**EVALUATION GRID**

**TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| pROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER |  |
| CALL FOR PROPOSALS |  |
| assessor (NAME) |  |
| evaluation step | **2** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **PROJECT SYNOPSIS** | |
| Project Title |  |
| lEAD PARTNER |  |
| TYPE OF ACTION | soft |
| TYPE OF PROJECT | integrated / symmetrical / single country |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **RELEVANCE & contribution to the programme (max 50 points)** | | | |
| The appropriateness of the project to the problems and needs of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries, and its contribution to the Programme are evaluated. | | | |
| **1.1 RELEVANCE (max 30 points) – eliminatory section (min 15 points)** | | | |
| **(a)** | **Needs analysis** | | |
| **2** | The problem addressed by the project impacts both sides of the border from the Programme area. | | |
| **2** | The problem addressed by the project is specific to the selected Programme Priority. | | |
| **2** | Target group(s) and final beneficiaries are described with all the necessary details required by the application form. | | |
| **2** | The analysis of the problem (causes and effects) is clear and logic, is clearly affecting the target group(s) and final beneficiaries chosen, official data is provided. | | |
| **2** | The solution proposed by the project is directly tackling the needs of the target group(s) and final beneficiaries, and brings positive change to those needs. The project General/ Specific Objectives are coherent with the solution proposed. | | |
| **Maximum score = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **A2 – C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) |
| **5 - 9** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, the presentation is coherent, consistent, logic and reliable, although some details are missing or need corrections e.g. target groups and final beneficiaries) |
| **< 5** | **Poor** (statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. inconsistencies, poor logic, lack of/ unsatisfactory justification, non-reliable or missing official data, lack of coherence between different levels of the needs’ analysis) |
| **(b) Cross border impact of the project – eliminatory criterion (min 6 points)** | | | |
| **2** | The cross border impact is described as long term benefits for both sides of the border from the Programme area (e.g. for project partners, target group or final beneficiaries). | | |
| **1** | The cross border approach supports achievement of the General/and Specific Objectives of the project. | | |
| **2** | The project puts into practice at least 2 cross border cooperation criteria, namely joint staffing and joint financing (comprising both grant and co-financing). | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 X 2 = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **C1.4 – C2.1 – C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, the presentation is coherent and consistent, although it could be more detailed. Each Partner has at least 1 project responsible and 1 financial responsible and manages a share of the project budget during implementation, job descriptions have been provided) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. inconsistencies, lack of/ unsatisfactory justification/ description, the mandatory cooperation criteria are not fulfilled) |
| **(c) Project contribution to strategies and policies** | | | |
| **2** | The local/ regional/ national strategies/ policies indicated within the application form are relevant for the project field. | | |
| **2** | The General/ Specific Objectives of the project clearly contribute to the objectives of the respective strategies/ policies. | | |
| **1** | There is reference to past or current EU and other projects or initiatives that are relevant for the project field. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | |
| **C2.1 – C3.1– C3.2** | | **5** | **Very good** (all statements above are fully valid) |
| **2 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, the presentation is reliable and coherent, although it could be more detailed) |
| **< 2** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. non-relevance and/ or weak link between the General/ Specific Objectives of the project and the strategies/ policies/ EU projects/ initiatives indicated) |
| **(d)** | **Cross cutting themes** | | |
| **5** | There is positive influence on more than one cross cutting theme of the Programme, project’s contribution during project lifetime and/or ex-post is clearly explained. Different sections of the application form are coherent is this respect e.g. target groups/ final beneficiaries, activities proposed, sustainability of project outputs and results. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | |
| **A2 – C4 – C8 – C9** | | **5** | **Very good** (the statement above is fully valid) |
| **2 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statement above is valid, at least 1 cross cutting theme is addressed by the project, the presentation is coherent and feasible, although some information could be more detailed/ there are minor inconsistencies between different sections of the application form) |
| **< 2** | **Poor** (the statement above is not valid due to e.g. lack of coherence between different sections of the application form, poorly justified/non-reliable project contribution to at least 1 cross cutting theme) |
| **1.2 CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROGRAMME (max 20 points)** | | | |
| **(a)** | **Contribution to Programme Result(s) – eliminatory criterion (min 6 points)** | | |
| **1** | The Programme Expected Result and the corresponding Programme Result Indicator are correctly chosen (they do match the specific Priority). | | |
| **4** | The General Objective of the project is clearly supporting the Programme Expected Result, contribution to the related Programme Result Indicator is consistently justified and achievable. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 X 2 = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (statements above are valid, there is correct choice of the Programme Expected Result and the related Result Indicator, contribution of the project General Objective to the Programme Result Indicator is clear, but moderate. If the Programme Expected Result is not correctly chosen, the score given to the project cannot be more than 4 points “poor”) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (there is incorrect / no choice of a Programme Expected Result and/or the related Result Indicator, statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. unclear/ poor/ unreliable contribution of the project General Objective to the Programme Result Indicator) |
| **(b)** | **Contribution to Programme Output(s) – eliminatory criterion (min 6 points)** | | |
| **1** | The Programme Output(s) is/are correctly chosen (they do match the specific Priority). | | |
| **4** | The project Specific Objectives and Results are clearly contributing to more than one Programme Output(s) and the corresponding indicators, and are achievable during project lifetime. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 X 2 = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **C2.1** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) |
| **6 - 9** | **Adequate** (statements above are valid, there is correct choice of at least one Programme Output and the related Output Indicator, contribution of the project Specific Objectives to the Programme Output Indicator is clear, but moderate. If the Programme Output is not correctly chosen, the score given to the project cannot be more than 4 points “poor”) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (there is incorrect / no choice of at least one Programme Output and/or the related Output Indicator, statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. unclear/ poor/ unreliable contribution of the project Specific Objectives and Results to the Programme Output Indicator/ non-achievable during the project lifetime) |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. PROJECT DESIGN (max 35 points)** | | | | |
| The quality of the intervention logic of the project, and of the project partnership are evaluated. | | | | |
| **2.1 QUALITY OF THE INTERVENTION LOGIC (max 20 points)** | | | | |
| **(a)** | **Project General Objective** | | | |
| **2** | The General Objective is formulated as broader, long-term change of the situation of the target groups /final beneficiaries. | | | |
| **2** | The General Objective meets SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). | | | |
| **1** | Indicator(s) chosen to measure achievement of the General Objective are appropriate. | | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
| **A2 -C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the General Objective and the related indicator(s) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the General Objective, related indicator(s) are oversized/ inappropriately chosen) |
| **(b)** | **Project Specific Objectives** | | | |
| **2** | The Specific Objectives are formulated as improvements of the situation of the target groups/ final beneficiaries (see sections C1.1, C1.2 and C1.3), and are clearly contributing to achievement of the project General Objective. | | | |
| **2** | The Specific Objectives meet SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). They are feasible during project lifetime. | | | |
| **1** | Indicators chosen to measure achievement of the Specific Objectives at the end of the project are appropriate. | | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
| **A2 -C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Good** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the Specific Objectives and the related indicators) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the Specific Objectives, related indicators are oversized/ inappropriately chosen/ not-achievable during the project lifetime) |
| **(c)** | **Project results** | | | |
| **2** | The project Results are formulated as clear benefits for the target groups /final beneficiaries and are contributing to achievement of the Specific Objectives. | | | |
| **2** | The Results meet SMART requirements (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, and Time Bounded). They are feasible during project lifetime. | | | |
| **1** | Indicators chosen to measure achievement of the Results at the end of the project are appropriate. | | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
| **A2 - C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some corrections are needed to the formulation of the Results and the related indicators |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed to correctly formulate the Results, related indicators are oversized/ inappropriately chosen/ not-achievable during the project lifetime) |
| **(d)** | **Project Main Outputs** | | | |
| **3** | The Main Outputs are works, supplies and/ or services to be delivered by the project and are mandatory to achieve the stated Results. | | | |
| **2** | The Main Outputs of the project are achievable within the project lifetime. | | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
| **C1.1 – C1.2 – C1.3 – C2.1 – C2.2** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (the statements above are valid and the logic is adequate, although some details or minor corrections are needed) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid and substantial changes would be needed due to e.g. lack of clarity, lack of logic) |
| **2.2 QUALITY OF THE PROJECT PARTNERSHIP (max 15 points)** | | | | |
| **(a)** | | **Relevance of the project partnership – eliminatory criterion (min 3 points)** | | |
| **2** | | Project Partners have the necessary competencies required in the field of the project. | | |
| **3** | | The Partners chosen including, if the case, those located outside the core regions, clearly support achievement of the project Results and objectives. If applicable, the participation of Partners located outside the programme area is well substantiated, and required by the nature and project objectives. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
| **B1 – C4 (all GAs) – C6.2 – supporting documents** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (project Partners have competencies in the project field, they adequately support achievement of the project Results and objectives. In case of Partners located outside the core regions, if their involvement is not justified in relation to the project nature and/or objectives, the score given cannot be more than 2 points “poor”) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (most of the statements above are not valid, some Partners do not have the competencies necessary in the project field or have unclear contribution to achievement of project Results and objectives. In case of Partners located outside the core regions, their involvement is not justified in relation to the project nature and/or objectives) |
| **(b)** | | **Previous experience and financial capacity of the project partnership** | | |
| **2** | | More than 50% of the project Partners have participated in/ managed at least 2 EU[[1]](#footnote-1)/ other internationally funded projects. The Applicant has managed at least 1 EU[[2]](#footnote-2)/ other internationally funded project. Partners do not subcontract management of their share of the project. | | |
| **2** | | Each Partner shows reliable sources of funding in the previous year, there is good balance between the share of grant requested, and the financial resources available. Each partner provides a share of co-financing during project implementation. | | |
| **1** | | Except for public authorities, all Partners have functioned for at least 3 years before the year of submission of the proposal. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
| **B1 – C6.2 – Budget – supporting documents** | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: at least 50% of the Partners have participated in/ managed at least 1 EU/ other internationally funded project; most of the Partners do not subcontract management of their share of the project; Partners show adequate sources of funding in the previous year) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (most of the statements above are not valid, in particular: less than 50% of the Partners have participated in/ managed EU/ other internationally funded projects, including the Applicant who intends to subcontract project management; Partners have small financial resources when compared to the grant requested or availability/ continuity of these resources is questionable) |
| **(c)** | **Partners’ contribution to the project** | | | |
| **2** | Distribution of responsibilities between the project Partners is well balanced and adequate to their competencies and previous experience. | | | |
| **2** | Ratio between the total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is less than 10%. | | | |
| **1** | Each Partner contributes to project implementation with staff, office and equipment. | | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | | |
|  | | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **C1.5 – C4 (all GAs) – Budget** | | | **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: responsibilities assigned to project Partners are compliant to competencies and previous experience; each Partner has some contribution to the project with staff, office and/or equipment; the ratio between total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is less than 20%) |
|  | | | **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: inadequate assignment of responsibilities to project Partners when compared to their competencies and experience; the ration between the total amount at heading *Equipment and supplies (office equipment and endowment)* and total amount at heading *Human Resources* is more than 20%) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. PROJECT VIABILITY (max 40 points)** | | | |
| The project’s capacity to be successfully implemented and to continue after the end of EU financing is evaluated. | | | |
| **3.1 TECHNICAL FEASIBILITY (max 25 points)** | | | |
| **(a)** | **Project preparedness**[[3]](#footnote-3) | | |
| **2** | Project stakeholders are identified, they have participated to its development, some of them will benefit of capacity building/ information and communication activities during project implementation as target groups/ final beneficiaries | | |
| **3** | The project has been well prepared in advance, Partners have been involved in its preparation. The preparatory steps undertaken are clearly described. | | |
| **Maximum score = 5 POINTS** | | | |
| **C4 (GA#0, GA#1, GA#4) – C5** | | **5** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: some major stakeholders participate to the project; preparatory actions have been undertaken and project Partners have been involved) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: major project stakeholders have not been consulted/ involved in project preparation, and they are not part of the target groups and/ or final beneficiaries; the project does not fill in GA#0) |
| **(b)** | **Project management** | | |
| **3** | Project coordination and management, including communication between Partners, is clearly presented in all the aspects related to project implementation (e.g. decision making process, activities and budget management, allocation of resources, collection and exchange of information between Partners). | | |
| **2** | Procedures for self-monitoring (e.g. of project activities, outputs, results and budget) and reporting (drafting and submission of reports and payment requests) are clearly described and support project implementation. | | |
| **3** | Main external and internal risks are properly identified, measures foreseen are adequate and realistic. | | |
| **2** | The information and communication plan is adequate to the project size and to the target groups/ final beneficiaries’ specificities, and goes over the mandatory actions required by the Programme. | | |
| **Maximum score = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **C4 (GA#2, GA#3)** | | **10** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **6 – 9** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: coordination and day-to-day management, as well as self-monitoring mechanisms are adequate; major risks have been taken into account and measures to tackle them are adequate; the communication strategy is well designed but it does not go over the mandatory actions required by the Programme. More details are needed on these issues) |
| **< 6** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: inappropriate coordination and day-to-day project management; lack of knowledge concerning the project self-monitoring and its purpose; unclear framework to meet the reporting obligations; some major risks were not taken into account and/ or measures to tackle them are inappropriate/ missing; poor communication strategy) |
| **(c)** | **Project planning & methodology** | | |
| **3** | Project activities are clear, logically sequenced and necessary to achieve the intended Main Outputs within the project lifetime. | | |
| **3** | The methodology gives sufficient details about how activities are to be performed e.g. role of project Partners, targets to be achieved (outputs, deliverables). | | |
| **2** | Activities adequately involve the target groups/ final beneficiaries, including those activities to be performed outside the core regions. | | |
| **2** | The timeframe of activities is appropriate. The project is feasible within the duration proposed. | | |
| **Maximum score = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **C4 – C6 – C6.1 – C7** | | **10** | **Very good** (the statements above are fully valid) |
| **5 - 9** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: activities are necessary to achieve the Main Outputs, and logically sequenced, although the timeframe could be improved and/or some corrections would be needed; resources are reasonably used. In case of activities to be performed outside the core regions, if benefits the target groups/ final beneficiaries are not demonstrated by the project, reduction of costs should be proposed. |
| **< 5** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: weak link between the activities and the Main Outputs; inappropriate timeframe jeopardizing project implementation; unclear/ inadequate methodology; poor involvement of the target groups/ final beneficiaries) |
| **3.2 FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY (max 10 points)** | | | |
| **(a)** | **Project budget** | | |
| **2** | The budget is mathematically correct. | | |
| **2** | Costs are eligible and compliant with requirements of the Programme and of the Call for proposals. | | |
| **2** | Costs are well detailed and justified according to Programme instructions. | | |
| **2** | Costs are necessary and they are directly related to/ generated by project activities. The budget proposed is efficiently used to achieve the intended project Main Outputs and Results. | | |
| **2** | Costs are reasonable when compared to current market prices | | |
| **Maximum score = 10 POINTS** | | | |
| **C4 – Budget** | | **10** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid) |
| **5 - 9** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: the budget is overall mathematically correct; costs are sufficiently described, eligible and compliant with the requirements, although some details/ minor corrections/ clarifications would be needed; costs are overall reasonable when compared to market prices; there is correspondence between the size of the budget and the Main Outputs and Results) |
| **< 5** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid due to e.g. large number of mathematical mistakes, poor description of costs, large number of inconsistencies between the budget and description of activities, non-compliance between the costs and the requirements, overestimated costs when compared to market prices; discrepancies between the size of the budget and the Main Outputs and Results s) |
| **3.3 SUSTAINABILITY (max 5 points)** | | | |
|  | **(a) Sustainability of project Outputs and Results** | | |
| **2** | Sustainability analysis is consistent and related to project Results and Main Outputs. | | |
| **3** | Measures proposed are realistic, affordable, and verifiable, responsibilities are clear. In case of projects with an infrastructure component, measures to preserve the nature, objectives and implementation conditions of the project for 5 years after its closure are described and feasible (art.39 point 3 from 897/2014 IR). | | |
| **Maximum s = 5 POINTS** | | | |
|  | | **5** | **Very good** (all the statements above are fully valid |
| **3 - 4** | **Adequate** (most of the statements above are valid, in particular: sustainability measures are related to project Results and Main Outputs, they are adequate, feasible and verifiable after project completion, although they would need some details/ clarifications) |
| **< 3** | **Poor** (the statements above are mostly not valid, in particular: sustainability measures are not related to project Results and Main Outputs, they are expensive/ unrealistic/ cannot be verified after completion; there are serious doubts that, in case of a project with an infrastructure component, the nature, objectives and implementation conditions of the project for 5 years after its closure will be maintained) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **4. STATE AID ASSESSMENT** | | |
| To verify if the project contains state aid elements. | | |
| **NO[[4]](#footnote-4)** | **YES** | **CRITERIA** |
|  |  | Are public resources involved? |
|  |  | Are public resources granted selectively to the beneficiaries? |
|  |  | Is any beneficiary of the project an “undertaking”? |
|  |  | Does any beneficiary (“undertaking”) and/or a third party (“undertaking”) get an economic advantage that it could not normally get from the market? |
|  |  | Does the aid (financing of the project) distorts or threatens to distort competition and trade between Member States, and/or between Member States and participant countries? |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SCORES & SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS** | |
|  | 1. **Project relevance**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **Quality of project design**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **Project viability**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  | 1. **State Aid Assessment**   ***[conclusions and recommendations]*** |
|  |  |
|  | **Maximum score = 125 POINTS** |

1. Statement not applicable for Priority 4.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Statement not applicable for Priority 4.3 [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Project stakeholders are any individuals, groups of people, institutions or firms that may have a relationship with the project and may (directly or indirectly, positively or negatively) affect or be affected by the project results. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. At least one NO given to these criteria means that no State Aid is involved by the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)