**ANNEX 7: QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID**

**Second call for proposals – Regular projects**

The Quality Assessment criteria are divided into sections and subsections. The quality assessment criteria are divided into strategic and operational. Each section has the maximum score which consists of the sum of scores received in subsections. Each subsection will be given a score in accordance with the guidelines below. Half point scores (0.5 points) above 1 point and below 4 points are allowed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4 points - Very good**  **(VG)** | The application fulfils the requirements to an excellent extent and the provided information is sufficient, clear and coherent for assessing it.  e.g. The need for transnational cooperation to address the identified challenge is clearly explained, the common challenges are tackled in a way providing results that are in scope of the Interreg NEXT Black Sea Basin Programme objectives; main outputs including mandatory output RCO87 are described in details, are correctly identified, linked, quantified and in line with the criteria in the definition of related Programme common output (RCO) and result (RCR) indicators; project work plan is very good, activities and role of partners are described in details, the workplan is well-balanced and partners have the capacity to implement the project and reach the target group(s); partnership composition is relevant and the partners have competence to act in the thematic field concerned, reaching the results is foreseen in a cost-efficient way providing added value for the programme area; project provides sustainability of results and durability of actions, complements with other projects and activities. |
| **3 points - Good**  **(G)** | The application fulfils the requirements, however there are some shortcomings in tackling common challenges or planned joint actions.  e.g. There is a need for transnational cooperation, however there are shortcomings in the work plan: the proposed approach tackles only partially the identified common challenges, activities and role of partners are described in details; main outputs are clearly described, however, only some of them are correctly identified, linked, quantified and in line with the criteria of related RCO and RCR indicators; mandatory output indicators are identified but they are incorrectly quantified and linked to the RCO and RCR; partners are relevant and have the competence to act in the area they are applying, results are in line and the cost-efficiency of reaching the results is ensured; results are realistic and achievable within the project duration and bring added value; sustainability of results (where relevant) could be improved, durability of actions is ensured, project complements with other projects and activities. |
| **2 points - Weak**  **(W)** | The application has serious shortcomings fulfilling the requirements and/or the provided information is of low quality.  e.g. The transnational relevance of the project is not clearly justified; the main outputs are not clearly described, they are not correctly identified, linked, quantified and in line with the criteria of related RCO and/or RCR; mandatory output indicators are not identified; the target groups of main outputs are not described. There are serious shortcomings in regard of tackling common challenges or undertaking joint actions; the scope and the approach are having shortcomings in work plan (activities and role of partners are described in brief), relevance and competence to act in the thematic field concerned of the partners is not demonstrated, the cost-efficiency is weak, or the results do not bring added value or are not realistic and achievable within the project duration; sustainability of results (where relevant) is weak, the durability of actions is weak. |
| **1 point - Unsatisfactory**  **(U)** | The application does not fulfil the requirements or information required is missing.  e.g. There is no transnational cooperation added value, there are no common challenges tackled or there is no joint actions planned, or the project is out of scope of the Interreg NEXT Black Sea Basin Programme objectives, or project work plan is weak, the partners do not have the capacity to implement the project or are not relevant, or the results are not targeted, realistic and achievable within the project duration. Results are not cost-effective or not providing added value for the programme area. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality assessment (Award criteria)** | **Indicative description on how to understand the assessment criteria** | **Maximum**  **Score** | **Reference to Application Form section (s) and annexes** |
| 1. **STRATEGIC CRITERIA** | | | |
| 1. **RELEVANCE (If the score is less than 3 points for any sub-criteria below, the application will be rejected)** | | | |
| 1.1 The project proposal is relevant in relation to the targeted programme specific objective and the expected results | * The project overall objective is clearly in line with one of the programme’s specific objective and field of action; * The project’s main outputs and results are linked and will contribute to the selected programme specific objective and its related indicator(s). | **4** | A, C.1, C.4, C.5 |
| 1.2. The added value of transnational cooperation for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated | * The project clearly identifies and describes the common problems and needs for the targeted regions; * The planned activities are suitable for tackling at transnational level the identified problems and needs; * The planned objectives and results demonstrate the transnational added value for the topic addressed. | **4** | C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3 C.4, C.5, C.7.5 |
| 1. **COHERENCE** | | | |
| 2.1. The project intervention logic (i.e project specific objective, activities, outputs and expected results) is consistent and clearly defined. | * Project specific objective, activities, outputs and expected results are clearly defined; * The planned outputs and results are achievable by implementing the proposed activities. | **4** | C.4, C.5 |
| 2.2 The indicators are correctly identified and quantified. | * The result and output indicators are correctly identified; * Outputs and results contribute to result and output indicators as defined in the Programme Performance Framework Methodology; * The quantification of result(s) and output(s) indicators is realistic. | **4** | C.4, C.5 |
| 1. **QUALITY OF THE RESULTS** | | | |
| 3.1 The project outputs will have an impact beyond project life time | * Project main outputs are durable (the proposal is expected to provide a durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted); * The developed concept includes institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project end. * Project main outputs are applicable and replicable by other organisations/regions/ countries outside of the current partnership (transferability); | **4** | C.8 |
| 3.2 Synergies, horizontal principles and capitalization | * Project contributes to the Common Maritime Agenda goals and priorities; * The project contributes to another macro-regional strategy (EUSDR[[1]](#footnote-2), EUSAIR[[2]](#footnote-3)) and/or to other relevant Black Sea strategy (e.g. SRIA[[3]](#footnote-4)); * The project creates synergies or builds on available knowledge and/or on the outcomes of BSB projects or other projects, programmes or initiatives; * The project describes well the contribution to the horizontal principles (i.e equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women, Environment protection and sustainable development). | **4** | C.2.5, C.2.6, C.2.7, C.7.6 |
| 1. **OPERATIONAL CRITERIA** | | | |
| 1. **PARTNERSHIP QUALITY** | |  |  |
| * 1. The project involves the relevant partners needed to address the common challenge/needs identified and to achieve the specific objective | * The partners have competence in the thematic field concerned; * Partners are actively involved in the joint implementation of activities; * The partners’ role in implementation of project activities and achievement of the forecasted results is described. | **4** | C.3, C.4 |
| * 1. The project partners have the, competence and financial capacity to manage a cooperation project. | * The lead partner has experience to manage a cooperation project; * The lead partner demonstrates the capacities to manage the implementation of the planned activities and achieve the expected results; * All partners have the financial capacity to secure the cash-flow needed for the project implementation, according to Annex 5 – Financial Capacity Self-Assessment. | **4** | C.3 |
| 1. **PROJECT WORKPLAN (If the score is less than 3 points for the sub-criteria 5.1 below, the application will be rejected)** | | | |
| 5.1 The workplan is coherent | * The proposed activities: * are clearly and consistently described (what, how, when, where and by whom is implemented); * are appropriate to achieve the planned outputs and results; * address the relevant target group(s); * In case of activities outside the programme area, they are described in the workplan and meet the programme requirements regarding such activities; * In case of investments, they are relevant for reaching the project objectives. | **4** | C.4, C.6, C.2.4 |
| * 1. The work-plan is realistic | * The sequence of activities is logical; * The time-schedule is feasible to implement the forecasted activities and deliver the proposed outputs in the given timeframe; | **4** | C.4, C.6 |
| * 1. The proposed management approach shows good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation | * Measures to secure a qualitative and sound project management, coordination, and risk mitigation measures are described; * Joint development, joint implementation and joint financing are demonstrated. | **4** | C.7.1, C.7.2, C.7.4, C.7.5 |
| 1. **COMMUNICATION** | | | |
| 6.1 The communication activities are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders | * The communication objectives are relevant and are expected to contribute to project specific objective; * Communication activities are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders. | **4** | C.4, C.7.3 |
| 1. **BUDGET AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS** | | | |
| * 1. The project budget demonstrates value for money, is coherent with the work plan and the envisaged outputs | * The budget is justified and necessary in terms of the forecasted activities, outputs and results; * The distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan and the envisaged outputs;  |  | | --- | | * The budget of each partner reflects the partner’s involvement in the project; |  * Planned outputs and activities are clearly reflected in the budget. | **4** | D, C4 |
| * 1. The costs included in the project budget are eligible and reasonable | * The proposed costs are eligible in terms of the programme requirements; * The proposed costs are reasonable; * There is no duplication of costs. | **4** | D, C4 |
| **TOTAL SCORE**  **If the total score is less than 37 points, the application will be rejected** | | **\_\_\_\_/56** |  |

1. EU Strategy for the Danube Region [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda for the Black Sea [↑](#footnote-ref-4)