**Phase II – Full Application**

**QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID**

**Project identification**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project title |  |
| Project acronym |  |
| Project number |  |
| Name of the Lead Applicant organization |  |

| **Assessment Criteria** | **Guiding principles for the assessment 🡪 To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:** | **Numerical assessment** | **Comments** | **Sections in FA** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Management (20 p.)  To what extent are management structures and procedures in line with the project size, duration and needs? | * Management structures are proportionate to the project size and needs and allow partners’ involvement in decision-making = **4 p.** * Management procedures (such as reporting and evaluation procedures in the area of finance, project content, communication) are clear, transparent, efficient and effective = **4 p.** * Project management includes regular contact between project partners and ensures transfer of expertise across the partnership (internal communication within the partnership) = **4p.** * Necessary provisions for risk and quality management are in place; the project demonstrates a proper risks assessment and a concerted risk management plan; = **4 p.** * The Lead Applicant demonstrates capacity to manage EU co-financed projects or other international projects or can ensure adequate measures for management support; The partnership and/or the project management team cover the needed professional competences; = **4 p.** |  |  | Project summary  A.  Project partners  B.  Work plan / work packages D.1. |
| Communication  (10 p.)  To what extent are communication activities appropriate and forceful to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders? | * The communication objectives clearly link to the project specific objectives = **3 p.** * The approach/tactics chosen are appropriate to reach communication objectives = **3 p.** * Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders = **4 p.** |  |  | Work plan / work packages D.1. |
| Work plan (25 p.)  To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent? | * Proposed activities (including the activities outside the programme area) and deliverables are relevant, clearly benefit for the programme area and lead to the planned main outputs and result/s **= 6 p.** * Distribution of tasks among partners is appropriate (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners’ role in the project, etc.) = **3 p.** * Time plan is realistic (contingency included) = **3 p.** * Activities, deliverables and outputs are in a logical time-sequence = **3 p.** * The importance of investments and their cross-border relevance is demonstrated to reach the project objectives - = **5 p.** * The proposed activities serve the needs of the identified target group = **5 p.** |  |  | Work plan / work packages D.1.,  Define Periods D.3.,  Feasibility Study, relevant studies/surveys |
| Impact and sustainability (25 p.) | * The project has a mid and long-term impact on the eligible area and target groups = **3 p.** * The financial and operational sustainability of the project is assured for at least 5 years after final payment effected by the MA = **3 p.** * The results of the project has a catalysing and multiplying effect in the eligible programme area = **3 p.** * Innovative methods are to be implemented in the project = **3 p.** * The project might become a best practice model = **3 p.**   Contribution to the horizontal principles is clearly demonstrated = **4 p.**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Ip | 6/c, 7/b, 7/c | 8/b | 9/a | | Sustainable development | 3 p. | 0,5 p. | 0,5 p. | | Equal opportunities and non-discrimination | 0,5 p. | 1,5 p. | 2,5 p. | | Social inclusion of disadvantaged groups | - | 0,5 p. | 0,5 p. | | Equality between men and women | 0,5 p. | 1,5 p. | 0,5 p. | |  | **4p** | **4p** | **4p** |  * Clearly demonstrated contribution to any of the programme level environmental indicators (Environmental Indicators Checklist) = **1 p** * The applicant indicates the project's contribution to EU Strategy for the Danube Region (encourages synergistic effects, innovative solutions, replication capacity at macro regional level, convergence with other EUSDR relevant projects) =**1p** * Partnership demonstrates strong commitment and contributions (observing joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing) = **4 p.** |  |  | Project focus / Durability of project, outputs and results C.2.,  Work plan / work packages D.1.,  Horizontal principles C.4.,  Project context C.3.,  Project relevance / Cooperation criteria C.1..,  relevant studies/surveys |
| Budget (20 p.)  To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money?  To what extent is the budget coherent and proportionate? | * The budget is clear and realistic; the project budget only contains eligible costs = **5 p.** * Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation; the project will be implemented in line with the principle of cost-effectiveness = **5 p.** * Total partner budgets reflect real partners’ involvement (are balanced in terms of tasks and responsibilities within the partnership and realistic) = **5 p.** * Project budget appears proportionate to the proposed work plan[[1]](#footnote-2) and the main outputs and results aimed for = **5 p.** |  |  | Work plan / work packages D.1,  FA Budget , Feasibility Study, relevant studies/surveys |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Total score[[2]](#footnote-3) :** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_  **The project proposal is recommended for support:**  YES  NO | Comments: |

1. Financial allocation per budget line is in line with the work plan; distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. The minimum threshold for score obtained in the Quality Assessment is of 65 points. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)