

QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

Project identification	
Project ID number	Pre-filled from AF
Project acronym	Pre-filled from AF
Name of the lead partner organisation (original language or English language)	Pre-filled from AF

A. Strategic assessment criteria – 57,5 p

A.1 Project relevance (20 p)

How well is the need for the project justified?

- The project addresses common territorial challenges of the programme or a joint asset of the programme area - there is a real need for the project: well justified, reasonable, well explained. (ref. AF C.2.1 and C.2.2) – 2 p
- The project clearly contributes to a wider strategy on one or more policy levels – i.e., EU / macroregional / national / regional / New European Bauhaus. (ref. AF C.2.5) – 2 p
- The project will make use of synergies with past or current EU and other projects or initiatives. (ref. AF C.2.6 and *Paper on complementarities and synergies* annexed to the Cooperation Programme) – 1 p

To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme's objectives and indicators?

- The project's overall objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the programme priority specific objective. (ref. AF C.1) – 3 p
- The project outputs clearly link to programme output indicators and their contribution to programme targets is sufficient¹. (ref. AF C.4) – 3 p
- Project's contribution to programme result indicators is realistic and sufficient². (ref. AF C.5) – 3 p

How does the project build on existing practices?

- The project makes use of available knowledge and builds on existing results and practices. (ref. AF C.2.7) – 2 p
- The project tries to avoid overlaps and replications; there is evolution of ideas. (ref. AF C.2.2) – 1 p

¹ To be determined, based on the assessor's professional judgment, taking into account the project's complexity.

² idem

- The project demonstrates new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/programme area/participating countries or adapts and implements already developed solutions. (ref. AF C.2.2) – 3 p

A.2 Cooperation character (15 p)

What added value does the cooperation bring?

- The importance of cooperation beyond borders for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated. (ref. AF C.2.3) – 3 p
- The results cannot/only to some extent be achieved without cooperation. (ref. AF C.2.3) – 3 p
- There is a clear benefit from cooperating for the project partners / target groups / project area / programme area. (ref. AF C.2.3) – 3 p

Are the mandatory cooperation criteria fulfilled?

- The project demonstrates: (ref. AF C.7.5)
 - joint development – 1,5 p (mandatory)
 - joint implementation – 1,5 p (mandatory)
 - joint staffing – 1,5 p
 - joint financing – 1,5 p

OBS: projects not getting at least 4.5p for this criterion will not enter the administrative and eligibility check and therefore will not be selected for support under the Programme.

A.3 Project intervention logic (10 p)

To what extent is the project's intervention logic plausible?

- Project-specific objectives are specific, realistic, and achievable. (ref. AF C.4) – 2 p
- Proposed outputs are needed to achieve project-specific objectives. (ref. AF C.4) – 1,5 p
- Project outputs and results that contribute to programme indicators are realistic: it is possible to achieve them with given resources in terms of time, partners, and budget. (ref. AF C.4, C.5, C.6, D) – 2 p

To what extent will project outputs have an impact beyond the project lifetime?

- Project outputs are durable, i.e. the proposal is expected to provide a significant and durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted; if not, it is justified. – (ref. AF C.8.2) – 3 p
- Project main outputs are applicable and replicable by other organisations/regions/countries outside of the current partnership (transferability); if not, it is justified. (ref. AF C.8.3) – 1.5 p

A.4 Partnership relevance (12,5 p)

To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?

- The project involves the relevant actors needed to address the territorial challenge / joint asset and the objectives specified. (ref. AF C.3) – 2.5 p
- With respect to the project's objectives, the project partnership: (ref. AF C.3)
 - is balanced with respect to the levels, sectors, territory and budget – 1.25 p
 - consists of partners that complement each other. – 1.25 p

- Partner organisations have proven competence in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project, in terms of financial, human resources, etc. (ref. AF B.1.6) – 5 p

OBS: Projects envisaging activities that involve complex/public procurement procedure(s) will not be awarded the maximum score for this criterion unless they can demonstrate their public procurement capacities with internal staff (job description/CVs) or external expertise (ToR) in case the expertise is missing inside the organization. (ref. Application annexes).

- All partners play a defined role in the partnership and the territory benefits from this cooperation. (ref. AF C.3) – 2.5 p

B. Operational assessment criteria – 42,5 p

B.1 Work plan (7,5 p)

To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent, and coherent?

- Proposed activities and deliverables are relevant and lead to planned outputs and results. (ref. AF C.4, C.5) – 2,5 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. (ref. AF C.4) – 2,5 p
- Time plan is realistic and the activities, deliverables, and outputs are in a logical time sequence. (ref. AF C.6) – 2,5 p

B.2 Project maturity (10 p)

How ready is the project?

- In which stage of completion are the administrative procedures that allow the implementation of the project (licenses, designs, permits, land acquisition, ToRs, procurement documentation, staffing, etc.) – 10 p

B.3 Communication (5 p)

To what extent are communication activities appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?

- The communication objectives are relevant and are expected to contribute to project-specific objectives. (ref. AF C.4) – 2,5 p
- Communication activities (and deliverables) are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders. (ref. AF C.4) – 2,5 p

B.4 Budget (20 p)

To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principles of economy, efficiency, and effectiveness?

- The principle of **economy** concerns minimising the costs of resources. The resources used by the project partnership for its activities should be made available in due time, in appropriate quantity and quality, and at the best price.
 - The budget allocated to staff and external expertise is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic. (ref. AF D.2 & E.3) – 2 p
 - Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation. (ref. AF D.2 & E.3) – 2 p

- The principle of **efficiency** concerns getting the most from the available resources. It is concerned with the relationship between resources employed and outputs delivered in terms of quantity, quality, and timing.
 - The need for engaging external expertise is justified and the costs seem realistic. (ref. AF E.3) – 2 p
 - Financial allocation per cost category is in line with the work plan. (ref. AF D.2 & E.3) – 2 p
 - If applicable, the distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan. (ref. AF D.4) – 2 p
- The principle of **effectiveness** concerns meeting the objectives and achieving the intended results.
 - The available information in the budget is transparent and sufficient. On that basis, the project budget appears proportionate to the proposed work plan, project outputs and project's contribution to programme indicators aimed for. (ref. AF D.2 & E.3) – 3 p
 - Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned for investments and equipment purchases (if applicable) and their costs are realistic. (ref. AF D.2 & E.3) – 2 p
 - How balanced is the budget of the project between the potential partners? (ref. AF D.2 & E.3) – 5 p

OBS: To pass the quality assessment phase, projects shall meet the following cumulative minimum requirements:

- *be scored minimum 65 points;*
- *be scored minimum 30 points for the strategic criteria (A1-A4);*
- *be scored > 0 points for each of the strategic (A1-A4) and operational (B1-B4).*

Failure to comply with the above minimum requirements shall lead to the rejection of the project proposal.