency of dates or inconsistent information on the initiation and completion of the project implementation	2.1, 2.2, 5.4 (SME)
17. Submitting of a corrected co-financing application after the expiration of the defined period	3.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.4,
18. Initiation of project implementation prior to delivery of confirmation that the project is eligible for support	4.2, 4.4
19. Designating of VAT as both an eligible and ineligible expenditure	5.4 (SME), 8.1,
20. Incorrect division of the project implementation period into quarters in the table Financial Plan	5.4 (SME), 8.1, 8.2
<b>Substantive evaluation (not applicable to measures 1.1, 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 8.1, 8.2, 8.3)</b>	
21. Project is not compliant with the objectives and substantive scope of measure	1.4-4.1 <sup>1</sup> , 3.3, 4.2, 5.4 (BEI and SME)
22. Planned expenditure is not eligible	1.4-4.1, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.4 (BEI)
23. Information included in the application or annexed documents do not confirm that the applicant has the capacity to finance the project	1.4-4.1, 4.2
24. Impossibility of impartial verification of the product and outcome indicators or the indicators are: inadequate for the given project type; disproportionately low in relation to the financial expenditure and the project duration; doubled; refer to ineligible measures; inconsistent with the project description or incorrectly defined	1.4-4.1, 4.2, 4.4, 5.2, 5.4 (BEI)
25. The project expenditure is not accordingly justified, inadequate or irrational in relation to the project scope and objectives (or there are no data allowing to state whether the expenditure meets these criteria)	3.1, 3.3, 4.2, 5.2, 5.4 (BEI)
26. No indication of relevant technical, personnel and organisational potential of the applicant necessary to implement the project	3.1, 4.2 <sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to the Criteria for project selection under the Operational Programme Innovative Economy approved on 15 December 2008 by the Monitoring Committee of the Operational Programme Innovative Economy this criterion is not applicable to the measures 1.4-4.1 and 4.2.

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to the Criteria for project selection under the Operational Programme Innovative Economy approved on 15 December 2008 by the Monitoring Committee of the Operational Programme Innovative Economy this criterion under measure 4.2 shall read as follows: „the applicant has the institutional capacity assuring the feasibility and steady project management”.

### Mistakes typical for particular measures/sub-measures

OP IE Measure	Mistakes description	Evaluation stage
<b>Measure 1.1</b> <b>Sub-measure 1.1.1</b> <b>Measure 1.3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- deficiency of power of attorney to sign the co-financing application and annexes,</li> <li>- although it is required to have the original of National Court Register copy issued not later than three months prior to the date of application submission the applicants delivered a copy of this document,</li> <li>- copies of documents certified by not authorised persons (e.g. by legal adviser),</li> <li>- no date and place of the application drafting (the last page of the application),</li> <li>- eligibility of the expenditure – existence of ineligible cost (e.g. audit cost in projects below 2 million PLN),</li> <li>- existence of expenditure in improper expenditure category e.g. abroad business trips in the category “general costs”; office supplies in the category “materials and resources”,</li> <li>- exceeded limits of the amounts for the project promotion,</li> <li>- differences concerning the amounts of the expenditure categories in point 22 of the application and the table: accumulation of material and financial schedule,</li> <li>- differences in terms of the partners number in the application and in the consortium agreement,</li> <li>- annexes to the application not compliant with the guidelines (the schedule not compliant with the binding patterns),</li> <li>- differences concerning the time stamps on the paper and electronic versions (after printing of the official version of the application an annex was added e.g. articles of association and was marked as “ready” which caused a change of the time stamp).</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">formal</p>
<b>Measure 1.4-4.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the general and operational costs exceed 20% of the total eligible expenditure presented for measure 1.4,</li> <li>- the costs of acquisition of intangible and legal assets and the purchase of research, counselling services and equivalent services in the research part of the project for measure 1.4 exceed 70% of the total eligible expenditure presented for measure 1.4,</li> <li>- the expenditure and co-financing amounts in the application and business plan are not consistent,</li> <li>- the application was filled out against the instruction,</li> <li>- the eligible costs are not compliant with the measure principles.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">formal</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the project is of no innovative nature,</li> <li>- the project does not meet the criteria indicated for the goal-oriented project in the Act of 8 October 2004 on the Principles of Science Financing,</li> <li>- there is no market demand for the product/ technology/ services resulting from the project and implying project profitability,</li> <li>- applicant has no capacity to implement the outcomes of the project research part.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">substantive obligatory</p>
<b>Measures 2.1 and 2.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- deficiency of a fixed clip of the paper application version,</li> <li>- deficiency of the document confirming the right to manage the property for the project purposes.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">formal</p>

<b>Measure 3.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– deficiency of information in the application necessary to state that the applicant meets the criteria provided for the entities that can be awarded aid for initiating of an innovative activity by PAED under the measure, deficiency of the document copies certifying the above-mentioned confirmation of e.g. articles of association, memorandum,</li> <li>– differences between the contents of the original co-financing application and the contents of the application delivered to PAED after the delivery of the letter with mistakes (comments by the Competition Committee) noticed during the formal evaluation,</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">formal</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– deficiency of information in the application on the experience of experts involved in the process of evaluation of the innovative concepts presented by the prospective final beneficiaries and thus no information to confirm that the people involved in the project implementation will have the knowledge in terms of implementation of the R&amp;D works results or technology transfer and the knowledge of the branches in which the applicant intends to specialise while running the incubator activity,</li> <li>– deficiency of information on experience of the people responsible for this field of the project in innovative projects commercialisation (obligatory),</li> <li>– in the expenditure categories references have been adduced from which it does not result what the given expenditure refers to,</li> <li>– including of contradictory information in the contents of the substantive and financial schedule and in the application contents.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">substantive</p>
<b>Measure 3.3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– no justification of the project fulfilling the needs of the entrepreneurs operating in the region covered by the project,</li> <li>– the project does not contain the evaluation programme of the performed training/measure,</li> <li>– no information in the application that the project implementation will contribute to enhancing of the standard of services provided by the applicant,</li> <li>– it cannot be clearly stated whether the actions provided for in the project are relevant and adjusted to the project target group,</li> <li>– no information in the application on the factual needs of the entrepreneurs in the planned region covered by the project,</li> <li>– the applicant does not assure the durability of the project outcomes, declares that the actions will be continued after the completion of project implementation but does not describe the scope in which they will be continued and how they will be financed after the completion of project implementation,</li> <li>– the applicant does not describe the experience of the entity providing advisory services concerning the transition from investments to the companies of the SME sector not quoted on the public market (obligatory)<sup>3</sup>,</li> <li>– the applicant does not describe the experience of all the entities providing advisory services since they plan on choosing after the project initiation which results in this criterion not being satisfied.</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">substantive</p>

<sup>3</sup> Pursuant to the Criteria for project selection under the Operational Programme Innovative Economy approved on 15 December 2008 by the Monitoring Committee of the Operational Programme Innovative Economy this criterion under measure 3.3 shall read as follows "the applicant assures the personnel with knowledge and at least a year of experience in implementing of investments in the companies of the sector of small and medium enterprises commencing business activity and not quoted on the public market through acquisition or sale of stocks or shares of these companies".

<b>Measure 4.2</b>	– the value of eligible expenditure of the investment part does not reach the minimal required value threshold (PLN 400,000),	formal
	– the applicant declared positive project impact on the EU horizontal policies set out in Article 16 and 17 of the Council Regulation (EC) No. 1083/2006, but did not confirm this information in a prepared application <sup>4</sup> .	substantive optional
<b>Measure 4.4</b>	– to a lesser extent an activity concerning a project is not eligible for support under Measure 4.4.	formal
	– to a lesser extent than the former one – non-compliance with the obligatory criterion of the technology application for less than three years worldwide.	substantive
<b>Measure 4.5</b>	– excessively complex name of project, – deficiency of summary of particular expenditure categories, – deficiency of the required declarations of the project applicant, – incorrect assignment of numbers of the annexes, – deficiency of the Polish version of the documents in foreign languages.	formal
	– inconsistency of the data provided in both application parts, – deficiency of exhaustive data allowing for a thorough evaluation of the project compliance with the financial criteria to be performed.	formal/ substantive
<b>Measure 5.1</b>	– deficiency of actual co-operation with a research organisation or business environment institution, – the applicant does not assure that the basic subject of business activity consists in the implementation of undertakings to the benefit of the association members, – deficiency in the independence of the entrepreneurs.	formal
	– deficiency of innovative activity of the entrepreneurs operating in the association, – project products are not used by all the entities operating within the association, – incomplete definition of the target group potential, – no calculation method for the revenues from the sales outside the association localisation area has been presented.	substantive
<b>Measure 5.2</b>	– submission of improper documents to confirm the provision of services of pro-innovative nature	formal
	– deficiency of documented applicant experience, – inconsistency of the project implementation schedule with its outcomes, – no indication of a document confirming the justification for the project implementation (reference to a general data “it results from the research...” with no reference to any specification, report, etc), – number of positions for works co-ordination and supervision inadequate in relation to the number of project assignment, – the project implementation schedule is planned unreasonably,	substantive

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to the Criteria for project selection under the Operational Programme Innovative Economy approved on 15 December 2008 by the Monitoring Committee of the Operational Programme Innovative Economy this criterion now shall read as follows “the project has a positive impact on the horizontal EU policies provided for in Article 16 or 17 of the Council Regulation (EC) No 1083/2006”.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– deficiency of information in the „network” project on the responsibility and assignment of individual project partners or deficiency of information stating that specific assignment of particular partners will be defined in the future,</li> <li>– the project does not specify which new service (or new service scope) will be designed and provided; deficiency of description of the new introduced service/new service scope that is essential for the project evaluation in the application; "new services" are only mentioned in the application and it is not known what they consist in, the actions concerning the pro-innovative services are presented from the beginning in the schedule as a “performance” thereof while there is deficiency of presented designing and implementation stages of the new service/ new scope of service that is obligatory in the measure</li> </ul>	
<b>Measure 5.4 (BEI)</b>	– the planned date for implementation commencement was not compliant with the date specified in the Competition Regulations.	formal
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– incorrect definition of the target group,</li> <li>– the project management structure is too complex in the institutional aspect, inadequate in relation to the planned project objectives or planned incorrectly,</li> <li>– the project implementation schedule has been drawn up according to the expenditure category instead of the category of planned substantive works or it is planned unreasonably,</li> <li>– the project implementation schedule is constructed in a very general way and does not take all the stages necessary for project implementation into consideration,</li> <li>– deficiency of a precise indication of the project scale (supra-regional one required).</li> </ul>	substantive obligatory
<b>Measure 5.4 (SME)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– the planned date for implementation commencement was not compliant with the date specified in the Competition Regulations,</li> <li>– applicant’s ineligibility under the Measure,</li> <li>– the years have not been defined by the outcome indicators.</li> </ul>	formal
<b>Sub-measure 6.2.2</b>	the applicant is not the owner or perpetual usufructuary of a land on which the investment is being implemented	formal
	land on which according the application the investment is to be implemented is not constituted by cohesive soil; the unemployment rate provided by the applicant does not refer to NUTS3,	substantive
<b>Measure 8.1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– improper date of business activity registration,</li> <li>– incorrectly filled in or not filled in table fields concerning the financial statement of the applicant,</li> <li>– the indicator „the number of new e-services” was divided into types,</li> <li>– after the call for complementation the applicant illegitimately modified the values of indicators, values and names of categories of eligible expenditure; the figures concerning the financing sources was modified.</li> </ul>	formal
<b>Measure 8.2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– no business plan, co-operation agreements and form of the awarded/not awarded public aid were attached,</li> <li>– the paper application version differs from the electronic one.</li> </ul>	formal
<b>Measure 8.3</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– problems of the applicants concerning the understanding of the issue of “maintaining of the project durability” and provision of the durability period for the project indicators,</li> <li>– financial analyses drafted against the guidelines of the Ministry of Regional Development,</li> <li>– inconsistency of the data included in the co-financing application with the data in the application annexes.</li> </ul>	formal