

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?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 <u>D.1.</u>
Communication (10 p.) To what extent are communication activities appropriate and forceful to	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA												
reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?																
Work plan (25 p.) To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•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.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•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. <p>Contribution to the horizontal principles is clearly demonstrated = 4 p.</p> <table><tr><td>Ip</td><td>6/c, 7/b, 7/c</td><td>8/b</td><td>9/a</td></tr><tr><td>Sustainable development</td><td>3 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td></tr><tr><td>Equal opportunities and non-discrimination</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>1,5 p.</td><td>2,5 p.</td></tr></table>	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.			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
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.													

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:				Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA
	Social inclusion of disadvantaged groups	-	0,5 p.	0,5 p.			criteria C.1., relevant studies/surveys
	Equality between men and women	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	0,5 p.			
		4p	4p	4p			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•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.						
Budget (20 p.) To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money? To what extent is the budget coherent and proportionate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•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 plan¹ and the main outputs and results aimed for = 5 p.						Work plan / work packages D.1, FA Budget , Feasibility Study, relevant studies/surveys

Total score² : _____

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.

² The minimum threshold for score obtained in the Quality Assessment is of 65 points.

<p>The project proposal is recommended for support:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	
---	--