

QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

Project identification

Project title	
Project acronym	
Project number	
Official name of the Lead Applicant organization	

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
A. STRATEGIC CRITERIA					
A.1	The project is relevant to the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals (5 points).	<p>Do the challenges addressed in the project match the thematic focus of the selected specific objective as set out in the CP?</p> <p>Maximum score will be given to project ideas directly contributing to the programme's objectives, having a</p>	<p>The project's results and main outputs clearly link to programme priority and its indicators:</p> <p>The project main overall objective clearly links to an Investment priority (Ip) of the Programme = 1 p.</p> <p>The project main results clearly link to a programme result indicator = 1 p.</p> <p>The project main outputs clearly link to the</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
		significant contribution to achieving the output/results indicators, especially those listed in the Performance Framework of the CP.	project specific objectives = 1 p. The project main outputs clearly link to programme output indicators, stated in the Performance Framework of the Programme; for Ips 5/b, 6/b, 9a and 11/b. The key implementation steps defined by the targets set for the 2018 milestone are also relevant = 2 p.		
A.2	The project addresses common territorial challenges and opportunities in the programme area - there is a real demand for the project; the project is of cross border value (5 points).	<p>What are the common territorial challenges that will be tackled by the project?</p> <p>What is the projects' approach in addressing these common challenges and / or joint assets?</p> <p>Does the project justify the need for cross border cooperation (does the proposed approach - activities, outputs and their use - and the partnership demonstrate the need for cross border cooperation)?</p>	<p>Common challenge is widely addressed in the Programme area by the project (projects submitted under Ip 11/b that can sustain cooperation in the long run will get maximum points versus one-off cooperation initiatives) = 2 p.</p> <p>The approach is new and it is proven that the cross-border cooperation is needed = 1.5 p.</p> <p>There is a real demand for the project = 1.5 p.</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
		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.			
A.3	The project addresses clearly identified needs and constraints of the target country/(ies) and/or region(s) (5 points) .	Have the local specific needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	<p>Addressed needs are clearly described = 1.5 p.</p> <p>The proposed solutions are relevant for the identified needs and constraints= 2 p.</p> <p>There are verifiable information sources to support the data presented (statistics, published surveys, etc.) = 1.5 p.</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
A.4	<p>The project proves all 4 joint cooperation criteria (5 points).</p> <p>Partnerships involving strong commitment and contributions (observing the joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing criteria) from all partners will be scored with</p>	<p>Does the project show a strong cross border character?</p> <p>(at least 3 criteria must to be fulfilled)</p>	<p>Partnership demonstrates strong commitment and contributions (observing joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing) = 5 p.</p> <p>Intermediate score can be granted, depending on the provided information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>joint development = 1 p</i> • <i>joint implementation = 1 p</i> 		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment				Comments	Sections in AF												
	maximum points!		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>joint staffing</i> = 1 p<i>joint financing</i> = 1 p<i>cooperation complying with all 4 cooperation criteria</i> = 5 p																	
A.5	<p>The target groups and the final beneficiaries are clearly defined and strategically chosen.</p> <p>Clear rationale is given on the necessity of the intervention in relation with the identified needs of the target group (5 points).</p>	<p>Are the selected target groups relevant in relation to the selected specific objective?</p> <p>Are they defined in terms of provenience and number?</p> <p>Is the selection methodology clearly described?</p>	<p>The target groups are strategically chosen considering the specifics of the project = 2 p.</p> <p>The target groups are clearly defined in terms of provenience = 1 p.</p> <p>There are numerical indicators attached regarding the size of the target groups = 1 p.</p> <p>The selection methodology is clearly described = 1 p.</p>					Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments												
A.6	<p>The proposal contains specific added-value elements related to horizontal principles, and environmental issues (5 points).</p>	<p>Do the project plan outputs that will bring additional value in the field of horizontal principles?</p>	<p>Contribution to the following horizontal principles is clearly demonstrated:</p> <table><tr><td>1p</td><td>5/b</td><td>6/b</td><td>11/b</td></tr><tr><td>Sustainable development</td><td>1 p.</td><td>1,5 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td></tr><tr><td>Equal opportunities and non-discrimination</td><td>1,5 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>3 p.</td></tr></table>				1p	5/b	6/b	11/b	Sustainable development	1 p.	1,5 p.	0,5 p.	Equal opportunities and non-discrimination	1,5 p.	0,5 p.	3 p.		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Attachments
1p	5/b	6/b	11/b																	
Sustainable development	1 p.	1,5 p.	0,5 p.																	
Equal opportunities and non-discrimination	1,5 p.	0,5 p.	3 p.																	

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment				Comments	Sections in AF
			Equality between men and women	1,5 p.	0,5 p.	0,5 p.		
			Increased use of sustainable procurement	-	0,5 p.	-		
			Consideration of life cycle costs of investment options for long term perspective	-	0,5 p.	-		
			Usage of green infrastructure	-	0,5 p.	-		
				4 p.	4 p.	4 p.		
			lp	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.		

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment				Comments	Sections in AF
			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 (Annex II.2 of the GfA and Annex V.6) = 1 p.					
A.7	The proposal demonstrates relevant impact in terms of approach, in relation to the output indicators of the relevant Investment Priority (10 points) .	Is there proportionality between the ratio of estimated output indicators of the operation and total output indicators per Ip versus ratio of costs of the operation and the total allocated budget per Ip? The assessor will verify the information provided, in terms of reality and proper justification.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 90% = 10 p. • 80% - <90% = 8 p. • 70% - <80% = 6 p. • 60% - <70% = 4 p. • 50% - <60% = 2 p. • 40% - <50% = 0 p. 					Project Budget , Workplan, Project summary
A.8	The size of the proposed partnership is in line with the proposed objectives, activities and the overall	The foreseen partnership covers the needed professional competencies; The Lead Applicant and his	Score will be maximum 5 points depending on the organization's experience in participating in and/or managing EU co-financed projects or other international					Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan,

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
	<p>volume of the project;</p> <p>The project involves the relevant partners needed to address the territorial challenge/opportunity and the objectives specified (5 points).</p>	<p>partners have relevant experience for implementing the proposed project;</p>	<p>projects of similar size and complexity.</p> <p>Partner organisations have proven experience in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.) = 2 p.</p> <p>With respect to the project's objectives, the project partnership:</p> <p>-is balanced as regards the levels, sectors, territory = 1 p.</p> <p>-consists of partners that complement each other and each partner has a defined role in the partnership and a clearly defined contribution to the project = 2p.</p>		Project Budget, Attachments
B. <u>OPERATIONAL CRITERIA</u>					
B.1	Management and Partnership (10 points)	<p>The partnership and/or the project management team cover the needed professional competences;</p>	<p>Management structures (e.g. project steering committee) are proportionate to the project size and needs and allow partners' involvement in decision-making = 2 p.</p> <p>Management procedures (such as reporting and evaluation procedures in the area of finance, project content, communication) are clear, transparent, efficient and effective = 2 p.</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
			<p>Project management includes regular contact between project partners and ensures transfer of expertise across the partnership (internal communication within the partnership) = 2 p.</p> <p>Necessary provisions for risk and quality management are in place; the project demonstrates a proper risks assessment and a concerted risk management plan; = 2 p.</p> <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 = 2 p.</p>		
B.2	<p>Communication (5 points):</p> <p>There is a coherent Communication plan and the approach is well adapted to the specific of the project as well as its target audience;</p>	<p>Maximum score will be given to project proposals including dedicated communication strategy/plan;</p>	<p>The communication objectives clearly link to the project specific objectives = 1 p.</p> <p>The approach/tactics chosen are appropriate to reach communication objectives = 1 p.</p> <p>Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders = 3 p.</p>		<p>Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments</p>

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
B.3	Work plan (10 points): Is there coherence between the expected results and the proposed approach? Can the listed results described be achieved through the proposed approach (do the planned outputs and activities lead to the described results; is the proposed approach realistic)? Are project deliverable and outputs in line with the Performance Framework of the Programme?	In particular, does the project proposal reflect the analysis of the problems involved; take into account external factors and relevant stakeholders?	<p>There is a logical link (correlation) between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results? = 1 p.</p> <p>The proposed activities (including the activities outside the programme area) and deliverables are relevant and lead to the planned main outputs and result/s, which are in line with the Performance Framework = 3 p.</p> <p>The activities, deliverables and outputs are in a logical time-sequence = 2 p.</p> <p>The proposed activities serve the needs of the identified target group = 1 p.</p> <p>Time plan is realistic (contingency included) and in line with the targets set for the 2018 milestone = 1 p.</p> <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.) = 2 p.</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
B.4	Impact and sustainability (10 points)	Maximum score will be given to projects that might become a best practice model;	<p>The project has a mid and long-term impact on the eligible area and target groups= 2 p.</p> <p>The financial and operational sustainability of the project is assured for at least 5 years after the financial closure of the project = 2</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget,

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
			<p>p.</p> <p>The results of the project has a catalysing and multiplying effect in the eligible programme area; = 2 p.</p> <p>Innovative methods are to be implemented in the project; = 2 p.</p> <p>The project might become a best practice model = 2 p.</p>		Attachments
B.5	Budget (20 points)		<p>The budget is clear and realistic; the project budget only contains eligible costs = 5 p.</p> <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.</p> <p>Total partner budgets reflect real partners' involvement (are balanced in terms of tasks and responsibilities within the partnership and realistic) = 5 p.</p> <p>Project budget appears to be proportionate to the proposed work plan¹ and the main outputs and results aimed for = 5 p.</p> <p>Also, the following aspects will be</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

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.

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
			<p>considered and if the case budget cut shall be proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The rate of the eligible preparation cost does not exceed 5% of the total eligible project cost. - The elaboration of application adds up to the amount of maximum 1% of the total eligible costs, but no more than €15,000 and is proportionate with the project complexity. - The management cost (staff costs and/or externalized services for project management) does not exceed 10% of total eligible project costs. - Total budget of activities to be carried out outside the programme area is up to maximum 10% from the financial support requested from ERDF. - The value of site supervision is limited to 5 % of the total estimated works related cost. - Total cost of investments in roads under Investment priorities other than Priority Axis 2 does not exceed 30% of the total eligible budget of the project. - If any, the costs of land acquisition (purchase /expropriations) will be included in the budget up to 5% of the ERDF estimated costs for the investment objective. - The proposal complies with the rule setting the maximum ceiling for the 		

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in AF
			small-scale infrastructure investments (Ip 6/c and 8/b).		

The project proposal is recommended for support : <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> YES, UNDER CONDITION(s) <input type="checkbox"/> NO	Total score²:	Comments:	
---	---------------------------------	------------------	--

² The minimum threshold for the Quality Assessment is of 65 points out of the total possible score of 100 points. Also, the minimum threshold for the strategic assessment criteria is 30 points (out of a total of maximum 45 points).