|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality assessment (Award criteria)** | **Score (maximum 100)** | **Comments** |  |
| **Strategic assessment criteria (%) – maximum 55** | | |  |
| 1. **Relevance (How well is the need for the project justified?)** | **11** |  |  |
| 1.1 The project is relevant to the programme specific objective(s) and expected results and addresses the specific needs/constraints /challenges of the programme area | **5** |  | 2.5 = relevant to the programme specific objective(s) and expected results  *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *2.5= very good*  2.5 *=* addresses the specific needs/constraints /challenges of the programme area  *0.5= poor*  *1.5= adequate*  *2.5= very good* |
| 1.2 The proposed activities (including new or innovative solutions, if it is the case) are appropriate for addressing the common needs/constraints /challenges identified | **5** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *2.5 = adequate*  *5 = very good* |
| 1.3 The Application falls under one of the eligible project types (integrated project; symmetrical project; project implemented mainly or entirely in a single participating-country but having a cross-border impact) | **1** |  | **YES = 1 , NO = 0** |
| ***If the score is less than 1 point for Section 1.3 and /or less than 9 points for Section 1, the Application will be rejected*** | | |  |
| 1. **Added value and cross-border cooperation impact (What added value does the cooperation bring?)** | **13** |  |  |
| 2.1 The importance of the cross-border cooperation to the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated:   * The results cannot (or only to some extent) be achieved without cross-border cooperation * There is a clear benefit from cooperating for: * target groups and final beneficiaries * project / programme area * the project partners | **6** |  | 3 = The results cannot (or only to some extent) be achieved without cross-border cooperation  *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good*  3 = There is a clear benefit from cooperating for:  1= target groups and final beneficiaries  *0 = poor*  *0.5 = adequate*  *1 = very good*  1= project / programme area  *0 = poor*  *0.5 = adequate*  *1 = very good*  1 = the project partners  *0 = poor*  *0.5 = adequate*  *1 = very good* |
| 2.2 The following cross-cutting issues will be mainstreamed during project implementation: environmental sustainability, democracy and human rights, and gender equality | **3** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| * 1. The project contributes to at least one of the existing EU strategies implemented in the programme area (Eastern Partnership of the European Neighbourhood Policy, Danube Strategy, Blue Growth Strategy and Europe 2020). | **2** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| * 1. The project builds on available knowledge and ensures synergies and complementarities avoiding duplications with other projects or initiatives supported by the EU or at regional/national level and other national/regional strategies in the field | **2** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| ***If the score is less than 4 points for Section 2.1, the Application will be rejected*** | | |  |
| 1. **Contribution to programme priorities, expected results and outputs (To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme’s objectives?)** | **21** |  |  |
| * 1. The project’s results and main outputs are clearly linked to programme priority and its indicators. * The project overall objective clearly links to a programme priority * The project results clearly contribute to a programme result indicator * The project specific objectives clearly link to the project overall objective * The project main outputs contribute to the project specific objectives * The project main outputs clearly contribute to at least 1 programme common/specific output indicators (specific for the priority for which the project is applying) | **5x2 = 10** |  | 5 x 2 = 10  *Detail 2 :*  *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| * 1. Results and main outputs: * are clearly defined and consistent * are linked with the selected target groups needs * are realistic (is it possible to achieve them with the given resources – i.e. time, partners, budget - and in the quantity foreseen) | **3x2 = 6** |  | 3 x 2= 6  *Detail 2 :*  *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| * 1. The main project outputs and results are sustainable (financial, institutional and if it is the case, at policy level), and follow up activities/actions are foreseen and described | **3** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| * 1. The main outputs are applicable and replicable by other organisations/regions/countries outside of the current partnership (transferability) and applicability and replicability is presented and explained | **2** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| ***If the score is less than 8 points for sub-section 3.1 and less than 16 points for Section 3, the Application will be rejected*** | | |  |
| 1. **Partnership relevance (To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?)** | **10** |  |  |
| * 1. The project involves the relevant partners needed to address the challenge/needs of the target group and to achieve the specific objectives | **5** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *2.5 = adequate*  *5 = very good* |
| * 1. All partners are actively involved to jointly implement the foreseen activities and have a clear defined role. | **5** |  | *0.5 = poor*  *2.5 = adequate*  *5 = very good* |
| **Operational assessment criteria (%) (Selection criteria) maximum 45** | |  |  |
| 1. **Partnership capacity (to what extent has the partnership the experience and capacity to implement the project?)** | **12** |  |  |
| 5.1 The **lead partner** has proven experience and capacity to manage the project and **all project partners** have proven experience, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)   * The lead partner and the project partners implemented projects (EU co-financed projects or other international projects) before * The lead partner and the project partners have the financial capacity to secure the cash-flow needed for the project implementation * the staff allocated by the lead partner and by the project partners for the management and coordination of project activities is adequate to ensure a smooth project implementation | 3x4 = 12 |  | 3x4 = 12  *Detail 4:*  *0.5 = poor*  *2 = adequate*  *4 = very good* |
| ***If the score is less than 8 points for Section 5, the Application will be rejected*** | | |  |
| 1. **Communication (To what extent are information and communication activities appropriate and able to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?)** | **6** |  |  |
| 6.1 Information and communication activities are clearly defined and linked to the project specific objective | 2 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| 6.2 Information and communication activities are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders | 2 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| 6.3 All the proposed information and communication activities are necessary and proportional with project activities as a whole | 2 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1 = adequate*  *2 = very good* |
| 1. **Work plan (To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?)** | **15** |  |  |
| 7.1 Proposed activities are eligible, realistic, consistent and lead to the planned main outputs and results | 3 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| 7.2 Activities and outputs are in a logical time-sequence | 3 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| 7.3 Time plan is realistic for the proposed activities | 3 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| 7.4 Distribution of tasks among partners is clear, logical, in line with partners’ role in the project and their competencies | 3 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| 7.5 Monitoring and evaluation arrangements are foreseen and appropriate for the project size | 3 |  | *0.5 = poor*  *1.5 = adequate*  *3 = very good* |
| 1. **Budget (To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money and is coherent with the work-plan and proportionate?)** | **12** |  |  |
| * 1. Project budget is correlated with the proposed activities and realistic to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results envisaged | 6 |  | *1= poor*  *3 = adequate*  *6 = very good* |
| 8.2 The costs included in the project budget are eligible, reasonable, justified and comply with the requirements of sound financial management, in particular regarding economy and efficiency | 4 |  | *1= poor*  *2 = adequate*  *4 = very good* |
| 8.3 Calculation of flat rate for office and administrative costs is correct, is within the maximum limit and costs are reasonable | 2 |  | 0.5 = Calculation for office and administrative costs is correct (yes/no) Yes=0.5; No=0  0.5 = is within the maximum limit (yes/no) Yes=0.5; No=0  1 = costs are reasonable  *0= poor*  *0.5= adequate*  *1= very good* |

Poor = the information is incomplete, not clear or does not demonstrate adequate features for the evaluation criterion being assessed

Adequate = the proposal demonstrates overall adequate features with regards to the evaluation criterion towards which it is being assessed even though it contains some notable weaknesses;

Very good = the proposal has identifiable features which demonstrate that is of very good quality with regards to the criterion towards which it is being assessed