EUROPEAN UNION

GOVERNMENT OF ROMANIA

MINISTRY OF REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT
AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

Instrumente Structurale
2007 - 2013

Evaluation of the Portfolio of Regional Development Investment Projects

WORLD BANK GROUP

Romania
Regional Development Program 2

Agreement for Harmonizing
EU and State Funded
Investments Program

Dated **August, 2015**

2

COMPONENT

Project co-financed from the European Regional development Fund through the OPTA 2007-2013

Advisory Services Agreement
on Harmonizing State and EU Funded Projects in Regions

Final Report on Evaluation of the Portfolio of Regional Development Investment Projects

August 26, 2015

This report corresponds to the deliverable “Final Report on Evaluation of the Portfolio of Regional Development Investment Projects” under component 2 “Advisory services related to the existing portfolio of investment projects in MRDPA” of the Advisory Services Agreement on “Harmonizing State and EU Funded Projects in Regions” between the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, signed on May 27, 2014.

This report was prepared by a team comprised of Radoslaw Czapski, Antonio Nunez, Marcel Ionescu-Heroiu, Sebastian Burduja, Alina Burlacu, Florian Gaman, Oana Luca, Andrei Stănescu, Alina Armașu, Cristian Postolache, Aurel Rizescu, Catalin Floarea and Madalin Iliescu. The report benefited from thoughtful comments by peer reviewers: Elena Lungu, Adrian Burlacu and Andrei Stancu.

The team would like to thank Juan Gaviria, Baher El-Hifnawi and Jean-Francois Marteau for the advice, support, and guidance provided throughout the elaboration of this report. The team would also like to thank the counterparts in the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration for the timely feedback, the support offered in the elaboration of this study, and the excellent collaboration throughout.

The findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the views and position of the Executive Directors of the World Bank, the European Union, or the Government of Romania.

Table of Contents

List of Figures.....	iv
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Acronyms.....	v
Executive Summary	vi
Chapter I: Introduction	1
Objective and Scope	3
Audience.....	5
Report Structure	6
Chapter II: PNDL Background and Portfolio Assessment.....	7
The PNDL Program Cycle	8
Allocation of PNDL Funds to Counties	10
Preparation of Project Proposals and County-Level Prioritization	12
Project Selection, Prioritization, and Contracting by the MRDPA.....	14
Implementation.....	15
Post-Implementation	17
PNDL 2014 Portfolio Assessment	18
By Size	19
By Sector	20
By Implementation Status (Ongoing vs. New Investments).....	22
By Geographic Location	25
Chapter III: Main Challenges related to the Quality of PNDL Projects.....	27
Overall Project Quality Issues in Romania	27
Program Design and Management Deficiencies.....	27
Project Design Challenges	28
Public Procurement Challenges.....	28
Project Implementation Challenges	29
Assessment of PNDL Applications	30
Step 1: Should the Project Be Considered for Financing?	31
Step 2: Is the Project Eligible for EU Financing?	32
Step 3: Could the Project Be Financed from the PNDL?.....	32
Step 4: Is the Project a Priority that Should Be Financed from the PNDL?	33
Key Findings from the Screening of a Sample of PNDL Project Proposals.....	33
Cost Analysis of the Assessed PNDL Project Proposals.....	36
Main Issues Identified During the Assessment Process	45
Issue #1: Lack of Supporting Documents/Technical Studies	45
Issue #2: Inadequate/Insufficient Technical Documentation.....	46
Issue #3: Incorrect Project Budget (Cost Breakdown)	47

Issue #4: Insufficient Cost Breakdown for Main Works	47
Issue #5: Lack of Main Drawings.....	48
Issue #6: Noncompliance with Standard Costs.....	48
Issue #7: Lack of Documents for Property/ Assets	49
Issue #8: Missing/Expired/Incomplete Urban Certificate (UC).....	49
Issue #9: Local Council Decision Requiring Amendments.....	49
Chapter IV: Observations and Recommendations for Policy Measures.....	51
1) Refocus PNDL's Scope and Avoid Overlaps with Other Programs.....	51
2) Improve projects' technical documentation.....	51
3) Build capacity for effectiveness.....	52
4) Design and Roll Out Awareness-Raising Campaigns for Beneficiaries	53
5) Enhance the Project Selection Model.....	53
6) Create a Standard Application System	55
7) Introduce Tendering for Technical Documentation with Suspension Clauses	55
8) Revise Standard Cost Policies and the Eligible Expenditures Order	56
9) Introduce Project Implementation Monitoring.....	57
10) Introduce Post-Implementation Monitoring.....	58
Annex 1: Letter of interest.....	60
Annex 2: Number of projects and allocations by county.....	64
Annex 3: Triage Grid for Existent Technical Documentation without a Financing Agreement ..	66
Annex 4: Conformity Checklist for Technical Projects.....	71
Annex 5: Recommendations for an improved PNDL conformity checklist	76
Annex 6: List of screened projects for 2014-2020.....	78
Annex 7: Triage results (separate file)	100

List of Figures

Figure 1. Proposed scheme for the triage of projects submitted for PNDL financing	4
Figure 2. Typical timeline for a new PNDL project.....	16
Figure 3. PNDL 2014 - distribution of projects by 2014 budgetary allocation.....	20
Figure 4. PNDL 2014 allocations have focused mostly on roads and water/wastewater.....	21
Figure 5. Average PNDL budgetary allocation by sector, 2014.....	22
Figure 6. The PNDL has continued to fund numerous new projects across most sectors (number of projects, 2014).....	24
Figure 7. PNDL 2014 – total number of projects by county	25
Figure 8. PNDL 2014 – total budgetary allocations by county.....	26
Figure 9. Scheme for technical screening of project documents	31

List of Tables

Table 1. Sector split of PNDL portfolio 2013-2014 – based on the number and value of projects.	7
Table 2. PNDL 2014 – budget allocations	18
Table 3. PNDL project portfolio by size categories*	19
Table 4. PNDL allocation by sector, 2014	20
Table 5. PNDL portfolio by sector and investment status (ongoing vs. new), 2014	23
Table 6. Structure of PNDL 2014 applications reviewed by Bank team	33
Table 7. Analysis of Chapter 1 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team	38
Table 8. Analysis of Chapter 2 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team	38
Table 9. Analysis of Chapter 3 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team	40
Table 10. Analysis of Detailed Chapter 3 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team.....	41
Table 11. Analysis of Chapter 4 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team.....	42
Table 12. Analysis of Chapter 5 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team.....	43
Table 13. Analysis of Chapter 6 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team.....	43
Table 14. Analysis of cost distribution from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team.....	44

List of Acronyms

CNADNR	National Highways and National Roads Company
CJ /CC	County Council
CL /LC	Local Council
DALI	Documentation for Approving Interventions
DG RDI	Directorate General for Regional Development and Infrastructure
EC	European Commission
EEO	Eligible Expenditures Order
EU	European Union
FS	Feasibility Study
GOR	Government of Romania
GD	Government Decision
GEO	Government Emergency Ordinance
IDA	Intercommunity Development Association
MARD	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
MRDPA	Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration
OP	Operational Program
OPTA	Operational Program Technical Assistance
OUG	Urgent Order
p.e.	Population equivalent
PNDI	National Program for Infrastructure Development
PNDL	National Program for Local Development
PNDR	National Rural Development Program
PPP	Public-Private Partnerships
RDA	Regional Development Agency
ROC	Regional Operating Water Company
ROP	Regional Operational Program
RON	Romanian New Lei
SOP	Sector Operational Program
TEC	Ministry's Technical-Economic Council
TP	Technical Project

Executive Summary

1. **This report seeks to contribute to the overall objective of improving the design and implementation of state-budget-funded investment programs under the MRDPA.** The main focus is on the National Local Development Program (PNDL), managed by the MRDPA as the largest state-budget-funded instrument for investments in local infrastructure. Work under this Component includes first and foremost a hands-on review of a sample of technical-economic documentation submitted by local authorities from across Romania for PNDL financing and for the MRDPA's consideration. This practical exercise further serves two goals: (i) to develop a comprehensive understanding of how the PNDL works in practice, particularly in the early part of a project cycle – namely project preparation, submission, evaluation, and selection for financing – including what works well and what should be improved; and (ii) to assist the MRDPA with improving the process of screening project proposals. Importantly however, the evaluation sheets filled out by the World Bank experts did not serve as a basis for financing decisions under the program, but were meant only to provide additional support and guidance to the MRDPA specialized staff in charge of formal processing/evaluation of PNDL applications.

2. **Based on the assessment of the PNDL portfolio of projects and of a select sample of financing proposals, this analysis – along with the report on “Prioritization Criteria for Local Infrastructure Development Projects” also under Component 2 – provides guidance on how to improve projects’ technical documentation.** The aim is to ensure a higher quality of applications for EU funds and for the PNDL over the 2014-2020 programming period. For example, on projects for which the technical documentation may be incomplete or may include outdated or irrelevant data/information, the applicant should be notified and further informed about how the technical documentation should be improved to make the project eligible for financing. Through similar notifications, the PNDL team should also inform an applicant if the project could be eligible for funding (in the opinion of the PNDL team) from any of the active EU Operational Programs. Such notification should also underline that applicants should consult directly with the respective Intermediate Bodies and the Managing Authorities of these Operational Programs. In relation to the documentation submitted and eligible for PNDL funding only, it will be the responsibility of the PNDL team in the MRDPA to provide clear feedback and instructions for improvements in applications to limit the risk of multiple rounds of clarifications and modifications, which translate into project delays. For a program like the PNDL implemented on an annual basis, it is critically important to ensure a smooth and speedy processing of financing requests.

3. **Of the 215 technical-economic documentations reviewed according to the updated grids proposed under the project, 212 projects (98.6%) were recommended for financing, while 39 projects (18.4%) were identified as the ones, which could be financed from EU structural funds.** This indicates that some projects submitted to PNDL could actually be financed using other sources, in particular EU structural instruments, which should also help increase the absorption of these funds. As a matter of principle the PNDL should only target projects that lack any other non-refundable option or have been initially considered, accepted, but ultimately not financed under an EU program for example because of lack of sufficient funding available.

4. **Throughout the assessment of a sample of 289 projects submitted to the PNDL and based on the overall analysis of the application process, the team has identified some areas of improvement, in particular some common conformity and eligibility issues.** Practically all of the identified issues are related to the administrative compliance and quality of application documents needed for the evaluation. This is to be expected. As this report describes in later chapters, the current evaluation process is essentially entirely focused on checking for administrative conformity and eligibility. In other words, the scope of the current technical assistance and of its main recommendations is inherently limited by the nature of the current PNDL evaluation process. Local/county authorities (program applicants) can correct/complete/update their submitted documentation upon receiving clear feedback and instructions from the MRDPA's technical staff.

5. **The list below includes typical issues encountered, with the aim of signaling to the MRDPA and to local authorities where typical gaps in the documentation exist or where the quality needs to be improved.** The issues identified are described in more detail in the report and are mostly related to the project preparation stage, as they are based on the analysis of applications submitted by PNDL's potential beneficiaries (i.e., county and local public authorities). So key findings regarding the application preparation part of the process and related technical documentation are the following:

- **Issue #1: Lack of Supporting Documents/Technical Studies**
- **Issue #2: Inadequate/Insufficient Technical Documentation**
- **Issue #3: Incorrect Project Budget (Cost Breakdown)**
- **Issue #4: Insufficient Cost Breakdown for Main Works**
- **Issue #5: Lack of Main Drawings**
- **Issue #6: Noncompliance with Standard Costs**

- **Issue #7: Lack of Documents for Property/ Assets**
- **Issue #8: Missing/Expired/Incomplete Urban Certificate (UC)**
- **Issue #9: Local Council Decision Requiring Amendments**

6. **These findings are discussed in more detail in the report.** They augment conclusions and recommendations resulting from a thorough review of PNDL's role, strategy and the entire project cycle undertaken as part of the other components of the current technical assistance.¹ It will provide the conditions for an efficient program that delivers relevant, high-quality, and timely projects.

This report confirms also the following key findings regarding the whole PNDL process formulated in other reports:

- **Issue #1: Unclear methodology of budget allocation by county**
- **Issue #2: Unclear project selection model**
- **Issue #3: Overlap with other programs**
- **Issue #4: Dual project application system**
- **Issue #5: Timeframe for preparation incompatible with annual program**
- **Issue #6: Weak project implementation monitoring**
- **Issue #7: Lack of post-implementation monitoring**

7. **Reports prepared as part of component 1 of this technical assistance propose a comprehensive reform of PNDL, but since such reform may take time, several improvements mentioned below are recommended in the short term.** In order to improve the quality of applications and the efficiency of PNDL, the following policy measures seek to make positive changes to the current system, even without a full overhaul of the PNDL – this may be called the “Status Quo+” scenario. By contrast, the framework suggested in the other reports prepared as part of component 1 and component 2 depart more significantly from the current program structure. So, in case of difficulties in implementing quickly a comprehensive PNDL reform, it is suggested that the MRDPA should consider the recommendations described in the following paragraphs for the next PNDL in 2016. The key criterion to consider for whether to select the Status Quo+ scenario

¹ See reports prepared under components 1, 2, and 3

or start immediately the full reform should be the *capacity* of the Ministry and of local administrations to implement adjustments quickly and manage a significantly revised program.

8. **The MRDPA should refocus PNDL's scope and avoid overlaps with other programs.** The current analysis suggests that the PNDL should prioritize projects that have no possibility of receiving other non-reimbursable funds, including in particular EU funds. The maximum funding amount from PNDL should also be specified for each type of project.

9. **The projects' technical documentation should show improvement.** A major issue identified during the assessment of the applications was the low quality of the technical documentation and often missing supporting documentation. To make sure that the applications follow the requirements, it is recommended that the MRDPA prepare and provide beneficiaries with an Applicants Guide. This Guide would provide interested potential beneficiaries with all the information needed to prepare the application. It would improve the transparency of the entire PNDL process, provide a coherent and fair framework, and include all standard documentation required for PNDL applications.

10. **The MRDPA should also promote measures for improving the local capacity for project preparation and submission.** Experience indicates that local authorities need continuous technical assistance, especially during the project preparation and application phase. A relatively easy way to deliver this kind of assistance would be to set up a help-desk system, either at the central level (MRDPA) or inside the intermediary bodies, if any will be designated depending on the chosen institutional architecture of the PNDL management system (RDAs or County Councils could be considered for serving in this role, each option having both pros and cons). It is also necessary to increase the capacity of the respective units in the MRDPA involved in projects appraisal. The current workload significantly exceeds available resources, which can lead to lower-quality evaluations, delays, and other issues discovered later on in the project cycle. A systematic training program could be set-up in the MRDPA, so that the decisions on project selection are consistent across all Ministry staff. Overall, project appraisal skills must be developed across MRDPA in a coordinated fashion to make sure that the new skills are applied in practice in decision-making.

11. **Awareness-raising campaigns for beneficiaries should be designed and rolled out.** The communication around the program and its financed projects is a key condition for stimulating potential applicants to prepare and submit candidate projects. This also helps inform the general public of the PNDL's impact and can boost the program's overall transparency.

12. **The MRDPA should consider enhancing the PNDL's project selection model.** There are a number of ways to boost the efficiency and transparency of project evaluation. As noted earlier, this report does not address project prioritization issues, as they are discussed in another dedicated report prepared under Component 2 of this technical assistance. A clear set of criteria for prioritizing PNDL investments across key sectors has been proposed in that report. The evaluation process for project proposals under PNDL should also be better adapted to their specificity (small projects) by using a simpler set of the proposed selection criteria, given the limited administrative capacity of the Ministry to process a large number of projects.

13. **A standard application processing system should be created.** According to Article 11, item 7 of GEO 28/2013 governing the PNDL's implementation, County Councils are required to send the list of funding proposals within 15 days after the planned budget has been agreed. This is circumvented in exceptional circumstances, whereby applicants may send funding proposals directly to the MRDPA. Since the Ministry makes budget allocations to PNDL for each County Council, it is unclear how the projects received directly from applicants (and not through the County Councils) are accounted for. The recommendation is standardize the process so that either all applicants send funding proposals only through their corresponding County Councils or all apply directly to the MRDPA. This would create a non-discriminatory treatment of applicants and ensure project financing based on clear priorities. In any scenario, the MRPDA should still have the important task of ensuring continuous monitoring and control of how County Councils are prioritizing projects and managing them.

14. **The MRDPA should promote the use of tendering procedures with suspension clauses for technical documentation.** On the basis of current procedures for contracting, construction works for any new projects can realistically begin no earlier than in November of a given calendar year. This situation often causes technical problems during the winter time and often results in postponing works. Hence the respective part of the budget expenditure allocated for such projects needs to be postponed to the following year. This results in inefficiency in spending the PNDL funds allocated for the given year. Once suspension clauses for technical documents are introduced and reflected in the PNDL Applicant Guide, applicants should be able to start the tendering process earlier, i.e. before signing financial contracts with MRDPA. The suspension clause essentially warrants that the local/county authority would only allow the winning bidder to start implementing the contract once the financing source is secured, i.e., the PNDL application is approved and the respective financing contract with the MRDPA is signed.

15. **The Ministry should also consider revising standard cost policies and the eligible expenditures order.** Implementation of cost standards for infrastructure is imperfect and has posed challenges to beneficiaries. The intention of deploying the cost standards was praiseworthy as a solution for keeping project costs under control, as well as to help in planning. The problem is that current cost standards are not sufficiently developed and, in some cases (i.e., wastewater systems), they do not exist at all. They also do not reflect updated nominal values of unit prices (i.e., values have not been adjusted for inflation since 2010), nor supply and demand fluctuations. It is also unclear if comparisons between project estimates and cost standards should be made in RON or EUR values and what exchange rates should be used for such comparisons. It is recommended therefore that cost standards should be updated or, if that is not feasible, they may be waived completely.² In the latter scenario, the authorities could use instead a list of reference prices preferably denominated in EUR to make sure that costs are kept under control. In this case local databases with ranges for local prices for main materials should be created and kept up to date. In addition, current standard costs reflect only standard technical solutions, thus limiting room for implementation of newer and often cheaper technical solutions. So the proposed changes in standard cost policies should also result in technical solutions proposed at the tendering stage being only indicative and designers/beneficiaries should be properly informed and in some cases even encouraged to propose alternative technical solutions that are of higher quality and cheaper in short/long-term.

16. **Clear project implementation monitoring and payment schedules should be introduced into financing contracts.** The current PNDL procedures provide no mechanism for monitoring the implementation of the projects financed through the PNDL. The monitoring is based on the reports sent by County Councils, which are based on the data sent by the ultimate beneficiaries, but only in relation to the three specific subprograms of PNDL (i.e., modernization of the Romanian village, urban regeneration of municipalities and towns, and infrastructure at county level). To achieve quicker progress in projects' implementation and to avoid cash flow problems, each financing contract should include: (i) advance payment (could be up to 10% of the contract value) and (ii) clear terms and conditions for subsequent disbursement tranches. Clear stipulations on penalties for both contractual parties should be included in the financing contract along with reporting requirements, including reporting process timelines and monitoring report(s) templates.

² More details are in the earlier reports prepared under components 1, 2 and 3 of this project

17. **Post-implementation monitoring should also be introduced.** The current legal framework includes no details on requirements for the post-implementation phase – i.e., the project’s results and evolution after completion. The system based on the Methodological Norms should be enforced. It requires that once works are finished, the beneficiary sends a copy of the completion report to the Ministry. Additionally, if there is a warranty period in the works contract, the local authority should send a copy of the formal hand-over documentation (“procesul verbal de recepție final”) to the MRDPA upon the warranty expiry date. Beyond that, the two key post-implementation functions related to any public sector investment program – i.e., ex-post monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and knowledge sharing – appear to be missing in the PNDL. Put differently, there is no formal process for evaluating the impact of completed investments and there are no institutionalized efforts for exchanging good practices among past, current, and future beneficiaries of PNDL funds. While this may not be surprising for a relatively “young” program like the PNDL it is recommended that, going forward, ex-post mechanisms should be set-up to ensure continuous improvement of the instrument. The final report on component 3 discusses in more detail basic features and key advantages of post-implementation monitoring and asset management systems.

Chapter I: Introduction

18. In the context of Romania's push toward sustainable and inclusive development, the Government has asked the World Bank to support the harmonization of public investments financed by the European Union and the state budget. This work is a follow-up to the World Bank's Regional Development Program in Romania (November 2012-March 2014) and aims to encourage synergies across public investments in local infrastructure, regardless of the funding source, and deliver stronger impact overall. Four components were agreed with the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration (MRDPA) under the overall project focused on harmonizing local infrastructure projects:

- **Component 1** – Assistance with the coordination of strategies and plans for EU and state-funded investments in infrastructure;
- **Component 2** – *Advisory services related to the existing portfolio of investment projects in MRDPA, including their optimal prioritization and preparation of potential EU-funded investments for the 2014-2020 programming period;*
- **Component 3** – Assistance with improving the use of efficient designs and technologies in investments overseen by the MRDPA;
- **Component 4** – Assistance with the design of a Housing and Infrastructure Development Strategy.

19. The second aforementioned component (in *italics*) focuses on the existing portfolio of investment projects financed by the MRDPA and further includes two sets of interrelated deliverables:

- a. *Proposal of enhanced prioritization criteria for local infrastructure development projects, including clear performance and monitoring indicators, assessment of project implementation timelines, and guidelines on identifying viable financing sources per type of project;*
- b. *Assessment of a sample of projects, at the level of technical-economic documentation (i.e., feasibility studies and/or detailed technical designs), to identify potential opportunities to leverage EU instruments and/or funds from the state budget.*

This final report covers the latter sub-component (in *italics*), including a diagnostic of the current portfolio of technical-economic documentations of the Directorate General for Regional Development and Infrastructure (DG RDI) in the MRDPA. DG RDI designs, manages, and implements the National Program for Local Development (PNDL), a key source of state-budget financing for local

infrastructure development. As such, the current report describes the PNDL's framework and project cycle and provides an overview of the program's project portfolio in 2014. It also draws a number of preliminary observations and proposes some potential policy measures, based on a review of 289 technical-economic documentations (in most cases feasibility studies) for new investments proposed for PNDL financing in 2014. Out of the long list of projects screened (363 in total as listed in Annex 6) 289 proposals were selected by the team for detailed review and assessment and Annex 7 includes the detailed review sheets for these 289 proposals, as filled out by a team of World Bank evaluators. The aim is to understand gaps and opportunities in the PNDL's programming and implementation, and also to help develop the MRDPA's capacity for assessing received proposals.

20. **This work is correlated with findings and recommendations from the broader current engagement with the MRDPA.** The assessment of the strategic correlation of strategies, plans, and investment programs at different levels (Component #1 described above) will define a filter for selecting local interventions that contribute to higher-level plans and objectives. Recommendations from the work related to innovative and efficient designs and technologies (Component #3 described above) will assist in the engagement of local authorities to improve technical proposals that promote the adoption of cost-effective technical solutions. The current report has also informed the proposals for prioritization and selection criteria for PNDL (also under Component 2).

21. **The primary sources of data and documents reviewed as part of this analysis include the following:**

- *Legal framework for the PNDL's implementation*, including the text of the ordinance establishing the program, implementation norms, eligibility and selection criteria, and application templates. Other legislative provisions related to the implementation of EU and state-funded investment programs have been considered.
- *Feasibility studies corresponding to projects in the PNDL's pipeline.* Observations are based on the results of a technical screening process of feasibility studies. It was carried out starting in July 2014 by a Bank team of technical and economic evaluators. The team focused on a sample of 289 feasibility studies for roads, water supply, wastewater systems, and social infrastructure.
- *Database of all projects financed under the 2014 PNDL*, with an initial original budget of close to RON 1 billion for the current fiscal year. The database includes key data like: investment name, total project value and 2014 allocation, ongoing/new investment, timeline, co-financing by the beneficiary, etc.

- *Interviews with stakeholders at the local, regional, and national level.* For the current report, the team has interviewed key stakeholders in the MRDPA's Directorate General for Regional Development and Infrastructure (DG RDI), at both managerial and technical levels. Between September 8 and 26, 2014, the team also successfully completed one round of field interviews at the local level, covering three county councils (Cluj, Bistrița Năsăud, and Sălaj) and 6 communes in the three aforementioned counties. Over the next phases of the engagement, the team has planned multiple rounds of field interviews across the entire country. To this end, it has provided the MRDPA a full list of potential locations and is waiting for the Ministry's confirmation and support in finalizing the schedule (as of November 1, 2014).
- *Other relevant World Bank analyses.* Specifically, this work draws on the 2011 Functional Review of the Ministry of Regional Development and Tourism – now the MRDPA – as well as on a series of reports produced under the 2012-2013 World Bank Regional Development Program, including “ROP 2.0.: MA-IB Collaboration and Support for Applicants and Beneficiaries of the Regional Operational Program,” “Identification of Project Selection Models for the ROP 2014-2020,” and “Competitive Cities: Reshaping the Economic Geography of Romania.”

Objective and Scope

22. **This report seeks to contribute to the overall objective of improving the design and implementation of state-budget-funded investment programs under the MRDPA – primarily the PNDL.** Work under this Component includes first and foremost a hands-on review of a sample of technical-economic documentation submitted for the DG RDI's consideration by local authorities from across Romania. This practical exercise further serves two goals: (i) to develop a comprehensive understanding of how the PNDL works in practice, particularly in the early part of a project cycle – namely project preparation, submission, evaluation, and selection for financing – including what works well and what should be improved; and (ii) to assist the MRDPA with improving the process of screening project proposals. Importantly, the evaluation sheets filled out by the World Bank experts do not serve as a basis for financing decisions under the program, but are meant to provide guidance to the MRDPA's own staff in charge of processing/evaluating PNDL applications.

23. **One of the key issues that this technical assistance tries to address is how to ensure that the existing technical documentation will eventually lead to completed, impactful projects.** Based on lessons of previous programs, not all project proposals that have been developed by local authorities can/should actually be pursued. As such, a first step in the evaluation of existing documentation will require the triage of the projects that are financeable and

those that are not. A second step should involve a determination of those projects that would be eligible for EU funding and should be directed to the respective decision making stream. As a matter of principle, whenever possible, EU funding should be sought, while state budget funds should be used only for activities that are not eligible for EU funding or for investments that are expected to complement or expand EU investments in areas that suffer from a funding gap. The figure below summarizes this proposed framework.

Figure 1. Proposed scheme for the triage of projects submitted for PNDL financing

24. Based on the assessment of the PNDL portfolio of projects and of a select sample of proposals, this analysis – along with the report on “Prioritization Criteria for Local Infrastructure Development Projects” also under Component 2 – provides guidance on how to improve projects’ technical documentation. The aim is to ensure a higher quality of applications for EU funds and for the PNDL over the 2014-2020 programming period. For some projects, the technical documentation may be incomplete or it may include outdated or irrelevant data/information. In this case, the applicant should be notified and further informed about how the technical documentation should be improved to make it eligible for financing. Through a similar notification, the PNDL team may inform an applicant if her project is eligible (in the opinion of the PNDL team) for funding from any of the EU Operational Programs. The notification should also underline

that applicants should consult directly with the Intermediate Bodies and the Managing Authority of these operational programs. For the documentation submitted and eligible for PNDL funding only, it will be the PNDL team's responsibility to provide clear feedback and instructions for improvement to limit the risk of requiring multiple rounds of clarifications or modifications.

25. **With respect to its sectoral focus, this engagement focuses on infrastructure investments overseen by the MRDPA, primarily in: communal/county roads; water; wastewater; and social infrastructure.** The scope is primarily centered on PNDL projects approved for 2014 – particularly with respect to the diagnostic of the status quo – given data made available through this stage of the engagement. The analysis focuses on projects that are still in the preparation/planning phase, leaving aside those investments for which implementation on the ground has already begun, which involves legal commitments to winning bidders and a host of other requirements. As such, this work serves mainly as a tool for identifying, selecting, and prioritizing infrastructure investments in the MRDPA portfolio for 2014 and beyond.

26. **In line with these objectives, this final report includes the following:**
- a. Analysis of portfolio of technical-economic documentations of the Directorate General for Regional Development and Infrastructure;
 - b. Screening results for a sample of projects' feasibility studies/detailed technical designs, selected based on project categories and on an agreed sampling methodology;
 - c. Statistics on cost components for this sample of projects;
 - d. Potential policy measures for improving the preparation and screening of projects at the local authorities and, respectively, the MRDPA level.
 - d. Contribution to a coordinated screening process by local beneficiaries and on-the-job training of technical teams responsible for project screening;

Audience

27. **As for the other outputs under this engagement with the MRDPA, the primary audience of the current report includes the staff of the Directorate General for Regional Development and Infrastructure, which manages the PNDL.** The report provides these key stakeholders with a diagnostic of the program's portfolio, a list of common issues encountered with the technical-economic documentation submitted by PNDL applicants, and proposals how to address current gaps. Local authorities and Intercommunity Development Associations (IDA), including technical staff within local governments responsible for working with designers and other consultants, can also use current recommendations to

improve the quality of their applications for PNDL and EU financing. Other stakeholders who would benefit from this assessment include ministries and agencies in charge of planning and implementing state-budget and EU-funded investment programs.

Report Structure

28. **The observations and conclusions of this final report are organized in the following three chapters:**

- *Chapter II: PNDL Background and Portfolio Assessment*
 - This chapter first describes the history, objectives, and legal framework of the PNDL, providing background information on the program.
 - Further, this chapter covers the main stages that a PNDL project goes through, from the pre-application phase through application, implementation, and post-implementation.
 - The final section provides an assessment of the PNDL project portfolio in 2014 by size, sector, implementation status, geographical coverage.
- *Chapter III: Main challenges related to the quality of projects submitted for PNDL financing*
 - This section describes the main deficiencies observed at each step in a project cycle, from the design phase through implementation.
 - This chapter also presents key findings emerging from the review of technical-economic documentations. These have included: feasibility studies for new works and documentation for approving interventions (DALIs) for rehabilitation projects; and proposes steps to be considered when assessing new projects' viability and identifying appropriate sources for financing them. It also analyses the cost structure of the sample of projects assessed.
- *Chapter IV: Preliminary observations and policy measures recommendations*
 - This final chapter includes a set of ideas for addressing observed gaps and deficiencies. This is not meant to be an exhaustive list but a summary of the key recommendations.

Chapter II: PNDL Background and Portfolio Assessment

29. This chapter provides an overview of the National Program for Local Development (PNDL) and an assessment of the PNDL portfolio. The first part reviews the PNDL program cycle, from strategic design to funding allocation, project preparation, evaluation, financing, implementation, and post-implementation. This information is also included in the other reports under this engagement with the MRDPA, as critical background information on the investment program, setting the stage for subsequent recommendations. The second part of this chapter presents summary data on the 2014 PNDL portfolio, which includes a total of 3,952 ongoing and new projects, though full information is only available for 3,031. The table below provides more details of sector composition of projects in the portfolio. Of these 3,952 projects, 2,530 were new projects, while 1,422 were projects that were started in previous years and received PNDL financing for 2014. Of the 1,422 started projects, 1,188 had a completion rate of less than 1% - i.e. they could technically be considered new projects. Less than 150 projects had a completion rate of 60%. In parallel, the World Bank team is finalizing a proposal for a revamped prioritization process for PNDL applications in the other report under Component 2 ("Prioritization Criteria for Local Infrastructure Development Projects"), which will be discussed with the MRDPA for potential use in the evaluation of projects from January 2015 onward.³

Table 1. Sector split of PNDL portfolio 2013-2014 – based on the number and value of projects

Type	Number of projects	Average value of project (in RON)	Total value of projects (in RON) (estimated)	% of total contracted projects
County Roads	192	16,265,000	3.1 bln	14%
Communal Roads	1,846	5,320,000	9.8 bln	45%
Water	859	4,200,000	3.6 bln	16%
Wastewater	526	8,100,000	4.2 bln	19%
Education	191	1,575,000	0.3 bln	
Health	16	1,480,000	0.023 bln	
Bridges	173	2,930,000	0.57 bln	
Cultural	40	2,840,000	0.11 bln	6%
Tourism	19	2,330,000	0.044 bln	
Sports	33	1,100,000	0.036 bln	
City Halls	57	2,800,000	0.16 bln	
TOTAL	3,952	5,575,000	22 bln	100%

Data Source: PNDL Database of Projects (MRDPA, 2014).

³ See our Final Report on harmonizing strategies and plans for local infrastructure investments (under Component 1) and the Final Report on improved prioritization criteria for local infrastructure development projects (under Component 2), of which the latter was submitted together with this current report

The PNDL Program Cycle

30. **The Government Emergency Ordinance (GEO) 28/2013 legally established the National Program for Local Development.** Along with its formal justification (“notă de fundamentare”) and the Methodological Norms for its application (Ministry Order 1851/2013), this act sets the PNDL’s design and implementation framework. At the time, the PNDL was an important expression of the new cabinet’s commitment to the development of local infrastructure, as reflected in the 2013-2016 Governing Program (as approved by Parliament through decision 45/2012). For example, one of the key objectives for Romania’s regional development is defined as the financing of a basic package of services for rural areas, including roads, drinking water, sanitation, social infrastructure etc., “for achieving [at least] minimum standards of living.”⁴ The same document further emphasizes the need to prioritize public infrastructure projects to contribute to Romania’s sustainable, balanced development.⁵

31. **The GEO 28/2013 defines three sub-programs as components of the PNDL: the modernization of Romanian villages; the urban regeneration of municipalities and towns; and the development of county-level infrastructure.** Eligible beneficiaries vary across sub-programs: while the first one targets communes (rural localities), the second one is aimed at cities and the latter at counties. GEO 30/2014 and MRDPA Ministry Order 919/2014 included Intercommunity Development Associations (IDAs) among the list of eligible beneficiaries for PNDL funding. Article 7 in the GEO describes the list of intervention areas (similar to “axes” of EU-funded programs):

- Water supply systems and drinking water treatment plant;
- Sewage systems (networks) and wastewater treatment plant;
- Education units (kindergartens, primary and secondary schools, high schools, etc.);
- Healthcare units in rural areas (clinics, pharmacies, etc.);
- Public roads (i.e., county roads, local interest roads, commune roads and/or public roads within localities);
- Bridges, culverts, and/or footbridges;
- Local cultural facilities, such as libraries, museums, multi-functional cultural centers, and theaters;
- Landfills;
- Public, commercial markets, fairs, cattle fairs, as applicable;
- Sports facilities; and

⁴ See 2013-2016 Governing Program, Chapter 10 on “Development and Administration”

⁵ Ibid.

- Headquarters of local public authorities and other subordinated public institutions.⁶

The types of eligible works include construction of new infrastructure, as well as extension, rehabilitation, and upgrading of existing infrastructure. Essentially, through such broad conditions, the PNDL is able to cover the MRDPA's entire vast portfolio of projects – both previously-financed interventions (at various stages of completion) and brand new investments, by all types of local public beneficiaries (from local councils in communes and cities to county councils).

32. In addition to the overall objective of supporting Romania's regional development, the PNDL has sought to integrate three investment programs that had operated independently in the past:

- *The infrastructure program based on Government Decision (GD) 577/1997* targeted the modernization of communal roads and connecting villages to water supply, sanitation systems, and electric and phone networks. Before its integration under PNDL, this program was managed by the MRDPA (formerly the MRDT) through the Public Works Directorate. County councils played a main role by centralizing funding requests from all potential beneficiaries in the county and communicating them to the MRDPA.
- *The Rural Infrastructure Development Program, based on Government Ordinance (GO) 7/2006*, also aimed at the “development and modernization of Romania's rural areas, [...] by connecting them to roads and water and wastewater networks.”⁷ In its initial form, this program was managed by a Commission, presided by the Prime Minister and bringing together representatives of 6 ministries, the Prime Minister's Chancellery, and the Association of Romanian Communes. The Ministry of Transport was responsible for monitoring the program's implementation.
- *Multiannual Priority Programs for Water and the Environment, based on GO 40/2006*, defined specific intervention sectors in certain geographical areas (for example, “water and wastewater infrastructure for the Criș river basin, Vaslui County, and the municipality of Ploiești”).⁸ Other projects targeted varied interventions, from increasing the safety of river dams to developing an integrated IT system for the environment sector and the sustainable development of the Danube Delta biosphere.

⁶ The last category (i.e., headquarters of public institutions) was introduced through GEO 30/2014.

⁷ See Article 3 of GO 7/2006

⁸ See Article 2, letter (c) of GO 40/2006

Moreover, GEO 28/2013 establishing the PNDL also dismantled the Program for the Rehabilitation and Upgrade of 10,000km of County and Local Roads.” The reason mentioned by the formal justification note is that the program had not received funding and thus had not financed any investment projects since its establishment in 2010.

33. **In essence, the PNDL brought under the same management and strategic direction three different investment programs that had similar objectives.** As noted by the government, this change was intended “to enable a more efficient use of public funds through an integrated implementation of infrastructure development programs in rural and urban areas.”⁹ Indeed, it makes sense that central government programs with the same target intervention areas would be merged under a single design and implementation unit – i.e., the MRDPA. As emphasized publicly by the MRDPA, the PNDL was never meant as a successor to the now-closed PNDI, which was based on a financing scheme whereby contractors would finance the cost of the project and get reimbursed upon completion. Still, PNDL norms make it possible that other projects previously started receive financing to finish the required works, provided that such investments are aligned with PNDL priorities and eligibility rules.

34. **On the downside, the legal framework, including the PNDL implementation norms, lacks clear references to potential synergies and coordination with other funds.** The program fails to draw lines that would avoid duplication and crowding out of EU-funded instruments, which come at much lower cost for the Romanian government. As the next sub-section shows, the PNDL is based on a relatively broad set of norms. On the one hand, this allows for increased flexibility in financing projects. On the other hand, there may be room for more specificity and rigor in the evaluation and selection of projects to increase the transparency, objectivity, and potential impact of the program. These arguments are further described in the following sections, which cover the key steps involved in the PNDL’s implementation.

Allocation of PNDL Funds to Counties

35. **Based on the budget allocation among ministries, as agreed at the government level and approved by Parliament, the MRDPA sets the PNDL’s total annual budget.** Next, the MRDPA allocates sums for each county, sub-program, and specific areas of intervention, based on a Ministerial Order. The criteria for allocating sums across counties are described in Annex 2 to the PNDL Methodological Norms.¹⁰ In short, the three main types of criteria that shape the

⁹ See the formal justification note to GEO 28/2013

¹⁰ See Box 1

allocation of PNDL funds from the national to the county level are based on ongoing (unfinished) projects (number and funding needs), demographic data (county population and surface area), and financial capacity.

36. **While the PNDL norms include sensible indicators to decide on the funding allocation for each county, the methodology shows room for improvement.** For one, the law is not clear which of the three main criteria are factored into the funding allocation, merely noting that “at least one of [them] should be considered.”¹¹ Second, there are no defined weights for individual criteria or for sub-criteria within the main categories (e.g., number of ongoing projects vs. their funding needs). Third, it is unclear how certain indicators would be measured in practice, particularly the administrative-territorial units’ capacity to co-finance investment projects. One proxy that could be used would be non-earmarked revenues as a share of total revenues,¹² in the absence of clear commitments (e.g., local/county council decisions to co-finance particular investments). Finally, other potentially relevant indicators are missing. For example, the PNDL does not seem to take into account a county’s development level, measured as GDP per capita (as used for the Regional Operational Program in deciding the split across Romania’s eight planning regions).

37. **It is worth highlighting that final decisions regarding the PNDL’s allocation of funding belong entirely to the MRDPA.** In this process, it is presumed that the Ministry makes use of county-level data, provided either directly by county/local authorities or by other central bodies (e.g., the Ministry of Finance). Once it makes a decision on the anticipated funding allocation, the MRDPA communicates it to county councils. Based on these expectations, county councils further interact with local authorities to begin making a list of investments that may be financed through the PNDL. Based on data available at this point, it is unclear whether at this stage the MRDPA decides only on the funding allocation per county or goes beyond that. Article 8 of GEO 28/2013 implies the latter: specifically, “the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration shall prepare and approve by order of the Minister of Regional Development and Public Administration the distribution of the amounts intended to the Program, per counties, per each sub-program, and per specific areas of intervention.”¹³ It is equally unclear if the MRDPA pre-selects investment projects to be included in the PNDL, as implied by Article 9 (3), as opposed to putting together the list of

¹¹ Methodological Norms for applying GEO 28/2013, MRDPA Minister Order 1851/2013

¹² For a detailed explanation of this methodology, see the 2014 World Bank report on “Identification of Project Selection Models for the Regional Operational Program 2014-2020”

¹³ See GEO 28/2013

investments based on inputs from local and county authorities, as implied by Article 9 (4) and by the Methodological Norms.

Box 1. Allocation criteria for the PNDL budget

“For the balanced distribution of funds to counties, *at least one of the following indicators* should be considered:

- (1) Weight of *number of ongoing investment projects* for each county, based on:
 - The *number* of ongoing investment projects for each county as a share of total ongoing investments at the national level;
 - The *funding needs* for completing the investment projects started and not completed as a share of the total funding needs for completing the investment projects started and not completed at national level.
- (2) *Demographic and administrative-territorial data* of counties, considering:
 - The weight of the *number of administrative-territorial units* in the county as a share of the total number of administrative-territorial units at the national level;
 - The weight of the county *population* as a percentage of the total population of the country;
 - The weight of the county *area* as a percentage of the total area of the country.
- (3) Administrative-territorial units’ *financial capacity*, considering the share of units’ capacity to participate with funds from the local budget for achieving investment objectives.”

Source: PNDL Methodological Norms (MRDPA Minister Order 1851/2013)

Preparation of Project Proposals and County-Level Prioritization

38. **Once the MRDPA decides on the indicative PNDL funding allocation for each county, county councils put together the list of projects proposed at the county and local level – both new and ongoing/unfinished investments.**¹⁴ To this end, local authorities submit their proposals to county councils or, “in justified circumstances,” directly to the MRDPA, as recently mandated by Article 3 of GEO 30/2014 and MRDPA Minister Order 919/2014. It is unclear what situation would qualify as “justified,” though field interviews suggest that more and more local authorities are bypassing County Councils. This puts even more pressure on the limited DG RDI staff; this topic is discussed in depth in the final report on PNDL prioritization criteria, submitted in parallel with the current assessment.

¹⁴ See Article 9 (4)

39. **The PNDL Methodological Norms include a clear template for project proposals, which applies to both new and ongoing investments.**¹⁵ This asks for: the name of the project; the name of the applicant/local authority; the location of the project; main physical characteristics; total value of the investment; total value of eligible costs to be financed from the PNDL; data regarding the design contract (contract ID number, value, etc.); and, for ongoing investments, the data regarding the construction works, the percentage of the project completed to date, and the deadline for project completion.

40. **County Councils have 15 days to send to the MRDPA the list of proposed investments, based on Annex 3 of the PNDL Methodological Norms.** Essentially, this is a table listing the projects proposed for financing through the program in a particular year, divided up by new and ongoing investments, and further by sub-program (i.e., “the modernization of the Romanian village,” “urban regeneration of municipalities and towns,” and “county-level infrastructure”). The list of proposed investments has to be accompanied by a justification note explaining how each county council decided to prioritize projects submitted by local authorities. The list includes both proposals put forth by county councils themselves (typically for county roads) and projects submitted by local authorities, which can span a wider set of sectors.

41. **Under the current PNDL framework, County Councils prioritize project proposals from local authorities within their jurisdiction based on four possible criteria, out of which “at least one should be used”:**

- Signing date of the goods/work/service contract, as applicable;
- Physical status (% complete);
- Population benefitting from the investment; and
- Local budget’s percentage of co-financing.

42. **As with the PNDL’s criteria for allocating funds *between* counties, the current prioritization criteria for selecting interventions *within* counties are broad and ambiguous.** This means that county councils have significant leverage to decide how to prioritize investments in their jurisdiction. In their current form, the methodological norms do not require county councils to use all four criteria, but merely to choose one out of the four listed above. This may mean that a county could decide solely based on the number of beneficiaries, while another could only look at the signing date of the contract. At the same time, it is unclear how a particular criterion should be deployed: for example, would a project with an older signing date take precedence over a newer one, or the other way around? Also, how should a local authority measure the population benefitting from a specific investment, say a local road that connects to a national road? It could be

¹⁵ See Annex 2 of the PNDL Methodological Norms.

just the population of a commune or the population of a much larger area (e.g., within 20, 40, or even 60 minutes of the locality). Additionally, there are no defined weights among criteria.

Project Selection, Prioritization, and Contracting by the MRDPA

43. **Based on the lists received from county councils across Romania, the MRDPA makes the final selection of projects that receive PNDL funding in a given year.** Once again, the methodological norms do not define a clear, transparent selection process. The final selection is to be based on the proposals received from county councils and directly from local authorities, as well as on “[the Ministry’s] own data and specialized assessments.”¹⁶ It is unclear what data are deployed in such evaluations. The same document notes that the selection is done exclusively by the MRDPA if county councils do not abide by the 15-day timeline or if they fail to prioritize investments based on at least one of the four criteria specified in the law. The finalized list of interventions is approved through the MRDPA’s Minister Order, including an annex with the full set of projects (for each of them, the annex simply notes the name of the administrative-territorial unit, the name of the project, and the sum channeled from the state budget).

44. **There are slightly different requirements for applicants with ongoing vs. new projects.** For the former, local authorities need to send to the MRDPA the documents that show the project’s current phase of completion, the updated value of remaining expenses to be incurrent for the finalization of the intervention, and public procurement contracts that have been signed previously, including addenda, if any. Upon verification of such documents, the process can move forward to the contracting phase. For new investment projects, beneficiaries are required to submit to the MRDPA the corresponding technical documentation. In most cases, this refers to feasibility studies for new interventions or the documentation for approving interventions (DALI¹⁷) for existing infrastructure. Feasibility studies and DALIs are not eligible for reimbursement through the PNDL and have to have been developed through the applicant’s own resources, in accordance with the regulations set by GD 28/2008. GEO 28/2013 also notes that the documentation must prove that the proposed projects abide by the applicable cost standards. However, cost standards are provided only for county roads, communal roads, and for water projects. No cost standards are provided for

¹⁶ PNDL Methodological Norms, Article 9 (8)

¹⁷ “Documentație de Avizare a Lucrărilor de Intervenții” (Documentation for the Approval of Intervention Works)

wastewater projects, as these are considered to require quite different technical solutions from case to case.¹⁸

45. **Recently, changes were introduced to the PNDL's methodological norms to increase the efficiency of assessing and approving new project proposals.** Until June 2014, the technical documentation would be first assessed by DG RDI within the MRDPA and then sent to the Ministry's Technical-Economic Council (TEC). Without the TEC's formal approval, projects would not be eligible for financing. Citing the low capacity of the TEC to assess proposals and the long delays incurred in the process, the MRDPA eliminated this step through Ministry Order 1851/2013. Currently, new projects pre-approved for financing through the PNDL only go through an assessment by the technical unit of the DG RDI, which primarily evaluates the following:

- whether the technical documentation is complete and in accordance with GD 28/2008;
- whether the applicant's folder includes the local/county council's decision for approving the project's technical-economic indicators and for ensuring the required co-financing; and
- whether the expenditures are properly presented and do not exceed current cost standards.

46. **The technical staff of DG RDI evaluates applications received and, where needed, asks applicants to provide clarifications or adjustments to submitted documentation.** Only those projects that respond to the requests satisfactorily move on to the contracting phase, though sometimes this back-and-forth can last for several months.

Implementation

47. **Once the contract between the MRDPA and local authorities is signed, actual implementation can commence.** The exact stages will depend on whether the project is new or ongoing. In the former case, the beneficiary of PNDL funds will have to organize public procurement procedures, in line with the applicable legislation (OUG 34/2006). In some cases, these procedures take a long time – due to challenges in court, lack of offers, or other reasons specific to each project – which may aggravate the risk of not using up the funds allocated for a particular year. This is because the PNDL is not a multi-annual program like an EU-funded instrument, which creates inherent incentives for applicants to submit for consideration smaller, easier projects that can be carried out in 1-2 years. If the

¹⁸ In practice, MRDPA technical staff use a simple rule of thumb for benchmarking sanitation projects, namely that they should not exceed 1.5 times the cost of equivalent water projects

project is ongoing and construction work has already begun in a previous year (through the PNDL or a different program), depending on a case-by-case basis, the beneficiary may continue previous engagements with service providers.

48. **Particularly for new investments, the process required for commencing works can be very challenging to accommodate in a single fiscal year, which is the *status-quo* timeframe for the PNDL.** The figure below depicts the steps and time required to start a new investment.

Figure 2. Typical timeline for a new PNDL project

49. **The straightforward insight of the scheme above is that for new investments, financed by the PNDL in a given year, works may begin only toward the end of that year.** Indeed, after eventually signing contracts with the MRDPA, beneficiaries launch public procurement procedures for design services (i.e., for the detailed technical design), the works supervisor (“dirigintele de şantier”), the contractor, etc. In parallel, beneficiaries also apply for construction permits. Based on recent experience with Romania’s public procurement framework, these procedures – even for relatively small projects as targeted by the PNDL – can take a minimum of three months (under an optimistic scenario). That means that the order to begin actual works can be issued by the beneficiary only in late fall/early winter. November and December are typically cold months in Romania, leaving little chance for making substantial progress with construction works. This suggests that new projects financed under the PNDL will have a tough time in

actually using up the allocated funds within a single calendar year, but the program is only tailored on an annual basis. In the absence of multi-annual budget planning, PNDL beneficiaries have no guarantee that they would continue to receive support in future years. This is partly why so many works are still ongoing and are either stopped or advancing very slowly, while new project proposals keep entering the PNDL pipeline.

50. **Additional critical factors for a smooth, successful implementation also relate to processing reimbursement requests, once the project actually kicks off.** Based on the methodological norms (Articles 16-17), beneficiaries submit reimbursement requests first to county councils, which then submit a consolidated request for each county to the MRDPA. This system was then changed to allow beneficiaries to request funds directly from the MRDPA, essentially simplifying the process by eliminating a step. Some county councils report, however, that local city halls sometimes fail to send them a copy of reimbursement requests sent to the Ministry, thus requiring repeated requests to keep them in the loop. Once it approves the requests received, the Ministry channels the funds – within the set annual limits and based on the proofs/documents received (“situații de lucrări”) – directly to beneficiaries. Finally, beneficiaries send back to the MRDPA the proof of payment of service providers (i.e., showing that the funds received were used for the intended purpose).

51. **In addition, beneficiaries are responsible for monitoring work progress and reporting updates to county councils and the MRDPA.** The flow of reports is similar to the initial one presented above for financing requests: local beneficiaries send all documents corresponding to PNDL investments to county councils; every quarter, county councils send to the MRDPA a consolidated update on the progress of construction works. Upon request, beneficiaries are required to send to the MRDPA any document related to the financed project. For its part, the MRDPA is responsible for the monitoring and controlling the program’s implementation. In this capacity, the Ministry can appoint representatives who, together with counterparts from the State Inspectorate for Constructions, verify the accuracy of reported data and compare it to the reality on the ground.

Post-Implementation

52. **The current legal framework includes no details on requirements for the post-implementation phase – i.e., tracking the project’s performance after completion.** At least based on the methodological norms, once the actual works are finished, the beneficiary sends a copy of the completion report to the Ministry. If and when the warranty period expires, the local authority again sends a copy of the formula documentation (“procesul verbal de recepție final”) to the MRDPA. Beyond that, the two key post-implementation functions for any investment program – i.e., ex-post monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and knowledge sharing – appear to be missing at this point in the PNDL’s evolution. Put differently, there is

no formal process for evaluating the impact of completed investments and there are no institutionalized efforts for communicating good practices among past, current, and future beneficiaries of PNDL funds.

PNDL 2014 Portfolio Assessment

53. **The PNDL budget allocation in 2014 was substantial, transforming the program (established only recently, in early 2013) into the main state-budget-financed source of investment for local infrastructure.** The total budget of PNDL in 2014 was RON 2.3 billion (or about EURO 530 million). For 2013, the program was initially allocated RON 492.94 million.¹⁹ The initial PNDL budget allocation for 2015 was at around RON 1.6 billion (similar to what was estimated by the Bank in the report on *Improved Prioritization Criteria for PNDL Projects.*)

54. **Moreover, it has not been uncommon to increase the original budget allocation for PNDL over the course of one year, as savings are realized in other parts of the national budget.** This happened in 2013 and again in 2014. In fact, in 2014 there were 3 substantial supplementary PNDL allocations added to the original base. The third one represented 43% of the total 2014 allocation, while the initial one represented 32% of the final budget as per the end of 2014. These figures indicate that most of the projects are not following the standard application process via the county councils but are rather submitted directly to the MRDPA all year long.

55. **Budget allocation may be affected by short term political considerations.** The third supplementary allocation corresponds indeed to an elections period. We can wonder whether the political agenda is driving the program as a whole but also the individual allocations.

Table 2. PNDL 2014 – budget allocations

Allocation	Date	Allocation (RON)	% total
Initial	March 2014	750,360,763	32%
Supplementary 1	July 2014	586,219,346	25%
Supplementary 2	September 2014		

¹⁹ See <http://cursdeguvernare.ro/misterele-bugetului-1-2014-anul-in-care-fondurile-europene-sunt-inlocuite-cu-bani-de-la-buget.html>

Supplementary 3	October/ November 2014	1,008,297,275	43%
Total: 2,344,877,344			

Data source: MDRAP

By Size

56. **The PNDL, as the main state-budget-funded program managed by the MRDPA finances primarily small and lower-middle-sized investments.** Following the methodology used in the 2014 World Bank report on “Project Selection Models” and using the Ministry of Finance’s definition for large projects, PNDL projects were sub-divided in the following categories: large projects (more than RON 100 million); upper-middle-sized projects (RON 30 – 100 million); small/lower-middle-sized projects (RON 1.5 – 30 million); and very small projects (less than RON 1.5 million). Very small projects (less than RON 1.5 million) constitute 2.5% of the PNDL portfolio, while small/lower-middle sized projects represent the bulk of projects, with an average value of around RON 6 million (~EUR 1.4 million). Both very small and lower-middle sized projects fall under the category of “small projects” according to the GEO 88/2013, i.e., they are under the threshold of RON 30 million.

Table 3. PNDL project portfolio by size categories*

	Number of projects	Average value of project (RON)	Total value of projects (in RON)	% of total contracted projects
Small Projects (<1.5 mln RON)	494	875,000	0.43 bln	2.5%
Medium-Sized Projects (1.5 - 100 mln RON)	2,533	6,460,000	16.4 bln	94%
<i>Lower-middle-sized projects (1.5 – 30 mln RON)</i>	2,501	6,000,000	15 bln	86%
<i>Upper-middle-sized projects (30 – 100 mln RON)</i>	32	44,000,000	1.4 bln	8%
Large Projects (>100 mln RON)	4	133,000,000	0.53 bln	3.5%
TOTAL	3,031	5,700,000	17.4 bln	100%

Data source: PNDL Database of Projects (MRDPA, 2014)

*Note: Only those projects were considered for which a total project value was available in the MRDPA database. The total number of projects under consideration by PNDL is 3,952 (as of 12/2014)

57. **In 2014, most PNDL projects received relatively small allocations – on average, close to RON 600,000.** 47% were allocated under RON 300,000 and very few (4.5%) received above RON 2 million. This result highlights the large difference in budgetary allocations for projects financed by the PNDL. The highest allocation for an individual project was RON 15 million, which went to modernizing a county road in Vrancea, DJ 205 D. MRDPA data show that this particular county road is at the 35% completion level and has a very large total value (RON 165 million). At the very other end of the spectrum, the Țepu Commune in Galați County received only RON 2,436 to finish up the sewage system, which had been financed under PNDL

in 2013 as well; in other words, it was nearly complete and required only a very small last payment.

Figure 3. PNDL 2014 - distribution of projects by 2014 budgetary allocation

By Sector

58. The MRDPA provided the World Bank team with a database comprising the key characteristics of all projects included in the PNDL for financing as of late November 2014. Roads (county and communal) represent by far the largest sector financed through PNDL in 2014, accounting for over 55% of the total program budget, followed by water and wastewater (with over 22% and 16%, respectively). The table and figure below summarize the PNDL's allocation by sector for 2014, emphasizing that the core priorities have indeed been aligned to the broader objective of the program – as also stated in the 2013-2016 Governing Program – namely the creation of a package of basic infrastructure for localities around Romania (primarily in terms of roads, water, and sanitation).

Table 4. PNDL allocation by sector, 2014

Sector	Number of projects	Amount (RON)	% of PNDL 2014 budget
Roads	2058	1,307,207,209	55.75%
Water	860	517,292,048	22.06%
Sewage	527	336,587,069	14.35%

Sector	Number of projects	Amount (RON)	% of PNDL 2014 budget
Education	195	63,927,597	2.73%
Bridges	145	60,884,001	2.60%
Cultural	40	17,073,222	0.73%
City Halls	57	16,083,087	0.69%
Markets	19	13,128,019	0.56%
Sport Facilities	33	8,517,931	0.36%
Piping	16	2,736,355	0.12%
Landfill	1	940,846	0.04%
Tourism	1	500,000	0.02%
Total	3,952	2,344,877,384	100%

Data source: MRDPA database for PNDL 2014

Figure 4. PNDL 2014 allocations have focused mostly on roads and water/wastewater

Data source: MRDPA database for PNDL 2014

Figure 5. Average PNDL budgetary allocation by sector, 2014

Data source: MDRAP (2014)

By Implementation Status (Ongoing vs. New Investments)

59. **Budgetary allocations among new and ongoing investments suggest that the concerning tendency to begin numerous new works before completing ongoing ones has continued in 2014.** Indeed, the number of new projects is slightly higher than the number of ongoing projects receiving PNDL allocations in 2014 (53% of the investments financed are new). Ongoing projects received only 65% of the budget allocation. This is relatively low given the typically large financial requirements of projects during the implementation phase compared to the startup phase, which usually includes financing the detailed technical design and possibly a limited first stage of works. However, the pattern is not homogenous across sectors as can be seen in the table below.

Table 5. PNDL portfolio by sector and investment status (ongoing vs. new), 2014

Sector	Ongoing Investments			New Investments			Total Number of Projects	Total Allocation PNDL 2014 (RON)
	Number of Projects	Allocation PNDL 2014 (RON)	% of Total	Number of Projects	Allocation PNDL 2014 (RON)	% of Total		
Roads	730	727,188,590	55.6%	1328	580,018,619	44.4%	2058	1,307,207,209
Water	613	440,960,656	85.2%	247	76,331,392	14.8%	860	517,292,048
Sewage	305	268,164,078	79.7%	222	68,422,991	20.3%	527	336,587,069
Education	75	31,410,299	49.1%	120	32,517,298	50.9%	195	63,927,597
Bridges	77	43,973,859	72.2%	68	16,910,142	27.8%	145	60,884,001
Cultural	9	8,997,011	52.7%	31	8,076,211	47.3%	40	17,073,222
City Halls	15	7,471,334	46.5%	42	8,611,752	53.5%	57	16,083,087
Markets	2	2,932,528	22.3%	17	10,195,491	77.7%	19	13,128,019
Sport Facilities	21	5,298,632	62.2%	12	3,219,299	37.8%	33	8,517,931
Piping	2	337,000	12.3%	14	2,399,355	87.7%	16	2,736,355
Landfill	-	-	-	1	940,846	100.0 %	1	940,846
Tourism	1	500,000	100.0 %	-	-	-	1	500,000
Total	1,850	1,537,233,988		2,102	807,643,396		3,952	2,344,877,384

Data source: MRDPA database for PNDL 2014

60. This is indicative of one of the main issues with the current PNDL: in the absence of clear and rigorous selection and prioritization criteria (not only for new projects, but also for selection among ongoing and new projects), the project portfolio has continued to expand. New projects enter the pipeline, while ongoing investments continue to advance at a very slow pace due to lack of resources, facing the risk of degradation and higher costs than initially estimated. The MRDPA and county-level authorities have repeatedly stated that Romania should prioritize the completion of ongoing works, as opposed to starting new ones. The number and value of ongoing projects are supposed to factor into the MRDPA's funding allocation across counties, while the projects' percentage completion rate is among the four possible criteria for prioritizing projects *within* a county (though as the previous section noted the application of such criteria remains vague and subjective). In practice, however, the PNDL has continued to finance new investments (over 2,100 projects have been started over the course of 2014), despite the very large portfolio of ongoing projects. This situation risks

creating an ever-growing backlog, and decision-makers must strongly consider solutions for more impactful and efficient allocation of funding.

Figure 6. The PNDL has continued to fund numerous new projects across most sectors (number of projects, 2014)

Data source: MRDPA database for PNDL 2014

61. **A simple calculation goes a long way to show that it is vital to apply much more rigor in the management of the PNDL portfolio going forward.** Importantly, the total value of the 3,952 PNDL projects (both new and ongoing) is roughly RON 22 billion (or EUR 5 billion). Assuming that the annual budget that PNDL will have at its disposal is similar to the allocation received at the beginning of 2014 (i.e., around RON 1.5 billion in total, including funds to pay for expenditures incurred during the previous year), at least 15 years will be needed to finish the nearly 4,000 projects with financing contracts under the PNDL (or about 10 years if the 2014 budget including all supplementary allocations was taken as a basis). Obviously, this is neither an efficient, nor a realistic implementation timeline, yet there is no clear evidence that the Government intends to “freeze” or at least slow down the financing of new investments. Moreover, anecdotal evidence suggests that the 3,952 figure does not even include *all* ongoing projects previously financed by the MRDPA, so the number of ongoing investments is likely to be even higher.

62. Moreover, of the on-going projects, at least 1,188 (those for which data was available), had a completion rate of less than 1%. In essence, this means that the large majority of on-going projects can also be considered to be de facto new projects, because they had a very low completion rate. This can obviously create huge backlogs further down the road.

By Geographic Location

63. The 2014 PNDL allocation for counties averages RON 57 million (roughly EUR 12.7 million), but there is variation across different areas of the country. The maps below show such differences in terms of the number and, respectively, value of projects by county. The smallest financial allocation went to Alba County (RON 32.6 million, or 1.39% of the total PNDL budget), while Olt County received the highest allocation (RON 91 million, or 3.91% of the total PNDL budget), nearly three times as high. It is true that Alba's GDP/capita is 5,900 EUR/inhabitant, compared to 3,700 EUR/inhabitant for Olt, though this in of itself does not justify allocating three times as much in funds for Olt. Despite such extreme examples, the vast majority of county allocations (73%) are between 2-3% of the total PNDL allocation for each county in total (i.e., including both new and ongoing investments).

Figure 7. PNDL 2014 – total number of projects by county

Data source: MRDPA PNDL database (2014)

Figure 8. PNDL 2014 – total budgetary allocations by county

64. Interestingly, there are significant differences across counties in the types of projects they decided to finance, with some clearly expressing a preference for completing ongoing investments as a matter of good practice. For instance, Vaslui County received RON 50.4 million, investing RON 48.6 million in ongoing projects; similarly, Vâlcea County received RON 78.7 million, of which RON 75.4 million (96%) went to ongoing investments. By contrast, the counties with the largest shares of funds spent on completely new projects include: Galați (75% of total funds allocated to new projects), Caraș-Severin (68%), Alba (68%), Satu Mare (66%), and Tulcea (59%).

65. The report under Component 2, on *Prioritization Criteria for Local Infrastructure Development Projects* proposes a number of criteria (such as investment needs, level of development, financial sustainability, etc.) for allocating PNDL funds.

Chapter III: Main Challenges related to the Quality of PNDL Projects

Overall Project Quality Issues in Romania

66. **The issue of poor project quality is well-known in Romania, and many reports have highlighted the challenges that the country faces in this respect.** The consequences of this situation are also widely recognized and include low absorption rates (particularly for EU-funded programs), delays in procurement and implementation, sub-optimal technical solutions, large differences between design and reality on the ground, etc. The following sections briefly review these issues, which are also relevant for PNDL projects, drawing on previous assessments by: national bodies in charge with the implementation of budget-funded investment projects, including the MRDPA (for social housing; social, cultural and sports infrastructure; water and wastewater; thermal insulation, etc.²⁰); the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) and the Managing Authorities for different 2007-2013 Operational Programs (see the Annual Implementation Reports²¹). In particular, the 2014 World Bank report “ROP 2.0: Support for Applicants and Beneficiaries of the Regional Operational Program 2014-2020” provides an in-depth assessment of such issues and offers potential solutions.

Program Design and Management Deficiencies

67. **First, managing authorities of investment programs have not dedicated sufficient attention to building the administrative capacity of potential beneficiaries (particularly local authorities).** Technical assistance services have not been sufficiently targeted to technical staff, and sometimes capacity development has occurred too late (e.g., public procurement workshops happened too late after the approval of Government Emergency Ordinance 66/2011). This has aggravated the issue of lack of program design and management competence at the local administration level. For their part, local authorities note that they face tough constraints in attracting qualified personnel because of low salary levels and the hiring freeze that was only lifted recently.

68. **There have also been deficiencies in building the administrative capacity of program authorities and intermediary bodies.** These have often resulted in inefficient communication flows with the beneficiaries, unclear and overly bureaucratic procedures (including financial forms), significant delays in evaluating and contracting projects, late and unpredictable reimbursements of expenses

²⁰ For details see <http://www.mdr.ro/en/lucrari-publice/-3144>

²¹ For details see <http://www.fonduri-ue.ro/documente-suport/rapoarte>

incurred by local authorities, etc. In addition, the delays in elaborating program documents, the eligible expenditures order (EEO), and the payment and reimbursement procedures have contributed to the creation of an insufficient and inequitable contractual framework with beneficiaries (for example, some of the local authorities benefitted from higher pre-financing levels than others, and the rules have changed repeatedly during the 2007-2013 programming period).

Project Design Challenges

69. **Technical-economic documentations for infrastructure projects have been often inconsistent with current legislation and have shown clear gaps in quality.** Common issues include: lack of technical description for the different specializations (e.g., architecture, resistance, piping, etc.), unrealistic quantitative and value estimations that lack correlation with identified needs and with the technical expertise, lack of property documents for land and buildings or inconsistent information concerning property issues within the project applications, etc. In addition, projects included unclear/incomplete project objectives, activities, and specificities. The project objectives were not well defined or easy to measure,²² and hence beneficiaries face challenges in monitoring and evaluating results and in proving that a particular investment had reached set targets.

70. **At the same time, budgets and estimates for human and time resources have often been unrealistic and have lacked sufficient detail.** The resources forecasted for the implementation phase were often underestimated or even missing for some activities. For example, the omission of the 10% of the total project budget for exceptional and unforeseen expenses in the general estimate caused serious problems for many beneficiaries. This resulted in non-eligible expenses, cash-flow problems, and financial losses for the beneficiaries. Repeated addenda to the financing and construction works contracts have been common, causing further delays and difficulties in implementing projects. Particularly in 2012-2013, many financial corrections were applied by various audit and control authorities that have noted irregularities (later on, some of these were “forgiven” by the national government, in cases where the beneficiary of EU funding was not found to be at fault).

Public Procurement Challenges

71. **The tenders’ documentation was often incomplete or outdated and inconsistent with the investments’ status and requirements.** In some cases, even the different sections of the same tender documentation were contradictory. The

²² A more commonly used descriptor for objectives is SMART (specific, measurable, actionable, realistic, and time-bound).

lack of any provision allowing or even requiring the bidders to visit the project location sometimes led to inadequate proposals put together without full information. In a few serious cases, some public works contracts were not consistent with the terms of references for the respective procedures (for example, an offer would be submitted without subcontractors, but subcontracting was still possible later on in the project according to the contractual terms). Such deficiencies have further aggravated the risk of non-eligible expenditures (for example, when the exceptional and the unforeseen expenses were not included in the terms of references).

72. Other issues have resulted from inadequate selection criteria and procedures. The most commonly used option was the lowest price criterion, which would attract bidders with very low offers just to win the contract. While this is indeed an important criterion, in the absence of strong evidence regarding the technical and financial capacity of the firms, this could result in lengthy and costly delays. The time required to complete the works was often utilized as an evaluation criteria in the bidding documents, but this also led to proposals lacking realism and also leading to the potential exclusion of serious bidders. Moreover, the supporting documents for the participation and good execution guarantees were sometimes missing. The procurement procedures' report did not always clearly justify the selection of the winning bidder or the rejection of other proposals. Thus, it has not been uncommon to select companies that were then unable to carry out the works in accordance with their proposals and would end up delaying the works and/or requesting more funds. If extra time was granted and the new time period exceeded the proposal of the second-placed bidder, the equal and nondiscriminatory treatment principle of public tendering was violated.

73. Perhaps the biggest drawback of the procurement framework has been the frequent delays in signing the public contracts due to numerous appeals from the losing bidders, sometimes leading to repeated procedures. In some other cases, there was even a need to select another contractor or apply different technical solutions, thereby increasing project implementation risks. If additional works and values are not the subject of the terms of reference or of an addendum, the associated expenses can be considered non-eligible by programs' managing authorities.

Project Implementation Challenges

74. In the implementation phase, the main challenges result from inconsistencies between project documentation and the situation on the ground. These result in further delays in the implementation schedule, compared to the agreed project calendar. The lack of an efficient reporting system for the works supervisor ("dirigintele de șantier") and the poor quality of the feasibility study and/or the detailed technical design have often resulted in the need to sign addenda to the construction works contracts leading to increases in their value,

without fulfilling the legal requirements. Besides the poor quality of the works by selected contractors or the purchase of products with inadequate features and performance, such issues are further adding to the risk of non-eligible expenses for the beneficiaries.

75. **As noted earlier, internal capacity issues are also responsible for some of the challenges related to the project implementation phase.** Most public authorities face the lack or temporary unavailability of key technical personnel. Staff may lack the required competences for the implementation of the project, may demonstrate poor knowledge of legal requirements and of specific investment programs, and may contribute to poor communication inside the project team and overall lack of motivation.

Assessment of PNDL Applications

76. **Between July 2014 and April 2015, a World Bank team of technical experts assessed a sample of a total of 289 applications (feasibility studies).** All documentation was provided by the MRDPA and sampled using the approach proposed in the inception report corresponding to this Component (submitted on July 25, 2014).²³ As for the actual process of screening those technical-documentations, this was proposed in the intermediate and final reports on prioritization criteria (also under Component 2).²⁴

²³ See Annex [...] for the triage methodology proposed

²⁴ See intermediate report (submitted on September 26, 2014) and final report (submitted on December 23, 2014) on “Improved Prioritization Criteria for PNDL Projects”

Figure 9. Scheme for technical screening of project documents

77. The figure above summarizes the main steps proposed for reviewing projects submitted for consideration under PNDL. The full review grid is included in Annex 3 and the next paragraphs provide brief descriptions of each proposed step. It is important to note that, at this stage of the engagement with the MRDPA, the World Bank team has focused only on the following questions:

- Is the project financeable?*
- Can the project be financed from EU funds and, if so, from which operational program?*
- Could the project be financed from the state-budget-funded PNDL (i.e., does it fit the program's conformity and eligibility requirements)? What adjustments are needed, if any, to ensure that a proposed project could be financed from the PNDL?*

It is thus for the other reports to be submitted under Component 1 of this broader engagement (in March and August 2015, for intermediate and final outputs, respectively) to apply criteria and answer an additional critical question: *is the proposed project a priority?*

Step 1: Should the Project Be Considered for Financing?

78. First, the assessment process tries to determine the basic need for a project, i.e., whether a project should be considered for financing at all. This does not propose to set overly restrictive eligibility criteria. The purpose is rather

to ensure that limited funds be directed to projects that can indeed help achieve a number of set targets. For instance, the Regional Water Master Plans indicate that the focus should be on agglomerations or clusters of over 2,000 people equivalent (p.e.) for wastewater projects and on localities of over 50 population equivalent (p.e.) for water projects. In the case of county and communal roads, rehabilitation and maintenance projects typically have significantly higher economic returns than new investments. Consequently, the funding priority should be rehabilitation. Investment in new projects, such as critical missing links, if any, or bypasses on road safety grounds can be considered on the basis of their socioeconomic returns.

Step 2: Is the Project Eligible for EU Financing?

79. **Second, the proposed framework seeks to determine whether the project may be eligible for EU funding, which is typically preferable given the more favorable financing conditions.** Operational Programs are prepared in coordination with the Government based on certain criteria. Only the Managing Authority for the respective Operational Program can decide whether the project is ultimately eligible or not, but applicants should be directed and encouraged to take this route before applying for PNDL support.

80. **A number of basic criteria are taken into consideration to assess a project's fit with Operational Programs that are now in draft form for 2014-2020.** In the case of county roads, one major criterion of fit with the Regional Operational Program 2014-2020 is whether the county road actually connects to the TEN-T Network. In the case of communal roads, the target for PNDL would be smaller projects (roads of less than 5km), with bigger projects recommended for funding from the National Rural Development Program (PNDR). In the case of water and wastewater projects, a first check is to determine whether they are on the list of priority projects for OP Large Infrastructure 2014-2020. If so, they would be recommended for funding under this Operational Program. If a project is included in the Regional Water Master Plan, but is not on the list of priority projects for OP Large Infrastructure 2014-2020, it can be recommended for financing under the PNDR.

Step 3: Could the Project Be Financed from the PNDL?

81. **Only projects that are assessed as generally financeable and at the same time are considered to be non-eligible for EU funding should make it to this stage.** Currently, the MRDPA only performs a basic conformity and eligibility check on submitted proposals for PNDL financing, based on a form that is not available to applicants. This checklist can be (i) improved to reflect all legal requirements and the PNDL eligibility criteria and (ii) made publicly available so that applicants start working on ensuring that their proposals are complete and in line with current legal provisions.

82. **Annex 5 provides an updated checklist to help DG RDI improve the eligibility and conformity verification process.** The recommendations are not aimed at improving the technical quality of documentation (e.g., choosing better/cheaper technical solutions, etc.), but merely refer to good practices for ensuring the full administrative conformity and eligibility of proposals submitted.

Step 4: Is the Project a Priority that Should Be Financed from the PNDL?

83. **The last step should be the project prioritization, i.e., confirming that the project fulfills priority criteria, but this is not possible at this stage of the World Bank project, as explained above.** The Component 2 final report on *“Improved Prioritization Criteria for PNDL Projects,”* delivered to MRDPA in parallel with this report, includes a first proposal for how to determine, for each main type of investment (county/local roads, water, wastewater, and social infrastructure), whether a particular project proposed should be financed as a priority in a given year. The Component 1 intermediate and final reports on prioritization criteria (due in March and August 2015, respectively) have further refined this proposal based on feedback collected from the MRDPA at the national level, and from regional/county/local actors.

Key Findings from the Screening of a Sample of PNDL Project Proposals

84. **The MRDPA provided the World Bank team of technical and financial evaluators with a total sample of 289 projects from July 14, 2014 through April 30, 2015.** As in the full portfolio of projects, roads represent the largest sector, followed by water and wastewater investment proposals.

Table 6. Structure of PNDL 2014 applications reviewed by Bank team

Review session	Total number of projects	Project type		
		Road infrastructure (%)	Water/ sewerage (%)	Social infrastructure (%)
July 14-23, 2014	74	78.3%	21.7%	0%
Sep. 30 – Nov. 6, 2014	44	75%	15.9%	9.1%
Nov. 6 – April 30, 2015	177	49.1%	17.5%	33.3%
TOTAL	289	59.9%	18.7%	21.5%

85. **As the screening process advanced, the verification grid was improved several times, as additional information was collected or changes were made to**

the PNDL's design.²⁵ For the first 74 projects reviewed, the team relied on a verification grid largely based on the one used by the MRDPA. Since during the first round of evaluation no social infrastructure application was screened, the first triage grid included only roads, water, and wastewater. Also, in July 2014, the list of eligible PNDL investments was updated by the MRDPA to include works for City Halls buildings, which were then also included in the verification grid.

86. **For all proposals screened from September to December 2014 (an additional 215 as of December 18, 2014), the Bank team adapted and expanded the verification grid.** For water and wastewater works, the first step (eligibility for funding) was refined in order to make the grid compliant with the provisions of the regional Master Plans for Water and Wastewater (2007-2013 and 2014-2020 versions). Also, the first triage grid reflected only the threshold of 2,000 p.e. The updated grid includes the possibility to finance from the PNDL extensions of networks for localities with less than 2,000 p.e., as long as they do not include building an additional new wastewater treatment plant. Projects for localities below 2,000 p.e. should follow the provisions of the master plans (clusters) and should be co-financed by EU funds whenever possible.²⁶ Finally, the terminology was updated. The term “communal roads” has been replaced by “local interest roads” to follow the official classification and avoid having eligible roads be excluded from the process.

87. **Some applications received late December 2014 were only assessed during January and February 2015 with an updated grid.** The first step was split into two. First it is verified if the project is eligible to PNDL according to the government requirements. In addition, social infrastructure was split into different types and investment caps for eligibility to PNDL financing were introduced. Maximum amounts were:

- County roads: 22.7 million Euro (100 million RON)
- Local Roads : 1 million Euro
- Education, Health: 500,000 Euro
- Culture: 1 million Euro
- Sport facilities: 665,720 Euro (according to HG 363/2010)

88. **Additional applications were received and assessed in 2015.** These are not included in this analysis for two reasons; First, these projects are to be financed under 2015 PNDL budget and this analysis focus on the 2014 portfolio,

²⁵ The verification grid is the main instrument used by the technical evaluators to establish whether a proposal submitted for PNDL financing passes the criteria established for administrative conformity and eligibility.

²⁶ It is assumed that these metrics (2,000 p.e) were developed on the basis of socioeconomic criteria and are now used for simplicity.

and second, the vast majority of them were prepared by the same design company and correspond to social infrastructure, what would create a bias in the analysis.

89. **Of the 215 technical-economic documentations reviewed according to the updated grids, 212 projects (98.6%) passed step 1 and were recommended for financing.** The complete triage results for these projects are attached in Annex 7. The few projects, which were not accepted for financing include:

- Two projects excluded because they involved developing sewerage networks (including wastewater treatment plants) for communities of less than 2,000 p.e.;
- One project was excluded because it was not eligible (i.e., it involved building a storm water channel and new road covering it).

90. **A total of 39 projects out of the 212 eligible (18.4%) were recommended as candidates for EU funds.** This indicates that some projects submitted to PNDL could actually be financed using other sources, in particular EU structural instruments, which would also help increase the absorption of these funds. The PNDL should only target projects that lack any other non-refundable option or have been considered, accepted, but not financed under an EU program (e.g., because of lack of funding). Projects recommended as candidates for EU funds included:

- For roads, projects involving road works on segments exceeding 5 km, which may be better suited for financing from the ROP or from the PNDR, depending on specific eligibility criteria (e.g., local roads may be financed from the PNDR, while county roads can only be financed from the ROP if they connect to the TEN-T Network) and projects including road sections classified as part of TEN-T Network and crossing a settlement/locality.
- For water, projects included in the respective Master Plan for Water and Wastewater, in a cluster with other communes with a common wastewater treatment plant. These projects should therefore follow the technical solution from the Master Plan and the local authority may coordinate with the Regional Operator for Water and Wastewater and attract EU funding. For wastewater, either the project was also part of the Master Plan and then eligible under EU funds or it supplied communities over 2,000 p.e.
- one project complying with requirements of ROP financing, but has been rejected by the MA-ROP and has been submitted instead for PNDL financing. The ROP application should be improved and resubmitted.

91. **Even the 39 projects that were recommended for EU funding were still screened against basic compliance with PNDL standards for the technical documentation.** This was done keeping in mind that all projects – regardless of

where they eventually get funding from – need to abide by a set of legal regulations (e.g., have certain permits, structure the feasibility study according to Government Decision 28/2008, etc.). Indeed, of the 39 projects, only one presented complete documentation (the one that had been previously submitted to ROP, since ROP's assessment is more rigorous).

Cost Analysis of the Assessed PNDL Project Proposals

92. According to the sample projects that MDRAP made available for the Bank, an evaluation of the price per km for road rehabilitation/modernization was made. Thus, for the projects with complete data (88 projects), the average value for road rehabilitation/modernization is RON 900,652 per km, with the smallest amount of RON 400,601 per km, for 2.1 km of road rehabilitation in Cluj county, and the highest amount of RON 2,612,894 per km, for 21.79 km of street rehabilitation in Constanta county. The big gap from these two extreme values might be due to the geographic position (roads in a plane area are cheaper than those in a mountain area), due to the art works that could be needed, but also due to different technical equipment that might be used. Unfortunately, the provided database does not offer such details. We can see however that roughly 50% of the projects have average cost per km comprised between 600,000 and 1 million RON.

Figure 10. Variation of road rehabilitation/ modernization price from Project Portfolio

93. The costs of the overall projects are different according to the field, but also to the area and the complexity of the works needed to be done. In the tables below, a short analysis of the costs of portfolio projects is done, according to the chapters from the general estimate (given by GD28/2008), where data was available.

94. The budget submitted for PNDL includes six chapters:

- Chapter 1 - Costs for obtaining and improving the land
- Chapter 2 – Costs for utilities needed
- Chapter 3 - Costs for design and technical assistance
- Chapter 4 – Main investment costs
- Chapter 5 – Other costs
- Chapter 6 – Technological tests

95. **Chapter 1 - Costs for obtaining and improving the land** includes:

- 1.1. **Land aquisition:** includes expenditure to purchase the land, payment of concession (fee) during building works, expropriation, compensation, legal regime change of the land, temporary or permanent removal from agricultural circuit and other charges of the same nature;
- 1.2. **Improvement of the land:** includes expenditure to prepare the land, which consists of demolition, dismantling, removal of current utilities, deforestation, deviations from the site utility networks, dewatering, diversion of watercourses, relocation of settlements or historical monuments, and others of this type;
- 1.3. **Environmental improvement and bringing the land to its original state:** includes costs for restoring the natural environment after completion of works, such as planting trees, green areas development, and others.

Table 7. Analysis of Chapter 1 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	No. of projects with available data Chapter 1	Average Value Chapter 1 (Th.RON)	Std Dev of Chapter 1 (Th.RON)	Minimum Value Chapter 1 (Th.RON)	Maximum Value Chapter 1 (Th.RON)
Culture	1	11.7	-	11.7	11.7
Education	9	30.3	32.2	0.7	100.1
Medical	1	0.9	-	0.9	0.9
Municipality	4	125.1	205.6	1.4	432.3
Roads	22	74.3	131.1	0.6	480.1
Sewage	8	20.0	19.0	1.5	48.0
Sport	2	5.5	4.9	2.0	9.0
Tourism	-	-	-	-	-
Water	4	65.8	103.1	1.5	219.6
Grand Total	51	56.0	108.0	0.6	480.1

96. **The costs of Chapter 1, for obtaining and improving the land, vary from field to field.** This happens mainly due to the works that are needed to be done before building the main investment. For example for Education or Municipality, if the actual building is not in a proper state, the costs for demolition or removal of the current utilities are very high. Also, considering Water and Roads, deforestation, deviations from the site utility networks, dewatering, and diversion of watercourses, are expensive treatments which need to be done. The low costs from Medical, Culture and Sport suggest that no costs are needed to acquire the land, nor to improve it in anyways. The big gap between the minimum and the maximum values, both in Roads, are due to the differences between locations, their actual administration, but also due to the solutions that were proposed in the feasibility study (for a rehabilitation of a road surface the costs from Chapter 1 are much smaller than in the case of a road modernisation, consisting of widening the carriageway, which involves removal of current utilities, deforestation, and others).

97. **Chapter 2 – Costs for utilities needed.** It includes the necessary expenses to ensure the optimal operation of the investment, such as water supply, sewerage, gas, heating, electricity, telecommunications, access roads, industrial railways, which are built on the site that is legally defined as belonging to the investment objective, and costs associated with the connection to utility networks.

Table 8. Analysis of Chapter 2 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	No. of projects with available data Chapter 2	Average Value Chapter 2	Std Dev of Chapter 2	Minimum Value Chapter 2	Maximum Value Chapter 2
-------	---	-------------------------	----------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------

		(Th.RON)	(Th.RON)	(Th.RON)	(Th.RON)
Culture	3	22.0	27.6	2.0	53.5
Education	15	36.0	32.0	2.0	99.5
Medical	4	22.3	21.6	4.5	50.3
Municipality	6	62.6	73.8	2.0	192.3
Roads	3	38.1	27.6	12.0	67.0
Sewage	13	105.5	75.3	19.1	309.2
Sport	3	14.9	13.5	5.0	30.3
Tourism	2	72.8	50.0	37.5	108.2
Water	7	70.8	88.9	21.4	266.0
Grand Total	56	57.9	63.0	2.0	309.2

98. **The costs for the utilities needed, reach high values for Sewage, Tourism, Water and Municipality.** These four fields are the one with the highest needs regarding the connection to utility networks. This is a major part of the investments for these types of fields for current design solutions. Even though this chapter should reach a higher value also for Education, Medical and Sport, this aspect was not approached according to the Project Portfolio reviewed by the Bank Team.

99. **Chapter 3 - Costs for design and technical assistance** include:

- 3.1. **Field studies:** includes expenses for studies like geotechnical, geological, hydrological, hidrogeotechnical, photogrammetry, surveying, and land stability;
- 3.2. **Permits, approvals and authorizations**²⁷: includes expenses to obtain/ extend the validity of urbanism certificate, construction/ demolition permit; to obtain the permits and approvals to connect to water public network, sewage, gas, heating, electric energy, telephony; other permits, approvals and authorizations;
- 3.3. **Design and engineering:** includes expense for the elaboration of all design phases (prefeasibility study, feasibility study, detailed design), but also technical verification of the documentations, elaboration of energy performance certificate for buildings and energy audit, elaborations of the documentations to obtain the permits, approvals and authorizations (urbanistic documents, impact studies, technical expertise, traffic studies);

²⁷ "Avize, acorduri si autorizatii", according to GD 28/2008.

- 3.4. **Procurement procedures:** includes expenses related to public acquisition procedures, expenses for the elaboration of the tender documentation and its multiplication, fees, transport, housing, and daily allowance for the members of the evaluation committees; and other expenses related to the communication of the results and clarifications of the tender;
- 3.5. **Consulting:** includes expenses to elaborate market studies, but also services regarding investment execution management or administration of construction contract;
- 3.6. **Technical Assistance:** includes expenses towards the designer during construction period (in case this is not foreseen in the design price), but also towards the authorised site manager ("diriginte de santier);

Table 9. Analysis of Chapter 3 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	No. of projects with available data Chapter 3	Average Value Chapter 3 (Th.RON)	Std Dev of Chapter 3 (Th.RON)	Minimum Value Chapter 3 (Th.RON)	Maximum Value Chapter 3 (Th.RON)
Culture	7	47.7	30.8	7.1	92.5
Education	30	60.7	40.5	16.0	167.3
Medical	5	56.1	47.7	25.6	139.5
Municipality	8	104.1	74.3	28.9	227.3
Roads	102	250.3	332.2	15.8	3,093.0
Sewage	16	312.6	213.2	62.5	706.0
Sport	4	59.5	46.6	28.2	127.0
Tourism	3	246.5	18.6	231.6	267.4
Water	16	129.9	107.5	11.5	371.9
Grand Total	191	193.0	268.0	7.1	3,093.0

100. **Design and technical assistance are key project components.** This can be observed by the sample size. Indeed, the number of projects with available data taken into consideration for Chapter 3 is almost four times higher than the number of projects considered for Chapters 1 and 2, so more reliable results are expected from the analysis of this chapter. With an average value from all fields of Th. RON 193.0, the highest costs for design and technical assistance are for Sewage, Roads and Tourism. These types of projects consist of a higher level of difficulty, including many field studies. Also, the magnitude of the project counts, for example the maximum value is from a road rehabilitation and modernization project of 21.79 km in Constanta county. The design and technical assistance costs for Culture, Education, Medical, and Sport projects are much lower.

Table 10. Analysis of Detailed Chapter 3 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	Average Value for Field Studies (Th.RON)	Average Value for Permits and approvals (Th.RON)	Average Value for Design and engineering (Th.RON)	Average Value for Acquisition procedures (Th.RON)	Average Value for Consulting (Th.RON)	Average Value for Technical assistance (Th.RON)
Culture	1.4	4.3	27.9	3.0	14.3	8.9
Education	3.2	4.6	37.4	4.7	9.9	11.8
Medical	2.6	1.6	34.5	10.0	8.0	12.6
Municipality	6.7	18.5	49.9	6.3	17.9	20.3
Roads	14.7	4.1	128.8	7.7	45.5	63.9
Sewage	22.2	22.1	159.3	10.5	44.0	65.5
Sport	2.7	5.9	34.0	2.1	23.0	12.2
Tourism	-	19.6	128.8	5.0	-	96.4
Water	14.4	6.9	60.6	7.9	21.5	27.3
Grand Total	12.6	6.9	100.1	7.5	36.5	47.1

101. **Chapter 3 covers many activities, as can be noticed in the table above.** In order to propose the best solution, field studies are needed, especially for Roads, Sewage and Water works. The next stage is to apply for permits and approvals of the proposed solutions, which depends on the number of administrations established through the Urbanism Certificate, emitted by the Local County. The highest percentage of Chapter 3 is covered by the design phase, which includes the Feasibility Study (or the DALI), and the Detailed Design. In this phase, the technical solutions are proposed, analyzed, and described. After the design and engineering phase is approved, the acquisition procedures should start, with an average cost of Th. RON 7.5. The Consulting and Technical Assistance values are established according to the needs of the Beneficiary and the difficulty level of the project.

102. **Chapter 4 – Main investment costs** include:

- 4.1. **Constructions and installations:** includes the expenses necessary to built the objective;
- 4.2. **Asembling equipments and installations;**
- 4.3. **Acquisition of equipments and installations;**
- 4.4 **Acquisition of transport equipments;**
- 4.5 **Amenities;**

- **4.6 Intangible assets:** includes the cost for patents, licenses, know-how or unpatented technical knowledge;

Table 11. Analysis of Chapter 4 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	No. of projects with available data Chapter 4	Average Value Chapter 4 (Th.RON)	Std Dev of Chapter 4 (Th.RON)	Minimum Value Chapter 4 (Th.RON)	Maximum Value Chapter 4 (Th.RON)
Culture	7	627.5	436.2	221.8	1,434.0
Education	30	841.3	714.5	85.0	3,559.4
Medical	5	478.9	354.1	121.0	1,039.5
Municipality	8	3,495.2	5,574.7	261.0	16,761.8
Roads	102	5,161.1	7,531.9	116.5	55,667.4
Sewage	16	5,353.9	3,197.9	1,954.6	12,275.9
Sport	4	909.5	973.1	255.8	2,349.4
Tourism	3	5,375.6	268.0	5,075.9	5,592.3
Water	16	1,510.8	1,169.5	99.7	3,217.5
Grand Total	191.0	3,748.8	6,018.1	85.0	55,667.4

103. **The costs for Chapter 4, main investment costs, are strongly related to the costs from Chapter 3, consulting and engineering.** The more complicated are the projects, the highest the construction costs are. Thus, Roads, Sewage, and Tourism are the most expensive investments, comparing to the ones from Culture, Education, Medical and Sport, which have a lower grade of difficulty regarding construction technologies, and the overall investment has a smaller scale. The big gap between the minimum and the maximum values for this chapter are due to the differences regarding the area where the investment is made (building in mountain areas is more expensive than in plain areas), the magnitude of the investment (the minimum value for roads is for an investment regarding the rehabilitation of a small bridge, and the maximum value is for the rehabilitation and modernization of 21.79 km of roads), and the different technologies that are proposed in the design phase.

104. **Chapter 5 – Other costs** include:

- **5.1. Site management:** includes basic site management expenditures (works), such as lockers for workers, warehouses for materials, foundations for cranes, lighting, and others;
- **5.2. Fees, taxes, interest:** financing bank fee, the tax towards the State Inspectorate in Constructions (ISC) for quality control of construction works, urban planning and authorizations of construction works, and others;

- **5.3. Contingencies:** the estimation of these expenses is a percentage of the previous chapters, according to the complexity of the work; for new investments, or for major rehabilitations, extensions, modernizations, a percentage up to 10% is applied; for consolidations or works due to natural disasters, a percentage up to 20% is applied; these costs have the purpose to cover the possible changes of the technical solutions, additional charges, and others;

Table 12. Analysis of Chapter 5 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	No. of projects with available data Chapter 5	Average Value Chapter 5 (Th.RON)	Std Dev of Chapter 5 (Th.RON)	Minimum Value Chapter 5 (Th.RON)	Maximum Value Chapter 5 (Th.RON)
Culture	7	32.2	21.5	11.3	71.9
Education	27	107.0	104.4	9.5	485.7
Medical	5	26.6	20.4	1.6	54.3
Municipality	7	300.6	389.8	14.3	1,122.3
Roads	101	539.0	937.3	9.9	8,015.7
Sewage	16	478.1	343.0	57.9	1,189.8
Sport	4	89.2	146.5	4.4	308.6
Tourism	3	546.8	248.0	299.7	795.8
Water	15	162.2	133.8	25.8	491.1
Grand Total	185	388.5	732.1	1.6	8,015.7

105. **Chapter 5 costs, for other expenses, represent a certain percentage from the other chapters, established by the designer according to the types of works foreseen for the investment.** For roads for example, the site management is the heart of the entire building process, as it houses workers, materials, and machines, and it is obviously higher than in other types of investments. The costs from this chapter are also very important when taking into consideration the possibility of changing the designed solution, a common aspect in nowadays projects.

106. **Chapter 6 – Technological tests** include:

- **6.1. Personnel trainings** on the correct use of equipments or technologies;
- **6.2. Technological samples and tests:** includes expenses with the tests according to the detailed design, grinding, and others.

Table 13. Analysis of Chapter 6 from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

Field	No. of projects with available	Average Value	Std Dev of	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
-------	--------------------------------	---------------	------------	---------------	---------------

	data Chapter 6	Chapter 6 (Th. RON)	Chapter 6 (Th. RON)	Chapter 6 (Th. RON)	Chapter 6 (Th. RON)
Culture	1	20.0	-	20.0	20.0
Education	4	9.2	1.7	6.6	10.0
Medical	-	-	-	-	-
Municipality	-	-	-	-	-
Roads	6	68.9	108.1	2.0	284.7
Sewage	7	10.3	7.1	1.8	17.9
Sport	-	-	-	-	-
Tourism	-	-	-	-	-
Water	5	12.7	13.2	2.7	33.5
Grand Total	23	26.3	58.1	1.8	284.7

107. From 191 projects with available data for Chapters 3 and 4, only 23 projects had data on Chapter 6, on 5 fields out of 9. Thus, it is difficult to draw up clear conclusions.

108. **Different allocations in the General Estimate are given for the works of the 9 fields, in the Project Portfolio.** A summary of these allocations is provided in the figure below, with a comparison of each chapter. As can be noticed, the highest amount for all types of fields is allocated within Chapter 4 – Main investments costs, with a rate of about 80% from the total cost. The following two chapters from the perspective of costs are Chapter 3 – Consulting and engineering, with an average of about 5%, and Chapter 5 – Other expenses, with an average of about 7.5%. The other 3 chapters represent the difference of about 7.5%, just a small amount considering the main investment costs.

109. **The overall cost distribution per chapter is given below.** We can see that the capital investments represent from 80 to 90% of the total costs. The second highest post is 'other costs' covering site management, fees, taxes, interest and contingencies. Follows then 'costs for design and technical assistance' representing 5.6% of the total cost in average.

Table 14. Analysis of cost distribution from General Estimate of Project Portfolio reviewed by Bank team

	% in Value of Chapter 1 Costs for obtaining and improving the land	% in Value of Chapter 2 Costs for utilities needed	% in Value of Chapter 3 Costs for design and technical assistance	% in Value of Chapter 4 Main investment costs	% in Value of Chapter 5 Other costs	% in Value of Chapter 6 Technological tests
Roads	0.27%	0.02%	4.19%	86.50%	8.95%	0.07%

Culture	0.23%	1.31%	6.61%	86.98%	4.47%	0.40%
Education	0.89%	1.75%	5.91%	81.95%	9.38%	0.12%
Medical	0.03%	3.07%	9.68%	82.63%	4.59%	0.00%
Municipality	1.58%	1.18%	2.62%	88.00%	6.62%	0.00%
Sewage	0.16%	1.37%	5.01%	85.73%	7.66%	0.07%
Sport	0.26%	1.04%	5.55%	84.83%	8.32%	0.00%
Tourism	0.00%	0.78%	3.96%	86.46%	8.79%	0.00%
Water	0.89%	1.68%	7.05%	81.92%	8.24%	0.21%

Main Issues Identified During the Assessment Process

110. **The overall screening process of the sample of projects submitted to the PNDL has revealed some common conformity and eligibility issues.** All of the following are aspects related to the administrative compliance of the evaluation and, therefore, local authorities (program applicants) can correct/complete/update the submitted documentation upon receiving clarification requests from the MRDPA's technical staff. The following sub-sections describe the typical issues encountered, with the aim of signaling to the MRDPA and to local authorities where gaps may exist in the documentation they submit or where the quality needs to be improved.

Issue #1: Lack of Supporting Documents/Technical Studies

111. **The field studies (the topographic study, the geotechnical study, etc.) and the technical review/control are basic documentation required by Government Decision 28/2008.** Naturally, they are also required by the PNDL. Legislation in this field includes the following:

- The *Geotechnical Study's* elaboration is stipulated by the Normative regarding the geotechnical documentation for constructions (Indicative NP 074-2014). The verification/authentication must be done by a project verifier, certified for the Af field (i.e., "terrain resistance/solidity and stability of the setting for massive constructions");
- According to the directive of the General Manager of ANCPI (the Romanian Office for Cadastre and Land Registration) No. 700/09.07.2014 regarding the approval of the Regulations for approval, reception, and registration in Register, the topographic drawings of the feasibility studies must be approved by the relevant agency.
- Article 5, paragraph (3) from the Government Decision (GD) 28/2008 warrants that the development of the technical review is a necessary phase in the design of construction works for intervention operations.

- The technical review/control is performed by a technical expert, authorized by the MRDPA and the designer must follow its recommendations.

112. Lack of the technical support documentation can lead to the following:

- The proposed technical solution is not adequate for the investment;
- The estimated value of the investment from the feasibility study/documentation for approving intervention works (FS/DALI) phase changes during the detailed technical design phase (in most cases, this results from the underestimation of the investment value);
- Subsequent changes to the technical solutions proposed in the FS/DALI stage may be required (construction system, emplacement, etc.), which would breach Ordinance 863/2008 and lead to extra costs.
- There may be delays in the implementation of construction works;
- Construction works may be suspended for lack of proper documentation and sufficient financial resources.

Issue #2: Inadequate/Insufficient Technical Documentation

113. Two main issues are found under this category: the submission of the DALI instead of the FS and the submission of the Detailed Technical Design instead of the FS. The feasibility study (FS) includes technical and economic documentation necessary for executing construction works for new investments, while the DALI is required for intervention operations on existing infrastructure (modernization, rehabilitation/consolidation, etc.). The framework content for the FS or DALI is established through the provisions of Annex 2 and Annex 3 of GD 28/2008. Also, the required basic studies are mentioned for each type of investment. For example, the technical review/control is required only for the DALI, while the cost-benefit analysis is required only for the FS.

114. A related problem occurs when the project includes a mix of new works (e.g., expansions/additions) and interventions on existing infrastructure. Many applicants incorrectly submit the DALI as technical documentation, although according to Article 5, paragraph (1) of GD 28/2008, expansions are treated as equivalent to new investments. Also, according to the Order of the Minister MDRL 276/2009, which modified GD 28/2008, the necessary documentation, in the case of mixed investments, is the technical review/control and the FS.

115. The Detailed Technical Design (in Romania, equivalent to the “Technical Project” – TP) is not accepted as technical documentation for financing, according to GEO 28/2013 that established the PNDL. According to Ordinance 863/2008, the TP is to be elaborated based on the FS/DALI, which sets the technical and economic indicators as well as the main technical solutions for the project. In the TP stage, a series of aspects that are not part of the previous stage

(FS/DALI) are no longer analyzed. In the TP, the technical and economic scenarios for reaching the investment project's objectives are not analyzed, and neither is the legal status of the land, utility aspects, and the cost benefit analysis. Therefore, in the absence of FS/DALI, key elements of the project's approval are unknown to the evaluators. In this situation, stage 3 of the triage grid cannot be performed, so a request should be sent to the applicant, specifying the need of FS or DALI to be provided.

Issue #3: Incorrect Project Budget (Cost Breakdown)

116. **Errors in the calculation of the project budget were commonly noticed in the screening process.** In many cases, the sum of the budget chapters is not equal with the General Total of the Budget because the applicants do not seem to be using a spreadsheet. Also, the applicants apply a wrong percentage for the VAT: 19% (the quota before July 1, 2010) instead of 24%. Additional typical budget-related errors include: (i) arithmetical errors; (ii) VAT applied to taxes; (iii) wrong VAT amount; (iv) a format other than the one established through GD 28/2008; (v) incorrect registration of amounts in budgetary chapters, typically as a way to lower expenditures so that they abide by the set standard costs. Such mistakes can lead to incorrect estimates of the value of investment (under/over estimation) with a potentially major impact upon the funds' allocation process. The projects can be affected too if there is a gap in the available funding compared to the needs on the ground. Another cause for underestimation of the budget is the lack of correlation between the sum of the main works budgets and the total amount foreseen in the cost breakdown (under chapter 4, as set in the GD 28/2008).

117. **Indeed, errors in registering the amounts in the budgetary chapters can "circumvent" the limits established by Annex 3 of GD 363/2010 on standard costs.** For example, some applicants register the costs related to the installation works in chapter 2 where normally the costs with connecting to utilities are included, therefore avoiding the application of the standard cost computation. In such cases, applicants should be requested to make changes to their project's budget.

Issue #4: Insufficient Cost Breakdown for Main Works

118. **According to Annex 4, article 8, paragraph (4) of GD 28/2008, "the expenses for each construction item are to be assessed through the Estimate of the Construction works."**²⁸ Annex 6 of the same act states its breakdown structure. Beyond the non-compliance with the legal demands, providing no or insufficient details on the estimation of the main works in the budget makes it impossible or very difficult for evaluators to verify whether the project abides by the set standard costs. Another issue that results from insufficient detailing of the

²⁸ See GD 28/2008

budget for the main works is the lack of correlation between the technical description and the budgetary estimation of the same items, and therefore can lead to an incorrect assessment of the real project costs. Applicants should clarify/address such aspects before their projects can be approved for PNDL financing.

Issue #5: Lack of Main Drawings

119. **According to Annexes 2 and 3 of GD 28/2008, drawings from the FS/DALI must include:**

- The Site Plan (1:25000-1:5000);
- The General Layout (1:25000-1:5000);
- Plans and general cross sections of architecture, structure, installations, special plans, longitudinal or transversal profiles, on a case by case basis.

Lack of such drawings or their development without the topographic documentation received from the Romanian Office for Cadastre and Land Registration can lead to delays in obtaining the Construction Permit. For example, if at the receipt of the execution plans for the Construction Permit differences are noticed between the configuration and the surface of the measured property that is the object of reception and the configuration and surface of the property recorded in the Real Estate Register, the receipt is formally rejected and an updated cadastral documentation will need to be resubmitted with the technical information. Also, the lack of drawings (e.g., plans and general sections of architecture, durability, structure, installations, etc.) can lead to approval of technical solutions that are incomplete and may lead to incorrect evaluations of the built surface, the volumetric analysis, etc. and directly affect the estimated value of investment. In such cases, applicants are requested to provide the missing drawings.

Issue #6: Noncompliance with Standard Costs

120. **The maximum values for unit costs are established through Annex 3 of GD 363/2010, modified through GD 250/2011.** The provisions for some investment types are, however, not very clear, which can lead to incorrect interpretations by the applicants. The most frequent mistake in applying standard cost has been noticed with road infrastructure projects where the MRDPA has only included the “road shoulder,” “causeway system,” and “elements for drainage” (i.e., only earth ditches). Most of the applicants understand, however, that the standard costs cover all the costs of the budget, including the costs for concrete ditches, for traffic safety, and other earthworks.

121. Noncompliance with standard costs was also a common issue in social infrastructure investments such as education facilities.

Issue #7: Lack of Documents for Property/ Assets

122. **Property documents are requested by GEO 28/2013 for approving the PNDL and by MDRL Ordinance 839/2009 for obtaining the Construction Permit.** In practice, some applicants fail to include them, which can lead to erroneous identification of the estate (built/land) in the studies' area. In this case, lack of property documents and estate drawings does not allow overlapping the cadastral documentation with the topographic one, which could lead to an incorrect location for the construction (including possible extensions), with negative effects on the accuracy of the technical solution and estimated costs.

Issue #8: Missing/Expired/Incomplete Urban Certificate (UC)

123. **According to Article 1 of the MDRL Ordinance 863/2008, in the FS/DALI stage all approvals and principle agreements must be obtained.** Approvals, agreements, and studies related to the planning certificate can establish preconditions for starting the investment, so it is vital to obtain these approvals (permits) and agreements before the development of the FS, which needs to take into account possible recommendations or constraints foreseen by these documents. Lack of complete approvals/permits can lead to inadequate, unfunded, or invalid technical solutions that are not in accordance with the type, technical characteristics, and availability of existing utilities. This was a common mistake in particular for social infrastructure for which permits and certificate of urbanism were often missing.

Issue #9: Local Council Decision Requiring Amendments

124. **There are multiple situations in which a local council decision concerning a particular project submitted for PNDL financing may require amendment.** These include the following:

- The approved total amount of the investment is insufficient compared to the total budget amount ;
- The amount of the local authority's own contribution is not explicitly mentioned;
- The amount of the own contribution does not cover all ineligible costs.

According to provisions of Annex 3 of GD 28/2008 and provisions of article 46, paragraph (3) from Law 500/2002 regarding public finances, investment expenses for feasibility studies and other studies associated to investments (e.g., intervention works) are to be approved by the main credit release authority. According to provisions of article 36, paragraph (4) of Law 215/2001, the Local Council "approves, upon the mayor's request, technical-economic documentations for local interest investment works, under current legal conditions." Also, according to article 126 of Law 215/2001, "construction works and repairs of public interest, financed through the local budgets, will be executed only based on the technical and economic documentation, approved by the local council."

125. **Lack of all required permits can lead to suboptimal investment decisions that do not have the local council's approval and/or do not have the allocated financial resources from the local budget.** Lack of financial resources associated with the co-financing can lead to incorrect financial allocations by the MRDPA and possibly to suspension of works for lack of financial resources.

Chapter IV: Observations and Recommendations for Policy Measures

126. **Throughout the assessment of the 289 projects in the sample received and based on the overall analysis of the application process, the team has identified some areas of improvement.** There are a number of ways to enhance the efficiency and transparency of project evaluation. As noted earlier, this report does not address project prioritization issues, as they are discussed in a dedicated separate report.²⁹

127. **The following policy measures seek to make positive improvements to the current system, without a full overhaul of the PNDL – this may be called the “Status Quo+” scenario.** By contrast, the framework suggested in the report dedicated to prioritization criteria departs more significantly from the current program structure.

1) Refocus PNDL’s Scope and Avoid Overlaps with Other Programs

128. **The PNDL finances a wide range of investments.** These include: i) modernization of villages; ii) urban regeneration of municipalities and towns; and iii) county infrastructure. But investments in these sectors are also financed by other programs (e.g., the Regional Operational Program, the National Rural Development Program, etc.). Moreover, the PNDL finances projects across all stages: i) projects meant to create new infrastructure; ii) projects for the extension/rehabilitation/modernization of existing infrastructures; and iii) projects that cover ongoing projects. The program description does not clearly indicate the assessment methods specific to the three project types, as classified by stage.

129. **The current analysis suggests that the PNDL should finance projects that have no possibility of receiving non-reimbursable funds.** The maximum funding amount from PNDL should also be specified for each type of project.

2) Improve projects’ technical documentation

130. **A major issue identified during the assessment of the applications was the low quality of the technical documentation.** To make sure that the applications follow the requirements, it is recommended that the MRDPA prepare and provide an Applicants Guide. This guide would provide interested potential

²⁹ See final report on “Improved Prioritization Criteria for PNDL Projects,” delivered with the MRDPA together with this current output (on December 23, 2014)

beneficiaries with all the information needed to prepare the application, including available funds, documentation required, and the type of projects to be prioritized (which may change for different programming periods). The guide should detail the filling-in manner, the eligibility conditions for the project and the applicant (and for the partners, if applicable), and should cover compliance, assessment, contracting, implementation, settlement, project completion and final payment, the checklist of documents (Model Annex 5), the assessment grids (Model Annex 3), the financing contract template, the design, execution, supervision, performance and audit contract templates.

131. The Applicant Guide would ensure complete transparency of the entire PNDL process and provide a coherent and fair framework for all applications. The ROP guide may be used as a basis for the preparation of the PNDL guide. The documents and forms specified in the Applicants Guide shall bring rigor in drafting the documentations for the requests for funding and would make the entire process easier, including during the phases of implementation and upon the project's completion. The period for assessing the requests for funding is expected to become shorter as a result of reducing the number of cases where clarifications are needed during the assessment process.

3) Build capacity for effectiveness

132. The experience of the EU-funded programs in the 2007-2013 programming period indicates that local authorities need continuous technical assistance, especially during the project preparation phase. A relative easy way to deliver this kind of assistance is to set up a help-desk system, either at central level (MRDPA) or inside the intermediary bodies, depending on the chosen institutional architecture of the management system (for example RDAs or County Councils).

133. Considering that most rural local authorities do not possess competent personnel for evaluating the project design quality, an option would include the extension of the help-desk services up to a pre-evaluation of the project proposal at the intermediary body level, at least from the eligibility point of view. This step would significantly reduce the workload of the evaluators that are confronted with a big number of incomplete documentations (see the project sample assessment).

134. It is also necessary to increase of capacity at MRDPA level to appraise projects. A systematic training program could be set-up at the Ministerial level, so that the decision on project selection is consistent across the Ministry. Overall, project appraisal skills must be developed across in a coordinated fashion, so that the new skills are actually applied in decision-making and not left to atrophy. An example could be the approach pursued by Ireland's Central Expenditure Evaluation Unit. As a key component of strengthening the country's public

investment management system, the unit has been promoting the delivery of professional training in public investment management through the country's Civil Service and Development Centre. Even countries with long established public investment management systems, like the UK, are giving renewed emphasis to systematic training: the established UK Major Projects Authority intends to train 200–300 civil servants over the next five years through its Major Projects Leadership Academy. Among transition economies, Slovenia's public investment management regulation reinforces the importance of developing and maintaining capacities by mandating the finance ministry to define training requirements and organize training.

4) Design and Roll Out Awareness-Raising Campaigns for Beneficiaries

135. **Once the Applicant Guide will be available, a series of awareness-raising campaigns are necessary to ensure the document has reached the potential beneficiaries of the PNDL.** At least one meeting with the local authorities should be organized in each county, or a few meetings per region at the Regional Development Agencies may also work well to promote the funding opportunity.

136. **An improved website for the program is also necessary for quickly providing all relevant documents and information for future and current beneficiaries.** PNDL is publicized on the official web page of MRDPA (www.mdrtr.ro/lucrari-publice/pndl), which includes Order 1851/ 2013, with all annexes, and GEO 28/2013. No other key information about this program is available.

137. **The communication around the program and on the financed projects is a key condition for stimulating potential applicants to prepare and submit projects.** The official page of the PNDL should publish the financial allocations per county, the list of projects contracted for financing, including the related amounts, and the projects' implementation stage.

5) Enhance the Project Selection Model

138. **The requests for funding should be assessed in four phases:**

- Phase I – Expression of Interest;
- Phase II – Eligibility and compliance verification (based on the updated grid included in Annex 3); and
- Phase III – Technical and financial evaluation;
- Phase IV (as needed) – Field assessment.

139. **The documentation related to the request for fundings should include, in the first stage, an Expression of Interest (EoI presented in Model Annex 1) based on which the MRDPA should assess whether it may grant the funding.** The

documentation related to the EoI should also be drafted based on an Applicant Guide containing a sample EoI and the annexes thereto, including the documents to be submitted by applicants.

140. **In addition, the requests for funding are currently assessed at the level of the MRDPA only in terms of the extent to which the applicant and the proposed project meet the eligibility conditions.** This is not a technical assessment based on an assessment grid with criteria and scores. The PNDL should include a thorough technical and financial evaluation (TFE) of proposed projects that are deemed to be eligible for funding and in full conformity with the program's administrative requirements. Projects that do not pass the conformity and eligibility verification should not make it to the TFE phase. EU-funded programs like the ROP and the PNDR provide good examples of what the TFE should consist of (these were discussed in more detail in the PNDL Prioritization criteria report that was delivered to the MRDPA in parallel with this report). Verification/evaluation grids should be published along with Applicant Guides to ensure that there is full transparency regarding how proposed projects are reviewed. Importantly, this step in the process can be iterative: evaluators should ask for clarifications and applicants – with the help of their consultants and designers – should be allowed the opportunity to improve the submitted documentation. A maximum number of clarification rounds can be set to two, as is typical for the EU-funded programs.

141. **The requests for funding must then be prioritized based on a set of criteria.** The current criteria for prioritizing ongoing and new investments under the PNDL (the signing date of the supply/service/works contract, as applicable, the project completion stage, the population served, the percentage of co-financing from the local budget) cannot be implemented transparently. County Councils may choose “at least one” of the four criteria (unclear which ones are chosen in practice), there are no baselines (is it better to have an older signing date or a more recent one?), and there are no weights.

142. **The World Bank team has prepared, under Component 2 of this technical assistance, a report proposing a clear set of criteria for prioritizing PNDL investments.** The evaluation process for project proposals under PNDL should be adapted to their specificity (small projects) by using a relatively simple set of selection criteria, given also the limited administrative capacity of the DG RDI to process a large number of projects.

143. **The requests for funding should be assessed according to the above two phases, plus a Phase III for field visits, as needed.** This may complement an online processing system for applications; field visits would aim to verify all documents submitted electronically and also check conditions on the ground for performing the proposed projects. The implementation of assessment phase III will also increase the success rate for the projects to be financed through PNDL.

6) Create a Standard Application System

144. **According to Article 11, item 7 of GEO 28/2013, County Councils are required to send the list of funding proposals within 15 days after the planned budget has been transmitted.** This is circumvented in exceptional circumstances, whereby applicants may send funding proposals directly to MRDPA. Since MRDPA makes budget allocations to PNDL for each County Council, it is unclear how the projects received directly from applicants (and not through the County Councils) are accounted for. The recommendation is to repeal item 7, so that all applicants send funding proposals only through their corresponding County Council. This would create a non-discriminatory treatment of applicants and ensure project financing based on clear priorities. This is not to say that the MRDPA should not play an active role; indeed, it would have the important task of ensuring continuous monitoring and control of how County Councils are prioritizing projects and managing them.

145. **An option to be considered is for the MRDPA to delegate the evaluation, technical assistance, contracting, and some monitoring tasks to intermediary bodies (IBs) that are already experienced in these respects, such as the RDAs.** This option would also ensure a better communication between the beneficiaries and the program authorities, considering that most local administration have worked with RDAs for other programs (PHARE and the 2007-2013 ROP). County Councils themselves may act as IBs (except for their own projects submitted for financing, which would go straight to the MRDPA for evaluation). The next iteration of this report will further explore the pros and cons of these various institutional structures.

7) Introduce Tendering for Technical Documentation with Suspension Clauses

146. **On the basis of current procedures for contracting, actual construction works for new projects can begin no earlier than November of a given calendar year.** This situation causes technical problems during the winter time or postponement of the execution of the budget exercise for the future, which means inefficiency in spending the funds allocated for the year in progress. Once the Applicant Guide is provided for a given year, applicants should be able to start the tendering process with suspension clauses for technical documents necessary for financial contracts. The suspension clause essentially says that the local/county authority would only allow the winning bidder to start implementing the contract once the financing source is secured, i.e., the PNDL application is approved and the contract with the MRDPA is signed.

8) Revise Standard Cost Policies and the Eligible Expenditures Order

147. **Implementation of cost standards for infrastructure is imperfect and has posed challenges to beneficiaries.** The intention for deploying the cost standards is praiseworthy as a solution for keeping project costs under control, as well as to help in planning. The problem is that current cost standards are not sufficiently developed and, in some cases (i.e., wastewater systems), they do not exist at all.³⁰ They also do not reflect updated nominal values (i.e., values have not been adjusted for inflation since 2010), or supply and demand fluctuations; and it is also unclear if comparisons between project values and cost standards should reflect RON or EUR values.

148. **Although the technical solutions included in the legislation on standard costs (particularly for the road infrastructure) are just a recommendation, they are adopted by all applicants.** Designers thus choose lower-quality, cheaper, less efficient technologies, which may result in higher long-term costs. In this context, it is challenging to adopt new/greener technologies that may come at a premium cost upfront, but which may be cheaper over the long term (e.g., if one takes life-cycle costing into consideration).

149. **Cost standards should be updated or waived completely.** In the latter scenario, the authorities could use instead a list of reference prices denominated in EUR to make sure that costs are kept under control. In this case databases with ranges for local prices for the main materials should be created. In any case, technical solutions proposed should be only indicative and designers/beneficiaries should be properly informed that they may adopt alternative options that are superior in terms of short/long-term costs and quality.

150. **As for the Eligible Expenditures Order (EEO), because the PNDL is in its entirety a state-budget-funded program, with money coming essentially from the same source, there is no reason to over-regulate beyond GD 28/2008.** Currently, the methodological norms specify a list of non-eligible expenditures (article 8 (3)), including feasibility studies, specialty studies, technical assistance, taxes, etc. The list, as it stands, is arguably a better option than what was deployed under the ROP 2007-2013, which defined what *can* be financed, excluding by default anything that was not specifically mentioned in the Order of Eligible Expenditures. In other words, it is nearly always better to define what does *not* qualify for reimbursement, as currently under the PNDL. It may still be worth it, however, to look at the list of non-eligible expenditures and decide whether it would warrant an exception.

³⁰ The MRDPA currently uses instead a rule of thumb whereby cost standards for wastewater systems are roughly 1.5 times the cost standards for water supply systems.

9) Introduce Project Implementation Monitoring

151. **The current procedure provides no mechanism for monitoring the implementation of the projects financed through PNDL.** The monitoring is based on the Reports sent by County Councils which are drafted by using the data sent by the funding beneficiaries only, for each of the three subprograms of PNDL (i.e., modernization of the Romanian village, urban regeneration of municipalities and towns, and infrastructure at county level).

152. **To achieve a higher success rate of projects and avoid financial deadlock situations, the financing contract should include:** (i) advance payment (could be up to 10% of the contract value), (ii) clear terms and conditions for disbursement tranches (e.g., advance payments - 1 month after contract signing, interim payments – a maximum of 3 tranches, and final payment – a maximum of 1 month after contract completion). Also, stipulations related to penalties on both contractual parties should be included in the financing contract. The financing contract should also include template formats for monitoring and reporting process.

153. **Proper monitoring is needed to verify the reimbursement requests submitted by beneficiaries.** Beneficiaries now request funds directly from the MRDPA, a simpler process than before, when they had to first send the requests to county councils. County council staff interviewed, however, reports that they would like to remain involved to be able to coordinate and monitor the implementation process in their respective jurisdiction, as required by the PNDL implementation norms. Once it approves the requests received, the Ministry channels the funds – within the set annual limits and based on the proofs/documents received (“situații de lucrări”) – directly to beneficiaries. Finally, beneficiaries send back to the MRDPA the proof of payment of service providers (i.e., showing that the funds received were used for the intended purpose).

154. **The main monitoring mechanism is currently based on the role of the engineer/work supervisor (“diriginte de șantier”), who has the full legal responsibility to verify work progress.** For EU-funded programs, this monitoring function is also carried out by Intermediate Bodies (e.g., Regional Development Agencies) and Managing Authorities and the National Audit Authority, on a sampling basis. It is true, however, that PNDL projects are typically much smaller, so caution is needed with respect to recommending a much more complicated system than the current one. As for the PNDL, it is clear that the monitoring function could not be accomplished solely by the MRDPA at the central level, for the simple reason of lack of capacity and high costs of sending monitoring missions throughout the country. At the most, the MRDPA can verify a carefully selected sample of projects, focusing on the most complex and expensive investments. As noted in the law, the Ministry can appoint representatives who, together with

counterparts from the State Inspectorate for Constructions, verify the accuracy of reported data and compare it to the reality on the ground.

155. **In addition, a solution for proper monitoring is to have specific units within county councils that can carry out this function on a continuous basis.** The advantage would be that these authorities are close to the ground and can more easily supervise work progress and also verify the accuracy of submitted expenses. This step would precede the beneficiaries sending reimbursement requests to the MRDPA. In other words, the chain of actions can be adjusted as follows: (i) a beneficiary submits to the respective county council the report on the work performed, including reimbursement requests, based on a simple, standard template (the one currently defined through the PNDL methodological norms is sufficiently clear); (ii) the county council verifies the accuracy of the reports and of the expenses, approves/amends it with the local beneficiary; (iii) the MRDPA receives the report and, based on the sampling methodology, can decide whether to subject it to further verification or clear it for reimbursement. Of course, this system would not apply in the case of county council projects (for obvious reasons related to conflicts of interest); in those situations, the monitoring would have to be done by the MRDPA.

156. **An alternative, simpler solution is to hire independent auditors to assess the expenses made and the accuracy of reimbursement requests.** This has the advantage of relying on neutral parties that are completely outside the decision-making chain related to PNDL projects. It would also not require expanding the government apparatus at the county council level. Also, EU-funded projects employ such resources to help with certifying expenses, so it would not be a new practice in Romania. As noted in the World Bank report on the Regional Operational Program 2014-2020, the role and functions of auditors require several improvements in the Romanian context: first, auditors should go beyond a simple desk review of accounting documents, but thoroughly evaluate every reimbursement request, including procurement procedures that have led to particular expenses; equally important, in other countries, a best practice is to require these actors to also perform technical audits, which would act as an additional filter verifying the quality of the technical documentation and construction works performed.

10) Introduce Post-Implementation Monitoring

157. **The current legal framework includes no details on requirements for the post-implementation phase – i.e., the project's evolution upon completion.** At least based on the Methodological Norms, once the actual works are finished, the beneficiary sends a copy of the completion report to the Ministry. If and when the warranty period expires, the local authority again sends a copy of the formula documentation ("procesul verbal de recepție final") to the MRDPA. Beyond that, the two key post-implementation functions for any investment program – i.e., ex-

post monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and knowledge sharing – appear to be missing at this point in the PNDL’s evolution. Put differently, there is no formal process for evaluating the impact of completed investments and there are no institutionalized efforts for communicating good practices among past, current, and future beneficiaries of PNDL funds. This is not surprising for a young program like the PNDL; still, going forward, it would be important to set-up ex-post mechanisms to ensure the continuous improvement of the instrument. The final report on component 3 discusses the basic features and key advantages of post-monitoring and asset management systems.

Annex 1: Letter of interest

1. Applicant: *Name, address, legal status*
2. Partner/I (if the case): *Name, address, legal status*
3. Applicant's/partners' experience in developing similar projects (*please specify any completed projects, financing source and the Applicant's role*):.....
4. Project name
5. Project type

☐ A	Road	A1 Bypass	☐
		A2 County	☐
		A3 Communal	☐
		A4 Inner streets	☐
		A5 Rural or agricultural/forest	☐

☐ B	Water supply:		
	- catchment		☐
	- pumping		☐
	- water delivery network		
	1-2 km	☐ 2-5 km	☐ >5 km
	- tank		
	< 20 cm	☐ >20 cm	☐
- treatment/chlorination station		☐	
- distribution network			
1-2 km	☐ 2-5 km	☐ >5 km	☐

☐ C	Sewage		
	Collection network	1-2 km	☐ 2-5 km
			☐ >5 km
	Pumping		☐
	Purification		☐

☐ D	Social infrastructure	D1 Educational infrastructure	☐
		D2 Health infrastructure	☐
		D3 Social service infrastructure	☐

☐ E	LPA (local public administration) headquarters	☐
		☐
		☐
		☐

6. The project represents:

A new investment
A modernization/rehabilitation project
The continuation of an ongoing project*
Other

*) In case the project continues an existing one, please indicate in detail the current project status, the financing sources used in the past, any problems/challenges faced during the project implementation [...]

.....

.....

.....

7. The project is fully executed on the public domain YES/NO

If NO, please specify details (maximum 3 lines)

.....

.....

.....

8. Project necessity and opportunity (*what are the current issues solved by the project execution - maximum 10 lines*)

.....

.....

.....

.....

9. Total estimated cost of the project (including VAT) - (Ron)

.....

10. Applicant's financial contribution out of the total estimated cost of the project (in %):

11. Project characteristics

A

Roads

A0 The road section proposed for financing was rehabilitated in the last 5 years.

A1 It ensures connection to the TEN-T and/or to the national road network

A2 It ensures direct or indirect connection to a growth pole located at a maximum 60 minute distance away

A3 It ensures direct or indirect connection to the administrative office located at a maximum 40 minute distance away

A4 It connects various regions

		A5 It connects various counties	<input type="text"/>
		A6 It takes over most of the traffic in the respective locality (bypass road)	<input type="text"/>
		A7. Other streets within the boundaries of the locality	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	B	Water supply	
		B1 The locality/s is/are included in the county water master plan	<input type="text"/>
		B2 The locality is a member or intends to be become a member of the Intercommunity Development Association and of the Regional Operator	<input type="text"/>
		B3 The locality or the Intercommunity Development Association agrees to entrust the operation of the water supply system to the Regional Operator	<input type="text"/>
		B4 The locality or the Intercommunity Development Association does not agree to entrust the operation of the water supply system to the Regional Operator, but it proves that it can operate the system and cover the financial costs required for the investment development	<input type="text"/>
		B5 Number of final users:	<input type="text"/>
<input type="text"/>	C	Sewage	
		C1 The locality/s is/are included in the county water master plan	<input type="text"/>
		C2 The locality is a member or intends to be become a member of the Intercommunity Development Association and of the Regional Operator	
		C3 The locality or the Intercommunity Development Association agrees to entrust the operation of the water supply system to the Regional Operator	
		C4 The locality or the Intercommunity Development Association does not agree to entrust the operation of the water supply system to the Regional Operator, but it proves that it can operate the system and cover the financial costs required for the

investment development
C5 Number of final users:

D	Social infr astr uct ure	D1 Education infrastructure	
		D2 Health infrastructure	
		D3 Social service infrastructure	
		D4 LPA (local public administration) headquarters	
		D5 Number of direct beneficiaries	

12. Project status

Expression of interest	
Pre-feasibility Study	
Feasibility Study/ Documentation for the Approval of Intervention Works (DAIW)	
Urban planning certificate	
Endorsements/Approvals requested by	
Specialized studies	
Basic design	
Construction permit	
Other.....	

13. Estimated impact (local/regional) as a result of the project development

Social (maximum 10 lines)
Economic (maximum 10 lines)
Environment (maximum 10 lines)
Other (maximum 10 lines)

Issuing date, Applicant,

Annex 2: Number of projects and allocations by county

County	Number of projects	Allocation 2014 (Lei)	%
Alba	63	32,624,327	1.39%
Arad	60	40,766,021	1.74%
Argeş	82	57,970,242	2.47%
Bacău	95	55,237,629	2.36%
Bihor	145	53,758,057	2.29%
Bistriţa Năsăud	122	79,605,950	3.39%
Botoşani	60	46,010,000	1.96%
Braşov	86	54,270,000	2.31%
Brăila	58	45,716,055	1.95%
Buzău	57	64,512,172	2.75%
Caras-Severin	111	48,276,010	2.06%
Călăraşi	61	51,770,028	2.21%
Cluj	107	51,177,927	2.18%
Constanţa	122	74,079,536	3.16%
Covasna	49	53,416,550	2.28%
Dâmboviţa	115	60,650,000	2.59%
Dolj	105	59,924,820	2.56%
Galaţi	60	54,157,575	2.31%
Giurgiu	110	56,896,082	2.43%
Gorj	119	66,138,689	2.82%
Harghita	88	45,228,745	1.93%
Hunedoara	67	50,618,155	2.16%
Ialomiţa	75	49,400,039	2.11%
Iaşi	157	69,665,990	2.97%
Ilfov	37	51,600,000	2.20%
Maramureş	115	60,199,435	2.57%
Mehedinţi	108	52,240,000	2.23%
Mureş	93	55,245,640	2.36%
Neamţ	203	70,289,297	3.00%
Olt	135	91,660,307	3.91%
Prahova	80	53,744,070	2.29%
Satu Mare	185	55,343,294	2.36%
Sălaj	67	33,524,888	1.43%
Sibiu	46	49,000,000	2.09%
Suceava	122	62,542,738	2.67%
Teleorman	71	78,624,201	3.35%
Timiş	146	60,957,000	2.60%
Tulcea	47	59,891,632	2.55%

Vaslui	106	50,450,995	2.15%
Vâlcea	137	78,718,288	3.36%
Vrancea	80	58,975,000	2.52%
<i>Total</i>	<i>3952</i>	<i>2,344,877,384</i>	<i>100.00%</i>

Annex 3: Triage Grid for Existent Technical Documentation without a Financing Agreement

Project Name:

Identification Code: -

Date/Timeline of Project Evaluation:

	DA	NU
<i>Clarifications sought (date.....)</i>		
<i>Answer to clarifications (date.....)</i>		

Observations and clarifications:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Needed Clarifications:

No.	Clarification
1	
2	
3	

Answer to clarifications

No.	Answer	Observations

If Applicant only submits the Technical Project (TP)

No.	Recommendations for the improvement of the technical project, in accordance with the Technical Project	Observations

	Conformity Checklist (see Annex 8)	
1		
2		
3		

STEP 1: Basic Eligibility Criteria	YES	NO
County and Communal Roads		
The Project targets the rehabilitation/modernization of a road and/or the development of a bypass. <i>[PNDL funds should primarily be used for the rehabilitation/modernization of existing roads]</i>		
Water Project		
The Project is designed for a locality with more than 50 people. <i>[Water development projects for localities smaller than 50 people do not help with the achievement of the EU Water Acquis and should not be considered.]</i>		
Wastewater Project		
The Project is designed for an agglomeration with more than 2,000 people equivalent.		
The Project is designed for an agglomeration with less than 2,000 p.e. <i>[Wastewater development projects for agglomerations smaller than 2,000 p.e. do not help with the achievement of the EU Water Acquis and should not be considered.]</i>		
The Project aims to expand a current sewage system for a locality with under 2,000 p.e. and involves connecting to an existing wastewater treatment plan.		
The Project aims to develop a sewage system for a locality with under 2,000 p.e. and involves development of a new wastewater treatment plant <i>[Such projects are not considered a priority based on EU acquis targets]</i>		

STEP 2: Assessment of Potential Eligibility for EU Operational Programmes	YES	NO
County Roads		
The Project presupposes the rehabilitation/modernization of a county

road that provides direct connection to the TEN-T Comprehensive network. <i>[If proposed county road project does ensure connection to the TEN-T network, it may be eligible for ROP 2014-2020 funding]</i>		
The Project involves rehabilitation/modernization work of a county road with a total value exceeding RON 100 million <i>[Such projects may be eligible for ROP financing]</i>		
Communal Road		
The proposed communal road rehabilitation/modernization is for a road link of more than 5 kilometers. <i>[Larger communal road links should ideally be financed by the Rural Development Program (PNDR). This way smaller projects can be financed by the PNDR, while bigger projects can be financed through the PNDR]</i>		
Water or Wastewater Project		
The Project is designed for an agglomeration with more than 2,000 people equivalent and is included in the Regional Water Masterplan. <i>[Such a project may be eligible for funding under the PNDR.]</i>		
The Project is in an agglomeration included in the list of eligible agglomerations for the SOP Large Infrastructure 2014-2020. <i>[Such projects should be part of an integrated approach under the SOP Large Infrastructure 2014-2020.]</i>		
Infrastructura sociala		
The project envisages the extension/rehabilitation/modernization of existent social infrastructure (educational units, healthcare units, cultural centers, sports facilities).	---	---

Note: The actual eligibility for an EU Operational Programme (e.g., ROP 2014-2020, SOP Large Infrastructure 2014-2020, Rural Development Program 2014-2020) is established only by the Managing Authorities for the respective Operational Programmes.

STEP 3: Assessment of Quality of Technical Documentation	YES	NO	Mentions
Legal Conformity			
The documentation abides by the template for the SF/DALI, as mandated by GD 28/2008 (with subsequent addenda). If the documentation includes a detailed technical design, it

must also include the FS/DALI			
The investment type abides by GEO 28/2013 and MRDPA Ministry Order 1851/2013			
Supporting Documentation			
<p>The documentation includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical expertise • Geotechnical survey verified for "Af" requirement • Topographical survey <p>Other surveys and studies (as relevant):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic study • Hydrogeological study • Energy efficiency audit • Other required studies 			
Permits and Approvals			
Documentation includes a valid Urbanism Certificate (UC).			
UC specifies required permits			
Documentation includes all required final permits (except the EIA), as specified by the UC.			
General Breakdown			
The project's General Breakdown is correctly developed and updated based on GD 28/2008 requirements			
The documentation describes general breakdown per objects to enable checking whether they abide by the cost standard limits			
The amounts included in the general breakdown for each chapter/subchapter abide by the maximum limits set by the cost standards from GD 363/2010.			
<p>Expenditures are presented clearly for the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and civil engineering (FS + permits and approvals documentation; Technical Design + technical verification of project) • Consultancy • Technical assistance • Construction site organization works • Unforeseen expenditures 			
Cost-Benefit Analysis (only for FS)			
The cost-benefit analysis is developed according to requirements set through Order 863/2008

Financial performance indicators are specified (net present value, internal rate of return, cost-benefit ratio, total cash flows)			
The economic analysis is included (required only for major projects)			
The sensitivity analysis is included			
The risk assessment is included			
<i>Availability of Technical-Economic Indicators</i>			
Total value, including VAT			
Construction and assembly			
Sequencing of investment			
Duration of completing the investment			
Capacities			
Other specific indicators			
<i>The Decision of the Local/County Councils</i>			
Mentions the technical-economic indicators, as noted in the technical-economic documentation			
Mentions explicitly the co-financing sum for completing the investment			
The co-financing sum covers the value required for developing the project, according to the general breakdown			
<i>Ownership</i>			
Documents proving ownership are annexed			
<i>Operation and maintenance</i>			
There is a written commitment by the applicant to either: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operate and maintain the investment with own funds. Cede operation of water and/or wastewater system to the Regional Operating Water Company (ROC). In case operation will be ceded to the ROC, applicant should also provide a certification that it has entered the ROC's Intercommunity Development Association

Annex 4: Conformity Checklist for Technical Projects

Name of investment:

Identification code: -

Documentation examination date / period:

STEP 1: General criteria regarding the TD's content	YES	NO	N.A.
The TD contains both written parts and drawn parts.	---	---	
A general report [<i>memoriu general</i>] that summarizes all aspects characterizing the investment is included.	---	---	
Technical reports on specialties [<i>memorii tehnice pentru specialități</i>] are included and presented separately.	---	---	
Tender books on each specialty are included.	---	---	
Lists with works amounts on each specialty are present			
An expenditure summary for each investment objective is included (form F1).			
An expenditure summary by categories of works and by goods is included (form F2).			
The lists with works amounts by categories of works are included (form F3).			
The lists with the hardware and technological equipment, including facilities are present (form F4).			
The specification sheets of hardware and technological equipment are included (form F5).			
The lists with the works amounts for temporary constructions are included (form F3).			
The overall work implementation schedule is included

in the documentation.			
The technical controllers' reports (signed and stamped) for each project section that requires checking according to the law are included.			
In case of intervention works, the technical expertise or the appraisal of the initial designer is included.			
Where appropriate, the geotechnical study is checked against the Af ³¹ requirement.			
The maps of the investment objectives are included for all specialties, according to the lists presented in the controllers' separate reports on specialties.			
The architecture plates for each object are present, including quotas, sizes, distances, functions, areas, clarifications regarding the finishing details according to the list presented in the reports of the technical controllers by specialties.			
Structure plates are included for each object, with all the features; the infrastructure and superstructure plans, as well as their characteristic sections are listed according to the list presented in the reports of the technical controllers by specialties.			
Detailed installation plates are included for each object according to the list presented in the reports of the technical controllers by specialties.			
Hardware and technological equipment plates are included according to the list presented in the reports of the technical controllers by specialties.			
Facilities plates are included according to the list presented in the reports of the technical controllers by specialties.			

³¹ Af - foundation soil resistance and stability in the case of constructions and solid ground.

Where appropriate, notices, agreements, approvals, planning certificate, technical approvals are attached.			
STEP 2: Specific criteria regarding the TD's quality aspects	YES	NO	N.A.
The written parts include the title page that contains the project title, the phase, the beneficiary, the data of the designer, the drafting date.			
The written parts contain the list with the signatures of the designer's legal representative, the project manager, and the specialized elaborators.			
There is a correlation between the TD's investment project and the FS (the scenario recommended by the elaborator of the study/approval documentation was considered).			
Where appropriate, there are technical reports on the following specialties: architecture, resistance, interior installations, utility networks, and technology.			
The TD is checked by technical controllers that are certified by specialties according to the "Quality control and technical expertise of projects, execution works and constructions – Government Decision no. 925/1995; O.M. no. 286/1995". The stamp and signature of the technical controller are included (written parts and drawn parts) where this is required by law.			
The documentation includes the project for site organization with a summary, demolitions, network deviations, temporary access ways, water supply, electricity, heating, and telecommunications.			
The tender books contain calculation summaries for dimensioning the construction elements and installations.

The tender books describe the works and materials provided for in each specialty project.			
The tender books contain instructions for execution, installation, technical specifications regarding the use of materials, equipment, tests and trials, while indicating standards, norms and technical requirements that must be met.			
Investment estimates [<i>devizele pe obiect</i>] are made on the basis of the ante-measurement according to the indicators of estimates norms/articles pooled with works descriptions.			
Topographical plans for vertical systematization works are included.			
Where appropriate, plans for underground constructions are included.			
The maps are numbered/encoded and their cartridges have a format and content in compliance with the applicable standards ³² ; the signatures of designers are also present.			
Specialty plates are correlated with the correspondent technical reports.			
Where appropriate, the necessary approvals for network deviations are obtained from owners/operators.			

Note: The forms F1 - F5 are included in Order no. 863/2008

IMPORTANT

Step 1 of the evaluation process is covered by the expert evaluators in the cases in which the documentation submitted by the Applicant contains only the TD.

³² Plates with different cartridges may be accepted, but only if they comply with the standard content and include the signatures.

Step 2 of the evaluation process is covered by the expert evaluators in the cases in which the documentation submitted by the Applicant contains the Feasibility Study/Documentation for Approval of Intervention Works (as the case) and the TD.

Annex 5: Recommendations for an improved PNDL conformity checklist

	Items	YES	NO	Mentions
1	The documentation includes a list of contents			
	The documentation abides by the template for FS/DALI, as mandated by GD 28/2008 (with subsequent addenda). If the documentation includes a detailed technical design, it must also include the FS/DALI.			
	The investment type abides by GEO 28/2013 and MRDPA Ministry Order 1851/2013			
2	The documentation includes:			
	Technical expertise			
	Geotechnical survey verified for Af requirement			
	Topographical survey			
	Other surveys and studies (as relevant):			
	-traffic study			
	-hydro geological study			
	-energy efficiency audit			
	- study of wastewater recycling (effluent to outfall)			
	-other required studies			
3	Permits and approvals			
	Documentation includes a valid Urbanism Certificate (UC)			
	UC specifies required permits			
	Documentation includes all required final permits* (as specified by the UC) * except EIA			
4	General Breakdown			
	The project's General Breakdown is correctly developed and updated based on GD 28/2008 requirements			
	The documentation describes general breakdown per objects to enable checking whether they abide by the cost standard limits			
	The documentation includes the list of works quantities for each work category.			
	The amounts included in the general breakdown for each chapter/subchapter abide by the maximum limits set by the cost standards from GD 363/2010.

	Items	YES	NO	Mentions
	Expenditures will be presented clearly for the following categories			
	Design and civil engineering			
	- FS + permits and approvals documentation			
	- Technical Design + technical verification of project			
	Consultancy			
	Technical assistance			
	Construction site organization works			
	Unforeseen expenditures			
5	Cost-benefit analysis (only for FS)			
	The cost-benefit analysis is developed according to requirements set through Order 863/2008			
	Financial performance indicators are specified (net present value, internal rate of return, cost-benefit ratio, total cash flows)			
	The economic analysis is included (required only for major projects)			
	The sensitivity analysis is included			
	The risk assessment is included			
6	The technical-economic indicators of the investment			
	Total value, including VAT			
	Construction and assembly			
	Sequencing of investment			
	Duration of completing the investment			
	Capacities			
	Other specific indicators			
7	The Decision of the Local/County Council			
	Mentions the technical-economic indicators, as noted in the technical-economic documentation			
	Mentions explicitly the co-financing sum for completing the investment			
	The co-financing sum covers the value required for developing the project, according to the general breakdown			
8	Documents proving ownership are annexed			
9	There is a written commitment by the applicant to operate and maintain the investment

Annex 6: List of screened projects for 2014-2020

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
1	1	14-07-2014	81380	Extindere retele de canalizare menajera in satul Polovragi, com. Plovragi, jud. Gorj	Gorj	Polovragi	Canalizare
2	1	14-07-2014	81380	Modernizare drumuri satesti, comuna Polovragi, jud. Gorj	Gorj	Polovragi	Drumuri
3	1	14-07-2014	109924	Modernizare drumuri satesti sat Negoiesti	Mehedinti	Baia de Arama	Drumuri
4	1	14-07-2014	109924	Modernizare DC40 Baia de Arama - Pistrita	Mehedinti	Baia de Arama	Drumuri
5	1	14-07-2014	109924	Realizare retea alimentare cu apa in zona Pirtie Schi, sat Dealu Mare	Mehedinti	Baia de Arama	Alimentare apa
6	1	14-07-2014	109924	Extindere retea canalizare zona Pirtie Schi, sat Dealu Mare	Mehedinti	Baia de Arama	Canalizare
7	1	14-07-2014	126825	Extindere sistem alimenntare cu apa, comuna Dobrun, jud. Olt	Olt	Dobrun	Alimentare apa
8	1	14-07-2014	127171	Modernizare drumuri locale, L=4,2 Km	Olt	Gradinari	Drumuri
9	1	14-07-2014	130339	Modernizare drum comunal DC127, L=1,56 Km	Olt	Gura Padinii	Drumuri
10	1	14-07-2014	129139	Modernizare drum comunal Strejesti-Gradinari, km 1+100-3+500, Modernizare DC21A cu lianti bituminoși si DC20 de la km 5+200 Strejesti-Gradinari	Olt	Strejesti	Drumuri
11	1	14-07-2014	129246	Modernizare drumuri locale, L=3,75Km	Olt	Serbanesti	Drumuri
12	1	14-07-2014	128374	Modernizare strazi in satele apartinatoare orasului Potcoava, L=5,3 km	Olt	Potcoava	Drumuri
13	2	16-07-2014	190	Consolidare zid de sprijin pe DJ121G, Iacobeni	Harghita	Harghita	Inginerie
14	2	16-07-2014	85680	Extindere reata de canalizare menajera in com. Sanraieni, jud. Harghita	Harghita	Sanraieni	Canalizare

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
15	2	16-07-2014	86311	Modernizare drum comunal DC142, km 0+000-4+320 si 0+000-1,290 dreapta, com. Varsag, jud. Harghita; Faza II, km:1+920-4+320 si 0+000-1+290 dreapta, lungime sector L=3,69 km	Harghita	Varsag	Drumuri
16	2	16-07-2014	83525	Reparatii pe DJ136km27+753 Cristuru Secuiesc - Avramesti, jud. Harghita, Zid de sprijin pe gabioane	Harghita	Cristuru Secuiesc	Drumuri
17	2	16-07-2014	84460	Reabilitare sistem rutier, reparatii podete, santuri si trotuare pe DC75 si ranforsare sistem rutier si santuri pe drum comunal neclasificat in com. Galautasi, jud. Harghita	Harghita	Galautasi	Drumuri
18	2	16-07-2014	86519	Reabilitare si modernizare DC133 in com. Santimbru, sat Santimbru, jud. Harghita	Harghita	Santimbru	Drumuri
19	2	16-07-2014	83525	Reabilitare strada Gradiniar si strada Harghitei, orasul Cristuru Secuiesc, jud. Harghita	Harghita	Cristuru Secuiesc	Drumuri
20	2	16-07-2014	190	Pod pe drumul judetean DJ123F, km 3+920 peste raul Olt intre localitatile Ciba-Ciceu	Harghita	Harghita	Inginerie
21	2	16-07-2014	190	Modernizare drum judetean DJ134A, Soimus Mic - Cristuru Secuiesc, km 7+500-16+000	Harghita	Harghita	Drumuri
22	2	16-07-2014	190	Modernizare sistem rutier pe DJ123E, Miercurea Ciuc-Pauleni DN12A, km 2+200 - 7+500	Harghita	Harghita	Drumuri
23	2	16-07-2014	84656	Reabilitarea si modernizarea DC235 in lungime de 740 m, com. Lunca de Jos. jud. Harghita	Harghita	Lunca de Jos	Drumuri
24	2	16-07-2014	86487	Refacere a 3 podete peste raul Nagy(Tulbure) din satul Porumbenii Mari, com. Porumbeni, jud. Harghita	Harghita	Porumbeni	Inginerie
25	3	17-07-2014	121055	Extindere sistem de canalizare oras Targu Neamt	Neamt	Targu Neamt	Canalizare

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
26	3	17-07-2014	121055	Reabilitare retele de alimentare cu apa in oras Targu Neamt	Neamt	Targu Neamt	Alimentare apa
27	3	17-07-2014	123479	Modernizare DC127 Piatra Soimului-Poieni km 2+200 - 4+400	Neamt	Piatra Soimului	Drumuri
28	3	17-07-2014	124661	Extindere si modernizare sistem de alimentare cu apa potabila, canalizare si ape uzate menajere in com. Timisesti	Neamt	Timisesti	Alimentare apa
29	3	17-07-2014	124661	Extindere si modernizare sistem de canalizare si ape uzate menajere in com. Timisesti	Neamt	Timisesti	Canalizare
30	3	17-07-2014	12105	Reabilitare retea de canalizare menajera si microstatie de epurare zona Baile Oglinzii, oras Targu Neamt	Neamt	Targu Neamt	Canalizare
31	3	17-07-2014	14352	Alimentare cu apa in com. Beleti - Negresti, sat Beleti	Arges	Beleti Negresti	Alimentare apa
32	3	17-07-2014	26338	Modernizare drumuri comunale (satesti) in com. Bucium	Bacau	Bucium	Drumuri
33	3	17-07-2014	23207	Modernizare drumuri locale, com. Lipova	Bacau	Lipova	Drumuri
34	3	17-07-2014	23644	Modernizare drum local DC20 si drumuri locale, com. Negri	Bacau	Negri	Drumuri
35	3	17-07-2014	25861	Modernizare drumuri satesti si comunale in localitatea Traian	Bacau	Traian	Drumuri
36	3	17-07-2014	21454	Modernizare drumuri locale si DC158, com. Birsanesti	Bacau	Birsanesti	Drumuri
37	3	17-07-2014	24187	IBU pe DS 897, DS 1177, DS 876/3 si DS 376/5 com. Pincesti	Bacau	Pincesti	Drumuri
38	3	17-07-2014	22460	Modernizare drumuri comunale si locale com. Faraoani	Bacau	Faraoani	Drumuri
39	3	17-07-2014	22380	Reabilitare drumuri comunale din com. Dofteana	Bacau	Dofteana	Drumuri
40	3	17-07-2014	21560	Modernizare drumuri locale satele Bogdanesti si Filipesti, com. Bogdanesti	Bacau	Bogdanesti	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
41	3	17-07-2014	21196	Modernizare si reabilitare drumuri locale si comune in com. Balcani	Bacau	Balcani	Drumuri
42	3	17-07-2014	105295	Modernizare drum local DC181, com. Stanesti	Giurgiu	Stanesti	Drumuri
43	3	17-07-2014	105348	Sistem de alimentare cu apa in com. Stoenesti	Giurgiu	Stoenesti	Alimentare apa
44	3	17-07-2014	123709	Infiintare sistem de alimentare cu apa in sat Poienari, com. Poienari	Neamt	Poienari	Alimentare apa
45	3	17-07-2014	123709	Infiintare sistem de canalizare si statie de epurare in sat Poienari, com. Poienari	Neamt	Poienari	Canalizare
46	3	17-07-2014	124885	Modernizare drum comunal DC78 km 0+4+727 Valea Ursului - Muncelul de Jos si drum vicinal km 0+1+453 in sat Muncelul de Jos	Neamt	Valea Ursului	Drumuri
47	4	21-07-2014	142122	Asfaltare strazi in localitatea Moigrad-Porolissum "Suseni" si "La Sasu", com. Mirsid, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Mirsid	Drumuri
48	4	21-07-2014	142550	Modernizare drum comunal DC17: Bulgari (DJ108D) - Domnin, km 0+000 - 2+000, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Salatig	Drumuri
49	4	21-07-2014	142550	Modernizare DC9: Salatig-Mineu, km 2+000 - 5+640, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Salatig	Drumuri
50	4	21-07-2014	142550	Modernizare DC14: DJ108D - Deja - Notig - DJ108A, km 4+000 - 9+050, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Salatig	Drumuri
51	4	21-07-2014	314	Modernizare drum judetean DJ 110E, km 0+000 - 18+470 Nufalau - Plopis - Faget (limita jud. Bihor) jud. Salaj	Salaj	Salaj	Drumuri
52	4	21-07-2014	140770	Modernizare drum comunal DC47, km 8+480-12+980, com. Cristolt, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Cristolt	Drumuri
53	4	21-07-2014	142774	Modernizare a doua drumuri comunale: DC47 km 5+200 - 8+480 (Solona-Testioara), DC22A km 0+000 - 0+830 (DN1H - Paralela Somes) com. Surduc, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Surduc	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
54	4	21-07-2014	141946	Asfaltare drum comunal DC93 Marca - Cerisa, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Marca	Drumuri
55	4	21-07-2014	141946	Modernizare strazi in com. Marca, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Marca	Drumuri
56	4	21-07-2014	59880	Modernizare DC12 Unguras - Darot, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Unguras	Drumuri
57	4	21-07-2014	58008	Modernizare drum comunal DC102 Iara - Masca, com. Iara, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Iara	Drumuri
58	4	21-07-2014	58204	Modernizare DC135 km 0+000 - 3+550, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Izvoru Crisului	Drumuri
59	4	21-07-2014	55008	Modernizare strazi in Municipiul Dej, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Dej	Drumuri
60	4	21-07-2014	59764	Modernizare drum comunal DC85 Tureni - Micesti, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Tureni	Drumuri
61	4	21-07-2014	57350	Modernizare drumuri in com. Cojocna, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Cojocna	Drumuri
62	4	21-07-2014	58464	Infiintare retea de canalizare menajera in localitatea Margau, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Margau	Canalizare
63	4	21-07-2014	57948	Infiintare retea de canalizare cu statii de epurare in localitatea Garbau, com. Garbau, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Garbau	Canalizare
64	4	21-07-2014	56014	Imbunatatire infrastructura turistica in com. Belis, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Belis	Turism
65	4	21-07-2014	60169	Modernizare drumuri in com. Negreni, 1718 ml, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Negreni	Drumuri
66	4	21-07-2014	60169	Modernizare drumuri in comuna Negreni, 6342 ml, jud. Cluj	Cluj	Negreni	Drumuri
67	4	21-07-2014	140770	Modernizare drum comunal DC48 km 0+000-4+000 com. Cristolt, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Cristolt	Drumuri
68	5	22-07-2014	141786	Modernizare drum comunal DC26 Letca-Soimuseni, km 0+000 - 9+231, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Letca	Drumuri
69	5	22-07-2014	140208	Modernizare drumuri de interes local in com. Banisor L=8 km, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Banisor	Drumuri
70	5	22-07-2014	140869	Modernizare drum comunal DC57: DN1G - Ruginoasa, km 0+000 - 8+000, jud. Salaj	Salaj	Cuzaplace	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
71	6	23-07-2014	125061	Modernizare retea stradala (Str. Biruintei - Viilor - Plopilor - Narciselo 2) in com. Zanesti, jud. Neamt	Neamt	Zanesti	Drumuri
72	6	23-07-2014	103238	Modernizare drumuri de interes local sat Copaciu, com. Ghimpati, jud. Giurgiu	Giurgiu	Ghimpati	Drumuri
73	6	23-07-2014	103238	Modernizare drumuri de interes local sat Valea Plopilor, com. Ghimpati, jud. Giurgiu	Giurgiu	Ghimpati	Drumuri
74	1B	01-10-2014	21418	Modernizare drumuri comunale, comuna Berzunti, judetul Bacau	Bacau	Berzunti	Drumuri
75	1B	01-10-2014	33989	Modernizare DC 40B si strazi in comuna Nimigea	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Nimigea	Drumuri
76	1B	01-10-2014	121652	Modernizare Dc 196 din DN 17 B-Borca-Soci, comuna Borca, judetul Neamt	Neamt	Borca	Drumuri
77	1B	01-10-2014	125150	Modernizare drumuri în comuna Gădinti	Neamt	Gadinti	Drumuri
78	1B	01-10-2014	121386	Modernizare străzi în comuna Bira	Neamt	Bira	Drumuri
79	1B	01-10-2014	124206	Modernizare strada Muncii, comuna Săbăoani	Neamt	Sabaoani	Drumuri
80	1B	01-10-2014	121938	Modernizare drum comunal DC1 Târzia- Groși	Neamt	Brusturi	Drumuri
81	1B	01-10-2014	122668	Modernizare Str. Moldovei- sat Gherăesti, Str. Moldovei- Sat Gherăești Noi, str. Viorelelor- sat Tețcani, comuna Gherăesti, județul Neamț	Neamt	Gheraesti	Drumuri
82	1B	01-10-2014	18778	Canalizare si statie de epurare in zona blocuri noi	Arges	Stilpeni	Canalizare
83	1B	01-10-2014	18581	Alimentare cu apa Lipia si Gainusa	Arges	Sapata	Alimentare apa
84	1B	01-10-2014	13169	Canalizare pluviala zona Craiova	Arges	Pitesti	Canalizare
85	1B	01-10-2014	13169	Modernizare Calea Campulung	Arges	Pitesti	Drumuri
86	1B	01-10-2014	16454	Sistem de canalizare menajera	Arges	Domnesti	Canalizare
87	2B	02-10-2014	148916	Modernizare drum comunal DC 36, km 4+000-5+321	Suceava	Gramesti	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
				Bălinești și DC 36C, km 0+000-0+936			
88	2B	02-10-2014	146263	Reabilitarea zonei centrale a municipiului Suceava prin reabilitare pietonal, străzi și iluminat	Suceava	Suceava	Drumuri
89	2B	02-10-2014	149316	Modernizare DC 12B, L=3,242 km	Suceava	Malini	Drumuri
90	2B	02-10-2014	150766	Asfaltare drum comunal DC 10A Nigotesti-Movileni L=4,28 km	Suceava	Vadu Moldovei	Drumuri
92	2B	02-10-2014	86133	Modernizare drumuri comunale neclasate în comuna Tulghes	Harghita	Tulghes	Drumuri
93	2B	02-10-2014	173533	Extindere rețea alimentare cu apă, sat Dianu	Valcea	Stroesti	Alimentare apa
94	2B	02-10-2014	171628	Modernizare drum comunal și drumuri de interes local	Valcea	Nicolae Balcescu	Drumuri
95	2B	02-10-2014	85877	Reabilitare și modernizare drum comunal DC 68 în comuna Subcetate, județul Harghita	Harghita	Subcetate	Drumuri
96	3B	06-10-2014	23948	Construire școală sat Scurta, comuna Orbeni	Bacau	Orbeni	Educatie
98	3B	06-10-2014	32955	Asfaltare ulițe laterale la Ciceu Giurgesti comuna Ciceu Giurgesti	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Ciceu Giurgesti	Drumuri
99	3B	06-10-2014	102525	Modernizare străzi de interes local	Ilfov	Darasti-Ilfov	Drumuri
100	4B	06-10-2014	114382	Modernizare străzi în comuna Sîncraiu de Mures: Sîncraiu de Mures: str. Bradului, str. Fabricii, str. Stejarului, str. Teilor, sat Nazna: str. Grîului, str. Crinului, str. Vadului, str. Liliacului, str. scolii	Mures	Sincraiu de Mures	Drumuri
101	4B	06-10-2014	66731	Construire sediu primarie si amenajari exterioare Comisani, jud Dambovita	Dambovita	Comisani	Municipality
102	4B	06-10-2014	179891	Asfaltare drum local Soseaua Noua Silistea-Persinari, comuna Raci, judetul Dambovita	Dambovita	Raci	Drumuri
103	4B	06-10-2014	15741	Reabilitare drum comunal DC 254 comuna Corbeni, judetul	Arges	Corbeni	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
				Arges			
104	4B	06-10-2014	150588	Modernizare drumuri comunale in comuna Udesti, judetul Suceava	Suceava	Udesti	Drumuri
105	4B	06-10-2014	148293	Modernizare drum comunal 51B Dornesti-laz km 0+000-3+300, comuna Dornești, județul Suceava	Suceava	Dornesti	Drumuri
106	4B	06-10-2014	150221	Reabilitare si modernizare drumuri de interes local în comuna Siminicea, judetul Suceava	Suceava	Siminicea	Drumuri
107	4B	06-10-2014	122285	Modernizare Dc 147 si drumuri locale in lungime de 3,650 km, comuna Dobreni, judetul Neamt	Neamt	Dobreni	Drumuri
108	4B	06-10-2014	95293	Reabilitare drumuri comunale Dc 31 Tomesti-Vladiceni, Dc 33 Tomesti-Goruni, Dc 44 Tomesti-Chicerea	Iasi	Tomesti	Drumuri
109	4B	06-10-2014	100004	Modernizare drum comunal Dc 16, Sculeni-Victoria-Luceni-Icuseni	Iasi	Victoria	Drumuri
110	4B	06-10-2014	147134	Imbracaminte bituminoasa usoara pe drumuri comunale neclasate, in comuna Bosanci, judetul Suceava	Suceava	Bosanci	Drumuri
111	4B	06-10-2014	34770	Modernizare DC 28, Km 5+850-10+176, DJ 151-Bretea	BISTRITA-NASAUD	SIEU-ODORHEI	Drumuri
112	4B	06-10-2014	40035	Reabilitare si modernizare drumuri comunale si satesti in sat Adăseni, comuna Adăseni, județul Botosani	Botosani	Adaseni	Drumuri
113	4B	06-10-2014	34235	Modernizare strada Brujeni, in comuna Prundu Bîrgăului, județul Bistrița Năsăud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Prundu Bîrgăului	Drumuri
114	4B	06-10-2014	150418	Alimentare cu apa sat Sucevita, comuna Sucevita	Suceava	Sucevita	Alimentare apa
115	4B	06-10-2014	146325	Reabilitare și modernizare drumuri de interes local în comuna Mitocu Dragomirnei, județul Suceava	Suceava	Mitocu Dragomirnei	Drumuri
116	4B	06-10-2014	34422	Extindere reabilitare cu apa potabila	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Silivasu de Campie	Alimentare apa

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
117	4B	06-10-2014	34770	Realizare sarpanta	BISTRITA-NASAUD	SIEU-ODORHEI	Educatie
118	7	07-11-2014	138280	Reabilitare scoala gimnaziala com. Odorheiu, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Odoreiu	Educatie
119	7	07-11-2014	16506	Canalizarea si epurarea apelor uzate menajere in satele Draganu – Olteni si Dumbravesti, comuna Draganu, judetul Arges	Arges	Draganu	Canalizare
120	7	07-11-2014	77313	Modernizare drumuri de interes local in comuna Tudor Vladimirescu, judetul Galati	Galati	Tudor Vladimirescu	Drumuri
121	7	07-11-2014	114809	Extinderea - Mansardarea cladirii noi - "Ateliere scoala la Liceul Tehnologic Ioan Bujor"	Mures	Reghin	Educatie
122	7	07-11-2014	96904	Modernizarea drumului communal DC 69A-km 6+000 – km 8+600 si drumuri satesti in localitatea Bradicesti, comuna Dolhesti, judetul Iasi	Iasi	Dolhesti	Drumuri
123	7	07-11-2014	33845	Modernizare drum communal DC21 si ulita Pe Vale, in comuna Micestii de Campie, Judetul Bistrita Nasaud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Micesti	Drumuri
124	7	07-11-2014	34397	Reabilitare scoala Tiberiu Morariu, comuna Salva, jud. Bistrita Nasaud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Salva	Educatie
125	7	07-11-2014	60455	Reparatii capitale, modernizare strazi si trotuare in oras Eforie	Constanta	Eforie	Drumuri
126	7	07-11-2014	57083	Lucrari de refacere si modernizarea infrastructurii rutiere afectate de inundatii in anul 2010 in comuna Chiuesti	Cluj	Chiuesti	Drumuri
127	7	07-11-2014	NA	Reabilitare si modernizare 13 strazi din satul SIMINOC, Orasul Murfatlar – Faza DALI”	Constanta	Murfatlar	Drumuri
128	7	07-11-2014	NA	Reabilitare si modernizare 26 de strazi in orasul Murfatlar – Faza DALI	Constanta	Murfatlar	Drumuri
129	7	07-11-2014	99922	Construire cladire pentru gradinita – sat Tutora, com. Tutora	Iasi	Tutora	Educatie

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
130	7	07-11-2014	96904	EXTINDERE SCOALA GIMNAZIALA DOLHESTI – GRUPURI SANITARE, CENTRALA TERMICA, BAZIN VIDANJABIL	Iasi	Dolhesti	Educatie
131	7	07-11-2014	173533	Asfaltare ulite in comuna Stroesti, judetul Vilcea	Valcea	Stroesti	Drumuri
132	8	10-11-2014	66474	Reabilitare, dotare si extindere Dispensar Medical sat Bucsani, jud. Dambovita	Dambovita	Bucsani	Medical
133	8	10-11-2014	78329	Modernizare drum comunal, DC 20 Copacioasa - Pojogeni km 5+575-8+575, judetul Gorj	Gorj	Targu Carbunesti	Drumuri
134	8	10-11-2014	83491	Reabilitare, extindere, modernizare Casa de cultura, orasul Borsec, judetul Harghita	Harghita	Borsec	Cultural
135	8	10-11-2014	146744	Reabilitare Strazi in municipiul Vatra Dornei judetul Suceava	Suceava	Vatra Dornei	Drumuri
136	8	10-11-2014	33202	Construirea unui sediu de primarie in localitatea Dumitra, jud. Bistrita Nasaud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Dumitra	Municipality
137	8	10-11-2014	34477	Gradinita Sinmihaiu de Campie, jud. Bistrita Nasaud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Sinmihaiu	Educatie
138	8	10-11-2014	78472	Infiintare sistem alimentare cu apa invatra de sat Campu Mare si statie de tratare a apei la gospodaria de apa Albeni, comuna Albeni, judetul Gorj.	Gorj	Albeni	Alimentare apa
139	8	10-11-2014	25148	Modernizare drum local sat Coman, comuna Sanduleni, judetul Bacau	Bacau	Sinduleni	Drumuri
140	8	10-11-2014	100086	REABILITARE SI MODERNIZARE SCOALA GIMNAZIALA VINATORI	Iasi	Vinatori	Educatie
141	9	12-11-2014	150935	REABILITARE SI MODERNIZARE SCOALA GIMNAZIALA "IORGU G. TOMA", COMUNA VAMA, JUDETUL SUCEAVA	Suceava	Vama	Educatie
142	9	12-11-2014	72926	Alimentare cu apa in sistem centralizat in comuna leu, sat ZanoagaA	Dolj	Leu	Alimentare apa

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
143	9	12-11-2014	166137	Infiintarea sistemului de canalizare in sat Fedesti, comuna Suletea, judetul Vaslui	Vaslui	Suletea	canalizare
144	9	12-11-2014	166137	Infiintarea sistemului de alimentare cu apa in sat Fedesti, com Suletea	Vaslui	Suletea	Alimentare apa
145	9	12-11-2014	176338	MODERNIZARE DC165 SECTOR DJ204P – RASCA, km 0+000-3+500	Vrancea	Gura Calitei	Drumuri
146	9	12-11-2014	35054	Extindere retea de canalizare pe strazile laterale din loc. Telciu	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Telciu	canalizare
147	9	12-11-2014	79932	Modernizare drum comunal DC40 Cruset_Slavuta comuna Cruset, judetul Gorj	Gorj	Cruset	Drumuri
148	9	12-11-2014	66697	Gradinita cu 5 grupe in comuna Cojasca satul Fantanele.	Dambovita	Cojasca	Educatie
149	10	13-11-2014	122132	Extindere, reabilitare utilitati sediu primarie Costisa, jud. Neamt	Neamt	Costisa	Municipality
150	10	13-11-2014	101957	Modernizare infrastructura rutiera pe strazile Tineretului, Piersicilor, Narciselor, Viitorului, Rasaritului si Aviatiei	Ilfov	Ciorogirla	Drumuri
151	10	13-11-2014	163903	Modernizare drumuri prin asfaltare in comuna Gagesti, jud. Vaslui	Vaslui	Gagesti	Drumuri
152	10	13-11-2014	122132	EXTINDERE SCOALA GENERALA CLASELE I-VIII, COMUNA COSTISA, JUDETUL NEAMT	Neamt	Costisa	Educatie
153	10	13-11-2014	74411	Asfaltare drumuri de interes local in comuna Teslui, jud. Dolj, sat Viisoara Mosneni, Urieni, Teslui	Dolj	Teslui	Drumuri
154	10	13-11-2014	71518	Modernizare strazi rurale in Comuna Caraula, Jud. Dolj	Dolj	Caraula	Drumuri
155	11	14-11-2014	63633	Alimentare cu apa in localitatea Ladauti, com. Barcani, jud. Covasna	Covasna	Barcani	Alimentare apa
156	11	14-11-2014	63633	Canalizare menajera in localitatea Ladauti, com.	Covasna	Barcani	canalizare

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
				Barcani, jud. Covasna			
157	12	17-11-2014	22488	Modernizare drumuri locale in satul Filipeni, Comuna Filipeni, judetul Bacau	Bacau	Filipeni	Drumuri
158	12	17-11-2014	105570	Modernizare strazi in comuna Tunari, judetul Ilfov	Ilfov	Tunari	Drumuri
159	14	28-11-2014	136768	Reabilitare drum comunal DC43 Andrid-Salacea	Satu Mare	Andrid	Drumuri
160	14	28-11-2014	137103	Extindere retea de alimentare cu apa potabila a localitatilor Barsau de Sus si Barsau de Jos, com. Barsau, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Birsau	Alimentare apa
161	14	28-11-2014	137103	Extindere retea de canalizare ape uzate menajere in localitatile Barsau de Sus si Barsau de Jos, com. Barsau, Jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Birsau	Canalizare
162	14	28-11-2014	136964	Reabilitare drum comunal DC142 Beltiug-Giungi	Satu Mare	Beltiug	Drumuri
163	14	28-11-2014	137844	Retea de canalizare menajera si statie de epurare in localitatile Giurtelec, com. Hodod	Satu Mare	Hodod	Canalizare
164	14	28-11-2014	138404	Gradinita cu program normal 4 sali de grupe	Satu Mare	Racsa	Educatie
165	14	28-11-2014	138921	Alimentare cu apa a localitatii Giorocuta, com. Supur, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Supur	Alimentare apa
166	14	28-11-2014	138921	Camin cultural cu sala multifunctionala localitati Giorocuta, com. Supur, Jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Supur	Cultural
167	14	28-11-2014	138921	Baza sportiva multifunctionala in localitatea Supuru de Jos	Satu Mare	Supur	SPORT
168	14	28-11-2014	139250	Reabilitare termica si reparatii curente la Dispensar uman, com. Urziceni, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Urziceni	Medical
169	14	28-11-2014	139250	Modernizare strazi in com. Urziceni si Urziceni Padure, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Urziceni	Drumuri
170	14	28-11-2014	136526	Modernizare drum E671 (DN19) in Municipiul Carei	Satu Mare	Carei	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
171	14	28-11-2014	136526	Reabilitare si modernizare sala de repetitii pentru Casa de Cultura Carei	Satu Mare	Carei	Cultural
172	14	28-11-2014	136526	Reabilitare corp D al manejului Castel Karolyi	Satu Mare	Carei	Cultural
173	14	28-11-2014	136483	Reabilitare cladire corp C5, invatamant primar din cadrul Liceului Teoretic German Johann Ettinger	Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Cultural
174	14	28-11-2014	136483	Reparatii capitale pod Decebal peste raul Somes	Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Drumuri
175	14	28-11-2014		Retea canalizare menajera in satul Agarbiciu	Satu Mare	Capusu Mare	Canalizare
176	14	28-11-2014	136964	Reafacere podet dalat peste paraul Maria in satul Ratesti	Satu Mare	Beltiug	Drumuri
177	14	28-11-2014	136964	Refacere podet dalat peste paraul Bolda in satul Bolda	Satu Mare	Beltiug	Drumuri
178	14	28-11-2014	137844	Modernizare drumuri de interes local comuna Hodod, judetul Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Hodod	Drumuri
179	15	28-11-2014	117998	Construire teren de sport in localitatea Baita	Mures	Lunca	SPORT
180	15	28-11-2014	85289	Reabilitare strazi si drumuri comunale in com. Plaiesii de Jos, drum comunal DC120	Harghita	Plaiesii de Jos	Drumuri
181	16	02-12-2014	162381	Apa	Vaslui	Bacesti	Alimentare apa
182	16	02-12-2014	138574	Apa	Satu Mare	Piscolt	Alimentare apa
183	16	02-12-2014	97722	Primarie	Iasi	Lungani	Municipality
184	16	02-12-2014	167240	Modernizare drumuri de interes local, comuna Rafaila, judetul Vaslui	Vaslui	Rafaia	Drumuri
185	16	02-12-2014	121297	Gradinita	Neamt	Bicaz	Educatie
186	16	02-12-2014	97722	Gradinita sat Conceea	Iasi	Lungani	Educatie
187	16	02-12-2014	63125	Gradinita Valea Seaca	Constanta	Valu lui traian	Educatie
188	16	02-12-2014	305	Parc balnear Belting	Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Turism
189	16	02-12-2014	305	Reabilitare sediu administrativ	Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Municipality

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
190	16	02-12-2014	138538	Reabilitarea, modernizarea si dotarea unitatilor sanitare din localitatea Pir, judetul Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Pir	Medical
191	16	02-12-2014	137899	Camin cultural	Satu Mare	Homoroade	Cultural
193	16	02-12-2014	305	Biblioteca	Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Educatie
194	16	02-12-2014	305	Centru scolar	Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Educatie
195	16	02-12-2014	97722	Gradinita	Iasi	Lungani	Educatie
196	16	02-12-2014	138208	Canal	Satu Mare	Moftin	Canalizare
197	16	02-12-2014	138208	Scoala	Satu Mare	Moftin	Educatie
198	16	02-12-2014	138208	Drum	Satu Mare	Moftin	Drumuri
199	16	02-12-2014	138574	Modernizare drumuri si strazi in localitati ale comunei Piscolt, jud Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Piscolt	Drumuri
200	16	02-12-2014	63125	Gradinita zona lotizata C	Constanta	Valu lui traian	Educatie
201	16	02-12-2014	138574	Modernizare strada Unirii, comuna Piscolt, judetul Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Piscolt	Drumuri
202	17	03-12-2014	138618	Reabilitare drum comunal DC24, intersectie DJ193B Bicaeu, comuna Pomi, judetul Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Pomi	Drumuri
203	17	03-12-2014	85528	Scoala	Harghita	Sarmas	Educatie
207	17	03-12-2014	139287	Camin	Satu Mare	Valea Vinului	Cultural
208	17	03-12-2014	139143	Canal	Satu Mare	Tarsolt	Canalizare
209	17	03-12-2014	138618	Drumuri Borlesti	Satu Mare	Pomi	Drumuri
210	17	03-12-2014	32599	Reabilitare drum DC2B, km 0+000 – 5+000, intersectie DN17D – sat Cormaia, judetul Bistrita Nasaud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Sangeorz Bai	Drumuri
211	17	03-12-2014	40492	Scoala Generala 1	Brasov	Zarnesti	Educatie
212	17	03-12-	40492	Scoala Generala 3	Brasov	Zarnesti	Educatie

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
		2014					
213	17	03-12-2014	40492	Continuarea lucrarilor de reabilitare si modernizare a corpului A al Gradinitei nr. 1 din Zarnesti, prin realizarea de investitii in reabilitarea termica	Brasov	Zarnesti	Educatie
214	17	03-12-2014	22059	Construire gradinita noua cu program normal cu 3 Sali de grupa in sat Bilca, comuna Cotofanesti, judetul Bacau	Bacau	Cotofanesti	Educatie
215	17	03-12-2014	138618	Retea cananalizare	Satu Mare	Pomi	Canalizare
216	18	04-12-2014	37217	Modernizare si reabilitare scoala, sat Durnesti, com. Durnesti	Botosani	Durnesti	Educatie
217	18	04-12-2014	37217	Modernizarea si reabilitarea dispensarului uman din com. Durnesti	Botosani	Durnesti	Medical
218	19	05-12-2014	139287	Camin	Satu Mare	Valea Vinului	Cultural
220	19	05-12-2014	124634	Sala de sport sat Adjudeni	Neamt	Tamaseni	SPORT
221	19	05-12-2014	66580	Construire sediu primarie	Dambovita	Cobia	Municipality
222	19	05-12-2014	67167	Asfaltare si modernizare drum	Dambovita	Cringuri	Drumuri
223	19	05-12-2014	100335	Scoala	Iasi	Rachiteni	Educatie
225	19	05-12-2014	122061	Dispensar	Neamt	Candesti	Medical
226	19	05-12-2014	123914	Modernizare drumuri satesti	Neamt	Raucesti	Drumuri
227	19	05-12-2014	123914	Construire pod	Neamt	Raucesti	Drumuri
228	19	05-12-2014	40438	Apa	Brasov	Sacele	Alimentare apa
229	19	05-12-2014	40438	Canal	Brasov	Sacele	Canalizare
230	19	05-12-2014	32633	Gradinita	BISTRITA-NASAUD	BISTRITA BIRGAULUI	Educatie
231	19	05-12-2014	41177	Drum Hoghiz - Cuciulata	Brasov	Hoghiz	Drumuri
232	19	05-12-2014	41177	Gradinita	Brasov	Hoghiz	Educatie

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
234	19	05-12-2014	85528	Scoala	Harghita	Samas	Educatie
235	19	05-12-2014	138351	Modernizare drum Orasu Nou-Orasu Nou Vii, com. Orasu Nou, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Orasul Nou	Drumuri
236	19	05-12-2014	33845	Modernizare drum comunal DC21 si ulita Pe Vale in comuna Micestii de Campie, judetul Bistrita Nasaud	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Micestii de Campie	Drumuri
237	19	05-12-2014	50399	Drum	Buzau	Valcelele	Drumuri
238	19	05-12-2014	147241	Drum DC48B, sat Sadau	Suceava	Brodina	Drumuri
239	19	05-12-2014	167222	Drum DC84 Suseni Manzati	Vaslui	Ibanesti	Drumuri
240	19	05-12-2014	94731	Drum DC25	Calarasi	Valcelele	Drumuri
241	19	05-12-2014	162693	Drum	Vaslui	Bogdanesti	Drumuri
242	19	05-12-2014	162014	Drum DC164; DJ244M	Vaslui	Albesti	Drumuri
243	19	05-12-2014	166315	Drum DJ244E	Vaslui	Tatarani	Drumuri
244	19	05-12-2014	40438	Drum	Brasov	Sacele	Drumuri
245	19	05-12-2014	162381	Alimentare cu apa	Vaslui	Bacesti	Alimentare apa
246	19	05-12-2014	147134	Modernizare si asfaltare drumuri comunale, com. Bosanci	Suceava	Bosanci	Drumuri
247	19	05-12-2014	93370	Strazi	Calarasi	Dor Marunt	Drumuri
248	19	05-12-2014	164892	Apa	Vaslui	Miclesti	Alimentare apa
249	19	05-12-2014	166182	Modernizare strada nr. 16	Vaslui	Tanacu	Drumuri
250	19	05-12-2014	378	Drum DJ284:DN24B	Vaslui	Vaslui	Drumuri
251	19	05-12-2014	107001	Modernizare strada	Maramures	Ardusat	Drumuri
252	19	05-12-2014	112995	Modernizare drum comunal DC38, DJ670	Mehedinti	Ponoarele	Drumuri
253	19	05-12-2014	111550	Apa	Mehedinti	Darvari	Alimentare apa
254	19	05-12-	80908	Apa	Gorj	Musetesti	Alimentare

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
		2014					apa
255	19	05-12-2014	70414	Amenajare zona agrement turistic	Dolj	Filiasi	Turism
256	19	05-12-2014	73709	Canalizare	Dolj	Plenita	Canalizare
257	19	05-12-2014	72926	Apa - zanoaga	Dolj	Leu	Alimentare apa
258	19	05-12-2014	104136	Stazi	Giurgiu	Mihailesti	Drumuri
259	19	05-12-2014	121055	Reabilitare biblioteca	Neamt	Targu Neamt	Cultural
260	19	05-12-2014	81861	Drum stradal modernizare	Gorj	Scoarta	Drumuri
261	20	08-12-2014	115183	Scoala Generala	Mures	Apold	Educatie
263	20	08-12-2014	57449	Drum	Cluj	Cornesti	Drumuri
264	20	08-12-2014	74108	Canalizare	Dolj	Seaca de Camp	Canalizare
265	20	08-12-2014	98505	Modernizare tronson din DC13, Cirlig (DN24) Cuza Voda, comuna Popricani, judetul Iasi	Iasi	Popricani	Drumuri
266	20	08-12-2014	111220	DC3	Mehedinti	Ciresu	Drumuri
267	20	08-12-2014	58856	Drum	Cluj	Panticeu	Drumuri
269	20	08-12-2014	121607	Scoala I-IV	Neamt	Bodesti	Educatie
270	20	08-12-2014	121607	Scoala I-VIII	Neamt	Bodesti	Educatie
271	20	08-12-2014	81264	Modernizare drumuri satesti si vicinale ce apartin domeniului public, com. Plopsoru	Gorj	Plopsoru	Drumuri
272	22	11-12-2014	70502	Modernizare strazi in orasul Segarcea, jud. Dolj	Dolj	Segarcea	Drumuri
273	22	11-12-2014	171325	Modernizare drumuri in satul Scarisoara, com. Mihailesti	Valcea	Mihaesti	Drumuri
274	22	11-12-2014	123255	Modernizare drum DC75 si str. Pompierului	Neamt	Oniceni	Drumuri
275	22	11-12-2014	49545	Modernizare infrastructura rutiera	Buzau	Smeeni	Drumuri
276	22	11-12-	46313	Drumuri	Buzau	Cislau	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
		2014					
277	22	11-12-2014	47159	Canalizare	Buzau	Largu	Canalizare
279	22	11-12-2014	175590	Modernizare drum Ciorasti - Salcia Noua DC192	Vrancea	Ciorasti	Drumuri
280	22	11-12-2014	44989	Reabilitare drumuri de inters local in satul Balaceanu, com. Balaceanu, jud. Buzau	Buzau	Balaceanu	Drumuri
281	22	11-12-2014	125418	Reabilitare. modernizare strazi	Olt	Bals	Drumuri
282	22	11-12-2014	47453	Modernizare drumuri comunale DC47 si DC 226 in com. Merei, jud. Buzau	Buzau	Merei	Drumuri
283	22	11-12-2014	120922	Baza sportiva noua, model tip I	Neamt	Horia	SPORT
285	22	11-12-2014	100610	Modernizare strazi etapa II	Calarasi	Oltenita	Drumuri
286	23	12-12-2014	45619	Drum DC 188	Buzau	Breaza	Drumuri
287	23	12-12-2014	74842	Modernizare drumuri comunale in comuna Catane	Dolj	Catane	Drumuri
288	23	12-12-2014	21971	Drum	Bacau	Corbasca	Drumuri
290	23	12-12-2014	16944	Modernizare DC152 L=6+420; Drum local L=348 m, comuna Lunca Corbului, judetul Arges	Arges	Lunca Corbului	Drumuri
292	24	15-12-2014	97722	Apa	Iasi	Lungani	Alimentare apa
293	24	15-12-2014	62798	Strazi reabilitare	Constanta	Rasova	Drumuri
295	24	15-12-2014	42101	Canalizare	Brasov	Ucea	Canalizare
296	25	18-12-2014	180055	Reabilitare, extindere Primarie	Calarasi	Crivat	Municipality
297	25	18-12-2014	35429	Extindere sediu Primarie	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Zagra	Municipality
298	25	18-12-2014	95792	Baza sportiva	Iasi	Baltati	Educatie
299	25	18-12-2014	119212	Modernizare DC92	Arges	Teiu	Drumuri
300	25	18-12-2014	17726	Extindere alimentare cu apa	Arges	Negrasi	Alimentare apa
301	25	18-12-2014	39532	Drum comunal DC29	Botosani	Unteni	Drumuri
302	25	18-12-	70673	Drum de legatura cu DJ542	Dolj	Amarastii de	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
		2014				Sus	
303	25	18-12-2014	74581	Asfaltare drumuri comunale	Dolj	Valea Stanciului	Drumuri
304	25	18-12-2014	75472	Reabilitare strazi si drumuri	Galati	Targu Bujor	Drumuri
305	25	18-12-2014	103354	Modernizare drum	Giurgiu	Gostinu	Drumuri
307	25	18-12-2014	58794	Reabilitare drumuri	Cluj	Palatca	Drumuri
308	25	18-12-2014	105623	Canalizare	Giurgiu	Ulmi	Canalizare
309	25	18-12-2014	78711	Sistem centralizat de canalizare si epurare	Gorj	Baia de Fier	Canalizare
310	25	18-12-2014	105570	Modernizare strazi	Ilfov	Tunari	Drumuri
311	26	19-01-2015	103567	Reabilitare si reamenajare camin cultural	Satu Mare	Crucisor	Cultural
312	26	19-01-2015	103561	Modernizare camin cultural in localitatea Vezendiu - completare	Satu Mare	Tiream	Cultural
313	26	19-01-2015	104856	Reabilitare modernizare si dotare dispensar medical	Satu Mare	Craidorolt	Medical
314	26	19-01-2015	104850	Reabilitare, modernizare, dotare si extindere asezamant cultural in localitatea Stana, comuna Socond	Satu Mare	Socond	Cultural
315	26	19-01-2015	104847	Gradinita cu trei grupe in localitatea Bogdand	Satu Mare	Bogdand	Educatie
316	26	19-01-2015	107083	Reabilitare, modernizare, dotare si extindere asezamant cultural in localitatea Marna, in comuna Sanislau, jud. Satu Mare	Satu Mare	Sanislau	Cultural
317	27	20-01-2015		Gradinita	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Budacu de Jos	Educatie
318	27	20-01-2015		Gradinita	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Sinmihaiu de campie	Educatie
319	27	20-01-2015		Gradinita cu program prelungit	Constanta	Valu lui Traian	Educatie
320	27	20-01-2015		Pod peste raul Barlad	Neamt	Oniceni	Drumuri
321	27	20-01-2015		Reabilitare, modernizare strazi	Prahova	Slanic	Drumuri
322	27	20-01-		Constructie sediu primarie	Prahova	Izvoarele	Municipality

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
		2015					
323	27	20-01-2015		Scoala Gimnaziala	Suceava	Dornesti	Educatie
324	29	23-02-2015		Scoala gimnaziala Mailat	Arad	Vinga	Educatie
325	29	23-02-2015		Scoala - reabilitare	Arad	Craiva	Educatie
326	30	23-02-2015		Sc. clasele I-VIII, extindere, reabilitare si modernizare	Arad	Seleus	Educatie
327	30	23-02-2015		Consolidare, reabilitare si modernizare scoala gimnaziala nr.2, com. Vinga , jud. Arad	Arad	Vinga	Educatie
328	30	23-02-2015		Consolidare, reabilitare si modernizare scoala gimnaziala nr.1, com. Vinga , jud. Arad	Arad	Vinga	Educatie
329	31	23-02-2015		Scoala I-VIII, extindere si reabilitare	Arad	Seleus	Educatie
331	31	23-02-2015		Liciu Mihai Viteazu, reabilitare si modernizare	Arad	Ineu	Educatie
332	30	23-02-2015		Scoala Gimnaziala - extindere, reabilitare si modernizare	BISTRITA-NASAUD	Zagra	Educatie
333	29	23-02-2015		Scoala I-IV - reabilitare si modernizare	Calarasi	Gradistea	Educatie
334	29	23-02-2015		Scoala gimnaziala - extindere	Calarasi	Chirnogi	Educatie
335	29	23-02-2015		Scoala I-IV sat Rasa, extindere, reabilitare	Calarasi	Gradistea	Educatie
336	30	23-02-2015		Scoala I-IV reabilitare si modernizare	Calarasi	Tamadau	Educatie
337	31	23-02-2015		Sc. gen nr. 3, reabilitare si modernizare	Calarasi	Chirnogi	Educatie
338	31	23-02-2015		Sc. V-VII, reabilitare si extindere	Calarasi	Gradistea	Educatie
339	29	23-02-2015		Gradinita 7 - lucrari amenajare	Constanta	Cernavoda	Educatie
340	30	23-02-2015		Sc. Gimnaziala, Mansardare, reabilitare si modernizare	Covasna	Sita Buzaului	Educatie
341	31	23-02-2015		Sc. gimnaziala nr. 3 consolidare, reabilitare, extindere si imprejmuire	Covasna	Sita Buzaului	Educatie
342	30	23-02-2015		Scoala supraetajare si reabilitare	Dambovita	Comisani	Educatie

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
343	30	23-02-2015		Sc. Gimnaziala - extindere si modernizare	Dolj	Cosoveni	Educatie
344	30	23-02-2015		Sc. gimnaziala reabilitare si modernizare	Dolj	Apele vii	Educatie
345	31	23-02-2015		Sc. gimnaziala, reabilitare, modernizare si extindere	Dolj	Calopar	Educatie
346	31	23-02-2015		Sc. gimnaziala nr. 4, Radu Voda Fetesti - reabilitare si modernizare	Ialomita	Fetesti	Educatie
347	29	23-02-2015		Liceu	Maramures	Somcuta Mare	Educatie
348	29	23-02-2015		Gradinita	Maramures	Viseu de Jos	Educatie
349	29	23-02-2015		Liceu tehnologic - reabilitare si modernizare	Prahova	Cerasu	Educatie
350	29	23-02-2015		Extindere, reabilitare si modernizare scoala Dumitru Ghenoiu, oras Baicoi, jud. Prahova	Prahova	Baicoi	Educatie
351	30	23-02-2015		Gradinita reabilitare si modernizare	Prahova	Surani	Educatie
352	30	23-02-2015		Sc. Gimnaziala - reabilitare si modernizare	Prahova	Teisani	Educatie
353	30	23-02-2015		Sc. gimnaziala Liliesti, extindere cu afterschool	Prahova	Baicoi	Educatie
354	30	23-02-2015		Sc. extindere Maneciu Pamanteni	Prahova	Maneciu	Educatie
355	30	23-02-2015		Sc I-VIII, extindere, reabilitare si modernizare	Prahova	Posesti	Educatie
356	31	23-02-2015		Scoala I-VIII Tinea, reparatii generale si modernizare	Prahova	Baicoi	Educatie
357	31	23-02-2015		Gradinita si Scoala Valea Borului, extindere si mansardare	Prahova	Cerasu	Educatie
358	31	23-02-2015		Sc. Dambu, consolidare si imprejmuire	Prahova	Baicoi	Educatie
359	31	23-02-2015		Liceu tehnic C-tin Cantacuzion, extindere, reabilitare sala de sport	Prahova	Baicoi	Educatie
360	35	30-03-2015		Scoala gimnaziala Poiana	Gorj	Turburea	Educatie
361	35	30-03-2015		Reabilitare scoala - Liceu	Prahova	Magurele	Educatie
362				Modernizarea strazii Soros si construire pod peste valea	Cluj	Panticeu	Drumuri

No	List	DATA	SIRUTA	DOCUMENTATII MDRAP EVALUATE INCEPAND CU 01 Octombrie 2014	JUDET	LOCALITATE	TIP
				Gombosoaiei in localitatea Panticeu			
363				Refacere si modernizare drumuri Ucea de Sus	Brasov	Ucea	Drumuri

Annex 7: Triage results (separate file)