

GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENT OF EU IPA CBC APPLICATION PACKAGES

Dragiša Mijačić



GUIDELINES FOR ASSESSMENT OF EU IPA CBC APPLICATION PACKAGES

**EDITED BY:
DRAGISA MIJACJC
APRIL 2010**

About the Guidelines:

This Guidelines is based on a similar document provided during the assessment of applications received under EU Neighbourhood Programme Romania – Serbia 2004 - 2006. The original document is adopted for the purpose of the assessment of applications received under EU IPA Cross-Border Cooperation Programmes between the Western Countries.

The Guidelines is developed as a tool to assist Assessors in assessment of each criterion of the proposal evaluation grid. The Guidelines does not have intention to restrict the Assessors in grading the applications, neither to advocate normative standards for assessment of IPA CBC Applications to EC and respective national authorities.

The Guidelines might also be used by the applicants in checking the quality of their applications prior to the final submission to the authorities.

The Guidelines is a public documents which can be distributed without having permission from the Editor. The Editor and InTER will not be responsible for any misuse of the presented documents.



About InTER:

Institute for territorial Economic Development (InTER) is a non-for-profit independent non-governmental think tank, established with the aim to promote and advance sustainable socio-economic territorial development of the countries of the Western Balkans. InTER is active in the field of local and regional development, strategic planning of territorial development, cluster development, public administration reform, EU project development, etc. InTER gathers scholars and practitioners with excellent experience in the fields of its operations.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION GRID

| Section | Maximum Score |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------|
| 1. Financial and operational capacity Note: If the total average score is less than 12 points for section 1: Financial and operational capacity, the Evaluation Committee will reject the proposal | 20 |
| 1.1 Do the applicant and, if applicable, partners have sufficient experience of project management ? | 5 |
| 1.2 Do the applicant and, if applicable partners have sufficient technical expertise ? (notably knowledge of the issues to be addressed) | 5 |
| 1.3 Do the applicant and, if applicable, partners have sufficient management capacity ? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)? | 5 |
| 1.4 Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance ? | 5 |
| 2. Relevance Note: If the total average score is less than 20 points for section 2: Relevance, the Evaluation Committee will reject the proposal | 25 |
| 2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and one or more of the priorities of the call for proposals? Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal contains specific added-value elements, such as promotion of gender equality and equal opportunities... | 5 |
| 2.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal? (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication.) | 5 |
| 2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately? | 5 |
| 2.4 Does the proposal involve genuine cross-border cooperation? Proposals with more than one form of cooperation and convincing cross-border partnership (joint development, joint financing, joint staffing and joint implementing) will receive higher score | 5 |
| 2.5 Are the activities proposed likely to have a clear cross-border benefit? | 5 |
| 3. Methodology | 25 |
| 3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the | 5 |

| | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| objectives and expected results? | |
| 3.2 How coherent is the overall design of the action? (in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation ?) | 5 |
| 3.3 Is the partners' and/or other stakeholders' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory? | 5 |
| 3.4 Is the action plan clear and feasible? | 5 |
| 3.5 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action? | 5 |
| 4. Sustainability | 15 |
| 4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups? | 5 |
| 4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects ? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.) | 5 |
| 4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - financially (<i>how will the activities be financed after the funding ends?</i>) - institutionally (<i>will structures allowing the activities to continue be in place at the end of the action? Will there be local “ownership” of the results of the action?</i>) - at policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc?</i>)? - environmentally (if applicable) (<i>will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?</i>) | 5 |
| 5. Budget and cost-effectiveness | 15 |
| 5.1 is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory? | 5 |
| 5.2 Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the action? | 5 |
| 5.3 Are costs well balanced across the border? | 5 |
| Maximum total score | 100 |

1. FINANCIAL AND OPERATIONAL CAPACITY OF APPLICANT/PARTNERS

Financial capacity and expertise – evaluation should be stressing on the technical expertise of the Applicant on the issues addressed by the project, experience in working with the target groups, etc. Attention should be placed on expertise in project management and in particular on management of EU grant schemes and projects. Applicants availability of resources – human, material and financial in view of the requested amount of grant has to also be evaluated.

| 1 Financial and Operational Capacity | Score (Max 20) | Application Form |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1.1 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient experience of project management ? | 5 | I.4, II.1, II.2, II.3 and III.1 |
| 1.2 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient technical expertise ? (notably knowledge of the issues to be addressed. | 5 | I.4, II.1, II.2, II.3 and III.1 |
| 1.3 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient management capacity ? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)? | 5 | II.2, II.3, II.4 and III.1 |
| 1.4 Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance ? | 5 | II.3.3, the Budget |
| Total Score * | | |
| Comments: | | |

PAY ATTENTION!

If a total score lower than “adequate” (12 points) is obtained for section 1, the proposal will be eliminated by the Evaluation Committee. The evaluation grid must nevertheless be completed.

1.1 Do the Applicant and partners have sufficient experience of project management?

This section has to evaluate the Applicant’s potential to implement the activities planned within the foreseen time frame and resources. In view of the fact that a limited number of applicants may have had such experience stated on their profile/annual budget, **please review the CVs of the project team** and if these are permanent staff of the institution, their expertise might be attributed to the legal entity. This however has to be clearly stated in the Comments.

Base your evaluation on the answers to the following questions:

- **Have the Applicant/Partners implemented projects so far?**
- **Have the Applicant/Partners implemented EU funded projects?**
- **Do the Applicant/Partners have experience in the management of funds?**
- **Is there any mechanism for the management of the project established within the Application’s structure with clear distinction of functions and responsibilities of partners?**
- **Is there a mechanism for inflow of information and who and how decisions are being taken based on this information, especially related to funding?**

Applicant and partners’ experience of project management is:

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have more than 3 projects implemented so far, including at least one EU financed cross-border co-operation projects; - Mechanisms for project management are well described and responsibilities clearly assigned - Inflow of information and decision making process is well explained |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have implemented 1 project so far - Mechanisms for project management are well described and responsibilities clearly assigned - Inflow of information and decision making process is well explained |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have not worked on projects funded by international donors but the project team has sufficient expertise - Mechanisms for project management are well described and responsibilities clearly assigned |

| | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Poor 2 | When, - The Applicant/Partners have not worked on projects funded by international donors but the project team has sufficient expertise - Mechanisms for project management and responsibilities are not well described and assigned |
| Very poor 1 | When, - The Applicant/Partners do not have any experience in project management - Mechanisms for project management and responsibilities are not well described and assigned |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- The team structure is not relevant for the activities foreseen (too many people for a limited number of activities or vice versa).
- No clearly defined control mechanisms (especially when the Project coordinator is not in charge for the financing of the project/organization).

1.2 Do the Applicant and partners have sufficient technical expertise?

Most of the foreseen project activities require specific expertise. This criterion allows assessing whether such expertise is available and if the Applicant/partners know what measures have to be undertaken to provide it for the implementation of the project and when the project ends.

Base your evaluation on the answers to the following questions:

- **Have the Applicant/Partners worked on similar issues (as the one described in the project) and with the target groups of the project so far?**
- **Do the team members possess the required technical expertise? (Do the CVs attached state experience in previous projects, publications, relevant main occupation, etc)?**
- **Do the Applicant/Partners rely entirely on external experts for the implementation of the project activities? Is the involvement of external experts in the project justified?**
- **Do the external experts proposed possess the required expertise?**
- **Are public officials listed among the members of the team? Are they included in the project on a long-term contract and is this not contradictory to their main occupation? Do the activities described in the project for**

these public officials duplicate their ordinary functions in the public administration?

Applicant and partners' technical expertise is:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Very good 5</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have at least three relevant project references in the field addressed by the project; - Project team members have sufficient expertise in the project issues/topics and know well the specificity of the target groups - The proposed external experts have extensive knowledge on the project issues/topics and do not duplicate knowledge of the experts of Applicant/Partners - The assigned tasks/functions to the external experts do not overlap with their job descriptions (in the organizations in which they are on permanent contracts) |
| <p>Good 4</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have at least one relevant project reference in the field addressed by the project; - The assigned tasks/functions to the external experts do not overlap with their job descriptions (in the organizations in which they are on permanent contracts) |
| <p>Adequate 3</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have at least one relevant project reference on the project issues/topics but lack thorough understanding on the specificity of the target group - Participation of some external experts is not well argued |
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have neither experience on the project issues/topics nor understanding on the specificity of the target group - The project relies entirely on external experts for the implementation of project activities and not all of them have the required technical knowledge |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Applicant/Partners have neither experience on the project issues/topics nor understanding on the specificity of the target group - The external experts also lack required technical expertise |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- More than 30% of the activities and budget costs are implemented by experts external to the Applicant/Partners organizations and their employment for the same tasks after the project ends is very uncertain.
- Involvement of public officials in the team of experts that are to implement activities, which are overlapping with their routine tasks and job descriptions.

1.3 Do the Applicant and partners have sufficient management capacity?

Evaluate whether the Applicant/Partners have the capacity to implement the project activities.

Base your evaluation on the answers to the following questions:

- **Do the Applicant/Partners have adequate number of staff to implement project activities (Permanent staff, volunteers, members of Managing Board, etc)?**
- **Do the Applicant/Partners have the minimum requested equipment to implement activities (computer, phone, e-mail)?**
- **Do Applicant/Partners have any budget of their own, for the current financial year?**
- **Is there a permanent financial expert/accountant with the Applicant's organisation?**

Applicant and partners' management capacity is:

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant/Partners have permanent staff/financial expert - Applicant/Partners have well equipped office/s - Applicant/Partners have resources with adequate capacity to the stated project activities |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant/Partners have permanent staff/financial expert - Applicant/Partners have office/s with the minimum requested equipment - Applicant/Partners have resources with adequate capacity to the stated project activities |

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Adequate 3 | When, - Applicant/Partners have permanent staff/financial expert - Applicant/Partners have an office with the minimum requested equipment |
| Poor 2 | When, - Applicant/Partners have permanent staff/financial expert (most of these are volunteers) |
| Very poor 1 | When, - Applicant/Partners have not provided any information to assess the management capacity |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Applicant/partners rely entirely on external experts for the management of the project and the technical expertise

1.4 Does the applicant /partners have stable and sufficient sources of finance?

Evaluate whether the Applicant/Partners have stable and sufficient sources of finance.

Base your evaluation on the answers to the following questions:

- **Do the Applicant/Partners provide evidence for reliable and stable sources of funding?**
- **Is there evidence for compliance between the stated co-financing and Applicant/Partners available sources of funding?**
- **Is there evidence of the capacity of Applicant/Partners to raise funds?**
- **Is there evidence for sustainability of the project outcomes at the end of the project from the Applicant/Partner own financial resources?**

The applicant/partners' sources of finance are:

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When, - Applicant/Partners show reliable and stable sources of funding for previous years, adequate to the requested grant - There is compliance between the stated co-financing and Applicant/Partners availability of financial resources - Applicant/Partners possess the necessary expertise to raise funds and |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | guarantee the sustainability of the project outcomes |
| Good 4 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant has no reliable source of funding, but Partners show sources of funding for previous years, although not relevant to the requested grant - There is compliance between the stated co-financing and Applicant/Partners availability of financial resources - Applicant/Partners possess some expertise to raise funds and guarantee the sustainability of the project outcomes |
| Adequate 3 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant/Partners do not have funding from own sources for previous years but managed to attract external resources to guarantee the project co-financing - Applicant/Partners possess some expertise to raise funds and guarantee the sustainability of the project outcomes |
| Poor 2 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant/Partners do not have funding from own sources for previous years but manage to attract external resources to guarantee the project co-financing - Applicant/Partners show no expertise to raise funds and could not guarantee sustainability of the project outcomes |
| Very poor 1 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Applicant/Partners have no funding from own sources for previous years and there is a discrepancy between the stated co-financing and evidences provided for this co-financing - Applicant/Partners show no expertise to raise funds and could not guarantee the sustainability of the project outcomes |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Inconsistency between the requested funding and the experience shown in the management of funds (i.e. requested funding amounts to 100,000 € while in the last 2 years the organisation has not managed more than 10,000 €).

2. RELEVANCE

Relevance relates primarily to the importance of the problems addressed and to the defined target groups and its compliance with the Programme's priorities and objectives.

| 2. Relevance | Maximum Score 25 | Application form |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|
| <p>2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and one or more of the priorities of the call for proposals?</p> <p>Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal contains specific added-value elements, such as promotion of gender equality and equal opportunities...</p> | 5 | I.1.5 & I.1.6 |
| <p>2.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal? (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication)</p> | 5 | I.1.6 |
| <p>2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?</p> | 5 | I.1.6 |
| <p>2.4 Does the proposal involve genuine cross-border cooperation? Proposals with more than one form of cooperation and convincing cross-border partnership (joint development, joint financing, joint staffing and joint implementing) will receive higher score</p> | 5 | I.1.6 & I.1.10 |
| <p>2.5 Are the activities proposed likely to have a clear cross-border benefit?</p> | 5 | I.1.5, I.1.6, I.1.9 & I.1.11 |
| Total score: | | |
| Comments: | | |

PAY ATTENTION!

If a total score lower than "good" (16 points) is obtained for Section 2, the proposal will be eliminated by the Evaluation Committee. The Evaluation grid must nevertheless be completed.

2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and one or more of the priorities of the call for proposals?

PAY ATTENTION!

A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal specifically addresses at least one priority or if the proposal contains specific added-value elements.

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Is there consistency between the Project's overall objectives to the Programme's objectives?**
- **Will the implementation of the project contribute (in the long run) to the achievement of the Programme's objectives?**
- **Is there relevance between the Project (Section 1.6 of the Application form) and the Programme?**
- **Is the project more appropriate to be funded under another EU programme?**

A project is relevant:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is relevant to at least one of the Programme's objectives - The relevance between the project and Programme objectives and priorities is well justified - Project falls within at least one of the priority sectors - There is no other more relevant EU Programme that could support the project activities |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is relevant to at least one of the Programme objectives - Project falls within at least one of the priority sectors - There is no other more relevant EU Programme that could support the project activities |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is relevant to at least one of the Programme objectives |

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Poor 2 | When, - It is not directly relevant to the Programme objectives - There is another more appropriate EU Programme that could support the project activities |
| Very poor 1 | When, - The project is not relevant to the Programme objectives |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Bad interpretation of the Programme's objectives
- Project objectives repeat literally the Programme objectives.

PAY ATTENTION!

A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal contains specific added-value elements. To assess the added value please give an answer using the following questions:

- **Is the project innovative, or does it imply innovative approaches? This may refer to the implementation of good practices in a region/the country for the first time.**
- **Are the activities planned original or do not go beyond traditional lecturing/training?**
- **Is the Applicant/partners going to develop new approaches that will be implemented in the future?**
- **Is the project going to introduce new/good practice from EU or eligible countries?**
- **Does the project take into consideration EU priorities in relation to promotion of gender equality, equal opportunities and environmental protection?**

2.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication)?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Is there a well-identified problem stated in Section 1.6 Justification of the Project?**
- **Are there enough data provided on the situation in the target region with respect to the stated problem?**
- **Is there evidence that the applicant has used official data (strategies, Statistical Institute or Government Institutions' data, etc) and the justification is not based only on perceptions/rumors?**

PAY ATTENTION!

The stated problem is a description of a negative situation. Assessors should evaluate **not the importance of the problem but:**

- To what extent the Applicant/partners is aware about the problem
- Clarity of the problem's presentation
- Clarity of the problem-consequences casual effect in the proposal

A project is relevant to the needs and constraints of the target region:

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The situation in the region with respect to the stated problem is defined in details - Official sources of information were used for justifying the problem - The justification is reliable and trustworthy |
| Good 4 | When <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The situation in the region with respect to the stated problem is defined in details - The justification is reliable and trustworthy |
| Adequate 3 | When <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The situation in the region with respect to the stated problem is well defined but not in details |
| Poor 2 | When <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The situation in the region is presented with general statements. |
| Very poor 1 | When <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information about the situation in the region where the project will be implemented is missing and general statements are made for the region as a whole. |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Problem is often schematically presented. The casual effect is not stated and the problem stated is rather justified for the country as a whole, rather than for the particular region or target group;

2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- Has a distinction been made between beneficiaries and target groups?
- Are there any important groups that have not been included into the project that might have a detrimental effect on its implementation?
- Are there any groups that might be negatively affected by the implementation of project activities?
- Are the target groups appropriately defined?
- Are the specific problems and needs of the target groups well defined?
- Are there evidences in the application that the target groups are interested and have positive expectations and perceptions from the project activities to be implemented?
- Is there consistency between the project objectives and identified needs? Are there needs – not properly defined which have also not been properly addressed by the project activities?
- What would be the involvement of the target groups in the project implementation?

PAY ATTENTION!

Definitions

Beneficiaries – those who benefit in whatever way from the implementation of the project

Target groups – are the groups/entities who will be directly positively affected by the project at the Project Purpose level

Final beneficiaries – those who benefit from the project in the long term at the level of the society or sector at large

Project partners – those implementing the project (also stakeholders and may be a target group)

The project is relevant to the needs and constraints of the target groups:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Very good 5</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the beneficiaries are well described - Clear distinction between beneficiaries and target groups is given - Target groups are well defined incl. quantitative and qualitative data - There is clear and detailed information (quantitative and qualitative) about the specific problems and needs of the target groups - Target groups were involved in the design of the project - The project objectives address the identified target groups' needs |
| <p>Good 4</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the stakeholders are well described - No clear distinction between target groups and beneficiaries is made - Target groups are well-defined incl. quantitative and qualitative data. - There is clear and detailed information (quantitative and qualitative) about the specific problems and needs of the target groups - The project objectives address the identified target groups' needs |
| <p>Adequate 3</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target groups are well-defined including quantitative and qualitative data. - The information about the specific problems and needs of the target groups is general and lacks specificity - The project objectives address the identified target groups' needs |
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target groups are schematically presented. - The information about the specific problems and needs of the target groups is general and there is no relevance between these needs and the stated objective of the project |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Target groups are schematically presented and are not relevant to the achievement of the Programme's objectives. - The specific problems and needs of the target groups are not identified |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Target groups are very generally described and analysis is not based on objective data and statistical information.

- The target groups are rather big in number and do not correspond to the time schedule and resources of the project.
- The Application/partners only provides general data about the identified problems, which not based on defined needs of target groups.
- The project is not relevant to the real needs of the target groups and they have not been involved in the design of the project.

2.4 Does the proposal involve genuine cross-border cooperation? Proposals with more than one form of cooperation and convincing cross-border partnership (joint development, joint financing, joint staffing and joint implementing) will receive higher score

All projects must have a **direct cross-border cooperation impact**, which shall be understood in terms of respecting at least one of the following conditions as described below:

- **Joint development** – means that the project must be designed in common by partners from both sides of the border. This means that project proposals must clearly integrate the ideas, priorities and actions of stakeholders on both sides of the border. The Applicant is the coordinator of this process but should include other partners from the beginning of the development process;
- **Joint implementation** – means that activities must be carried out and coordinated among partners on both sides of the border. It is not enough that activities run in parallel. There must be clear content-based links between what is happening on either side of the border and regular contact between the two sides. The Applicant is responsible for ensuring that activities are properly coordinated, that schedules are kept and that the right quality levels are achieved
- **Joint staffing** – means that the project should not duplicate functions on either side of the border. Therefore, regardless of where the person is located, there should be one joint project manager, one joint financial manager etc., (of course more staff may be required for larger projects). These staff will be responsible for project activities on both sides of the border. The Applicant is generally the employer of core project staff
- **Joint financing** – means that there will be only one contract per project and there must therefore be one joint project budget. The budget should be divided between partners according to the activities carried out. There is also only one project bank account for the EU contribution (held by the Applicant) and payments representing EU support are made from the programme to this account. The Applicant is responsible for administration and distribution of these funds and for reporting on their use. Match funding should come from both sides of the border and illustrates the commitment by each partner to the joint project

To assess this criterion please take into consideration the following scoring system:

| | |
|------------------|---------------------------------|
| Very good | When |
| 5 | - all 4 criteria are fulfilled; |

| | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| Good 4 | When - 3 criteria are fulfilled; |
| Adequate 3 | When - 2 criteria are fulfilled; |
| Poor 2 | When - at least one criterion is fulfilled; |
| Very poor 1 | When - no criteria are fulfilled; |

2.5 Are the activities proposed likely to have a clear cross-border benefit?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- Will the achievement of project objectives create benefits in the cross-border area?
- Is the problem that project tries to address clearly identified? Are the project objectives established in order to solve the identified problem?
- Is the project creating best practice models in cross-border cooperation?
- Does the project create models for spillover effects inside and outside of the cross-border area?

Cross-border benefit of the project activities is:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When, - The project will create clear and tangible benefit in cross border area. - The project objectives are comprehensive, well justified and clear in targeting the identified problem. - The project will create models of best practices in cross-border cooperation. - Spillovers effects are likely to happen to other initiatives in and outside of cross-border area. |
| Good 4 | When, - The project will create clear and tangible benefit in cross border area. |

| | |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project objectives are comprehensive but not well justified. Project objectives are somewhat related with the identified problem. - The project will generate best practices in cross-border cooperation. - Spillovers effects are not likely to happen. |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cross-border benefit of the project results is feasible, yet not well explained. - The project objectives are comprehensive but not well justified. There is a consistency between the identified problem and established objectives - The project will not create models of best practices in cross-border cooperation. - Spillovers effects are not likely to happen. |
| Poor 2 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cross-border benefit of is limited - The project objectives are not comprehensive neither well justified. There is no consistency between the identified problem and established objectives - The project will not create models of best practices in cross-border cooperation. - Spillovers effects are not likely to happen. |
| Very poor 1 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no cross-border benefit created by the project results. - The project objectives are not comprehensive and needs complete revision. - The project will not create models of best practices in cross-border cooperation. - Spillovers effects are not likely to happen. |

3. METHODOLOGY

The evaluation of this section should focus on the **feasibility of the project activities**. This requires assessment of the project intervention logic (**Logframe Matrix**) – i.e. if planned activities would lead to achievement of the results and if assumptions hold true - would the project specific objective be achieved and would this contribute to the achievement of the overall project objective?

The evaluation of the methodology should give an answer to the level of Partnership, involvement of target groups and, most importantly, an **assessment of the external factors** (risks).

In addition it should assess whether the Applicant has the necessary recourses and expertise to implement the activities in the foreseen timeframe and within the available budget.

An important part of the methodology is the internal evaluation of the project and the relevance and quantification of indicators, assessment of feasibility and reliability of sources for information for checking the indicators and the cost-efficiency of the proposed methods and frequency for collection of information.

| 3. Methodology | Maximum Score 25 | Application form |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results? | 5 | I.1.7, I.1.8 and I.1.9 |
| 3.2 How coherent is the overall design of the action? (in particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and anticipate an evaluation ?) | 5 | I.1.5, I.1.7, I.1.8 and I.1.9 |
| 3.3 Is the partners' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory? Note: If there are no partners the score will be 1. | 5 | I.1.7, I.1.9 and I.1.10 |
| 3.5 Is the action plan clear and feasible? | 5 | I.1.10 |
| 3.6 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action? | 5 | I.1.8, I.1.12, Annex C1 and Annex C2 |
| Total score | | |
| Comments | | |

3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Are the project activities defined in sufficient detail? Are the goal, target groups, concrete deliverables, duration and completion date, resources, responsibilities, etc., specified for any activity?**
- **Are the activities consistent with the project objectives?**
- **Are there activities that are essential for the efficient implementation of the project that are not foreseen?**
- **Are there activities which implementation is not necessary?**
- **Are the activities feasible in terms of number, timing, cost-effectiveness (human and material resources employed)?**
- **Are there activities foreseen that overlap with routine practices of the state/local authorities?**

Activities proposed are practical and consistent with the objectives and expected results:

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When, - They are defined in sufficient detail - They are consistent with the Project's objectives - They are necessary for achieving concrete results - They are feasible in terms of number, timing, cost effectiveness and human and material resources employed - They do not duplicate routine practices of the state/local authorities |
| Good 4 | When, - They are relatively well defined - They are consistent with the Project's objectives - They are necessary for achieving concrete results - They are feasible in terms of number, timing, cost effectiveness and human and material resources employed - They do not duplicate routine practices of the state/local authorities |
| Adequate 3 | When, - They are relatively well defined - They are consistent with the Project's objectives - They are necessary for achieving concrete results - They do not duplicate routine practices of the state/local authorities |

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Poor 2 | When, - They are only schematically presented - It is difficult to assess their consistency with the Project's objectives and results |
| Very poor 1 | When, - They are not well defined - They bear no relevance to Project's goals and concrete results |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Activities are only schematically presented, details are missing (i.e. curricula, training modules).
- Stated activities overlap with routine practices of the state/local authorities.

3.2 How coherent is the overall design of the action?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Is the methodology for the implementation of activities clearly detailed?**
- **Are all the proposed methods and approaches relevant to the knowledge level/ background and cultural specificity of the target group?**
- **Is there evidence that the team proposed has the capacity and experience to apply the proposed methodology?**
- **Are there any target groups' biases and cultural specificity that could hamper the implementation of the proposed project activities?**

The overall design of the project is coherent:

| | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When: - Proposed approaches and project design are fully relevant to the needs and specificity of the target groups - The methodology for the implementation of the project activities is detailed and concise - Applicant/Partners possess the required capacity to implement the methodology proposed |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Good 4 | When, - Proposed approaches and project design are fully relevant to the needs and specificity of the target groups - The methodology for the implementation of the project activities is detailed and concise |
| Adequate 3 | When, - Proposed approaches and project design are relevant to some extent to the needs and specificity of the target groups |
| Poor 2 | When, - Proposed approaches and project design are not relevant to the needs and specificity of the target groups - Applicant/Partner do not demonstrate the required capacity to implement the methodology proposed |
| Very poor 1 | When - The methodology to implement the project activities is not defined - The approaches to work with the target groups are not well described |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Main methods and approached to work with the target groups are not clearly defined;
- Some of the proposed interventions do not respond to the specificity of the target groups/ beneficiaries;

3.3 Is the partners' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory?

IMPORTANT NOTE: IF THERE ARE NO PARTNERS THE SCORE WILL BE 1.

Partnership is one of the EU key principles. A partnership has to be evaluated based on the following: clear and detailed description of the role of each partner; participation of the partner with human and material resources, based on specific expertise; complementarities between partners and experience in the implementation of joint activities/projects.

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Is the participation of the Partner justified?**
- **Do the Partners have a real role to play in the implementation of the project?**
- **Do the Partners provide financial contribution to the project?**
- **Are any budget resources allocated for the Partners?**

The involvement of the partners is satisfactory:

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The partners have an active role in the design and implementation of the project - The role of the partners and their responsibilities is clear and based on their capacity and expertise - The partners contribute to the project budget and get financial remuneration for activities implemented |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The partners have an active role in the design and implementation of the project - The role of the partners and their responsibilities is clear and based on their capacity and expertise |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The partners have some role in the design and implementation of the project but their roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined |
| Poor 2 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Partnership is formal but they do not participate actively in the project <p>Role of partners is not defined at all</p> |
| Very poor 1 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are no partners in the project. |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Partnerships stated in the proposal are formal (just to “earn” higher score).
- There is no complementarity between partners.

3.4 Is the action plan clear and feasible?

PAY ATTENTION!

The format of the Action plan in the Application form has to be respected and all the fields have to be filled in.

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Are all the activities described in Section 1.7 of the Application form listed in the Action plan? Are there activities listed which are not described in details in Section 1.7 of the Application form?**
- **Are the stated activities realistic to be implemented in the foreseen period and stated human resources?**
- **Are the responsibilities of Partners clearly defined for each of the activities?**
- **Is the Action plan realistic? Could an activity be implemented within a shorter period of time? Does an activity need a longer period of time?**
- **Are there periods in the Action plan in which quite a high number of activities are foreseen while in other periods, activities are not planned (but the budget states costs for salaries, etc)?**

The action plan is clear and feasible:

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Activities are clearly stated, logically sequenced and feasible- There is full compliance between the Action plan and the activities stated in Section 1.7 of the Application form- The period for implementation of activities includes also the preparatory time with clear specification of Partners responsibilities- Distribution of activities over the period of the project implementation is optimal |
| Good 4 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Activities are clearly stated, logically sequenced and feasible- There is full compliance between the Action plan and the activities stated in Section 1.7 of the Application form- Distribution of activities over the period of the project implementation is optimal |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Adequate 3</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activities are clearly stated, logically sequenced and feasible - There are few discrepancies between the Action plan and the activities stated in Section 1.7 of the Application form - Distribution of activities over the period of the project implementation is optimal |
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activities are not very clearly stated, logically sequenced and feasible - The Action plan contains activities which are not stated in Section 1.7 of the Application form - Responsibilities of partners are not clearly stated |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activities are not logically sequenced and feasible - There are inconsistencies between the Action plan and Section 1.7 of the Application form - There is an unrealistic distribution of activities over the period of the project implementation - Responsibilities of Partners are not clearly stated |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Inconsistency between the Action plan and Section 1.7 of the Application form.
- Too many activities planned over a relative short period of time while the resources are insufficient

3.5 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action?

Indicators provide the basis for measuring the performance of the project. They have to be specific and quantified. The objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) for evaluating the outcome of the project are usually **listed in the second column of the Logframe Matrix.**

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Have indicators been defined with respect to the project's overall objective, specific objectives and results?**

- **Are the indicators specific for the project and closely related to project activities and outputs?**
- **Are the indicators quantified and time-framed?**
- **Are the indicators reliable and would they allow comparability of results?**
- **Are the indicators simple and cheap, or do they require a lot of time and resources to be collected?**
- **Are the sources of information identified, as well as the frequency of collection of information and responsibility of the Partners with respect of collecting this information?**

Indicators are defined:

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They are project specific and reliable - They are quantified and time-framed, - Sources are identified, as well as the frequency of collection of information and responsibility of Partners - When they are cheap and do not require a lot of resources |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They are project specific and reliable - They are quantified and time-framed, - Sources are identified, as well as the frequency of collection of information and responsibility of Partners , but requires a lot of resources and additional activities |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They are project specific and reliable - They are not well quantified - Sources are identified, as well as the frequency of collection of information and responsibility of Partners - They are heap and do not require a lot of resources |
| Poor 2 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - They are project specific - They are not quantified - Sources of information are not identified - Cheap and not requiring a lot of resources |

| | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very poor 1 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none">- They are not well defined- They are not project specific- Sources of information are not identified. |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Instead of indicators processes are formulated (improving, mastering, etc).
- Indicators are not quantifiable;
- Indicators are complicated and would request sufficient resources to be collected;

4. SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainability of the project results is also important to be evaluated properly. The evaluation of the sustainability is an assessment of the **expected impact/change** on the target groups/beneficiaries. Since the sustainability of the project is hard to be assessed at this stage focus should be given to evaluating the effectiveness of the envisaged mechanisms to guarantee availability of factors that would influence sustainability of the project results.

| 4. Sustainability | Maximum Score 15 | Application form |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups? | 5 | I.1.8 and I.1.9 |
| 4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.) | 5 | I.1.9 |
| 4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - financially (<i>how will the activities be financed after the EC funding ends?</i>) - institutionally (<i>will structures allowing the activities to continue be in place at the end of the action? Will there be local “ownership” of the results of the action?</i>) - at policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc?</i>)? - environmentally (if applicable) (<i>will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?</i>) | 5 | I.1.11 |
| Total score | | |
| Comments | | |

4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- Will the activities planned lead to the achievement of the stated results?
- Will the results stated lead to the achievement of the project's specific objective/s? Will the achievement of the specific objective/s contribute to achieving the overall project's objective?
- Is it feasible to achieve the objectives stated with the resources employed (human, material)?
- Are the assumptions (that may influence the achievement of the planned results) properly addressed? What is the probability these assumptions hold true?

The tangible impact of action on the target group is defined:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project impact on the target group defined as a change is clearly presented - The stated impact is feasible and in line with the project vertical logic - Stated assumptions/external factors are most likely to happen and are well described |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project impact on the target group defined as a change is clearly presented - The stated impact is feasible and in line with the project vertical logic - Assumptions are not properly addressed |
| Adequate 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - When, - Project impact on the target groups is not well defined - Project vertical logic needs revision - Assumptions/external factors are most likely to happen |
| Poor 2 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Project impact on the target groups is not well defined - Serious weaknesses in the Project vertical logic - Assumptions/external factors are not well assessed |
| Very poor 1 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The probability that the project will have a substantial impact on the target groups is very marginal |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Planned activities are inconsistent with the stated results.
- Lack of information about the project results/impact.
- Too many assumptions are not properly addressed to achieve stated results and guarantee impact on the target groups.
- Impact is stated as an activity, rather than a change.

4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects? (Including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information)?

The evaluation of this criterion should focus on the probability and the ways through which the project results could be multiplied, repeated.

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Does the project incorporate/foresee a model/practice for replication?**
- **Are the mechanisms/approaches for multiplication properly described?**
- **Do the Applicant/Partners identify parties/organisations that may be interested to implement this model/practice?**
- **Is the project foreseeing a mechanism to provide information to these parties/organisations during the project implementation, so that these institutions are interested and motivated to apply it?**
- **Do the Applicant/Partners have the capacity (incl. material and human resources) to multiply this model/practice?**

The multiplication effect is described:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Very good 5</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project will create a model/practice which will lead to multiplication - Mechanisms/approaches for multiplication are properly described - Parties/organisations that may be interested to implement this model/practice are identified and show interest in this model - Applicant/Partners have the capacity (incl. material and human resources) to multiply this model/practice |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Good 4 | When, - The project will create a model/practice which will lead to multiplication - Mechanisms/approaches for multiplication are properly described - Applicant/Partners have the capacity (incl. material and human resources) to multiply this model/practice |
| Adequate 3 | When, - The project will create a model/practice which will lead to multiplication - Parties/organisations that may be interested to implement this model/practice are not identified properly - Applicant/Partners do not have the capacity (incl. material and human resources) to multiply this model/practice |
| Poor 2 | When, - It is very unlikely that the implied approaches/mechanisms will be multiplied - Applicant/Partners do not have the capacity (incl. material and human resources) to multiply this model/practice |
| Very poor 1 | When, - Project does not foresee and Applicant does not have elaborated mechanisms for multiplication of the project results. |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Project does not foresee model/practice that is possible to be multiplied.
- Interested parties in multiplying the project results are not identified.
- Lead partner has no capacity (human resources) to multiply the effect/results

4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable: (financially; institutionally, at policy level)? What will be the structural impact of the action (e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc.)?

The evaluation should be based on giving answers to the following questions:

| | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Financially | Is there evidence that outputs will outstrip project inputs? Are there more feasible means for responding to the needs of the target groups and achieving the project results? How will the Applicant financially guarantee the replication of project |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

| | |
|-------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | activities after the project has ended? |
| Institutionally | <p>Is there evidence that the project team will keep on working and providing services to the target groups after the project ends?</p> <p>Is there a justification for sustaining the employed technology/equipment after the project end?</p> <p>Will there be structures in the target regions that are capable to keep on providing the developed services during the project after the project end?</p> <p>Is there evidence that the target groups will be interested in the developed activities after the project end?</p> |
| At Policy Level (where applicable) | <p>Is there a national/municipal policy in the respective sector that may guarantee the public/state interest to the project results?</p> <p>Is there evidence that the municipality/state would support the project results through appropriate mechanisms/budget/resources?</p> <p>Will the project lead to amendments of legislation, development of codes of conducts, etc.?</p> |
| Environmentally | Is there evidence that the project action will have a negative/positive impact on environment? |
| Gender Aspect | Does the project foresee equal access to men/women to project activities/results? |

The sustainability of the proposed results is described:

| | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chances that the project benefits will be sustained after the project has ended are high; - The Applicant has identified all the 3 forms of sustainability (financially, institutionally and at policy level) and has analysed these adequately |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The chances that the project benefits will be sustained after the project has ended are high; - Applicant has identified at least 2 of the forms of sustainability and has analysed these adequately |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite of the weaknesses in the Applicant's analysis of the probability of the project benefits to be sustained after the project ends, results could be sustained after the project ends |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no evidence that the project benefits will be sustained after the project has ended - Some analysis is made on at least one of the sustainability forms by the Applicant |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is no evidence that the project benefits will be sustained after the project has ended - The Applicant has not made any attempt to analyse any form of sustainability |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- No attempt is made to assess how results and activities will continue after the project ends.
- No description on how the created local offices and equipment will be sustained after the project has ended.

5. BUDGET AND COST EFFECTIVENESS

General Rules

Project budget relates activities to expenditures and should provide information on quantities and value of all the needed inputs.

The Evaluation grid section related to the budget includes the following questions.

| 5. Budget and cost-effectiveness | Maximum Score 15 | Application form |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| 5.1 Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory? | 5 | Annex B |
| 5.2 Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the action? | 5 | Annex B, I.1.7, I.1.8 and I.1.9 |
| 5.3. Are costs well balanced across the border? | 5 | Annex B and I.1.7 |
| Total score | | |
| Comments | | |

When evaluating the budget the assessors have to:

PAY ATTENTION!

Respect of the Budget form – Annex B of the Grant Contract (incl. detailed justification of costs)

Budget includes only eligible cost

Respect of the maximum/minimum project/grant amount

Respect of budget heading thresholds

Respect of co-financing requirements

All activities are budgeted

Inclusion of costs for expenditure verification (if applicable – see below)

5.1 Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?

The costs in the budget have to respond to normal market prices and the costs normally borne by the beneficiaries. Attached quotations/ documents for preliminary market search should be encouraged.

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Are all the stated costs realistically quantified and priced compared to the estimated outputs (number of: consultancies, trips, brochures, participants)?**
- **Could outputs be produced with fewer inputs?**
- **Is there compliance between the stated costs with the real costs (relevant to the market prices)?**
- **Are there costs in the budget that are not stated in the narrative description of activities?**
- **Are there unjustified costs (i.e. equipment not related to activities, trips, publications, etc.)?**
- **Are any ineligible costs included? (i.e. prices quoted with VAT, capital investments, depreciation, currency exchange losses, on-going projects expenses, etc)**

Ratio between the estimated costs and the outputs is

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Costs have been realistically quantified and priced compared to the estimated outputs - Quantities are realistically estimated compared to the outputs - Costs stated are in line with going market prices and quotations are attached |
| Good 4 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the costs have been realistically quantified and priced compared to the estimated outputs - Quantities are realistically estimated compared to the outputs - Some of the costs stated exceed the going market prices |
| Adequate 3 | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some of the quantities have not been realistically estimated compared to the estimated outputs - Some of the costs stated exceed the going market prices |

| | |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are serious discrepancies between budget items and usual market prices or costs normally borne by beneficiaries - Some ineligible costs are stated in the budget. |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Budget format is not respected - There are serious discrepancies between budget items and estimated outputs - Costs stated consistently exceed the going market prices - Ineligible costs have been budgeted |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Excessive quantities (working days, circulation of publications, transportation, trips, etc.).
- Budget includes ineligible costs.
- Unrealistic costing, especially for salaries, per diems, equipment.
- Public officials put on a full-time salary without evidence that they would leave their current job.
- Thresholds not respected.
- Inconsistency between cost given in the breakdown of costs and Partner declarations.
- Subcontracting costs with no added value to the project are stated.

PAY ATTENTION!

Check the Budget for arithmetical errors!

5.2 Is the proposed expenditure necessary for the implementation of the action?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- **Do the stated costs correspond to the activities described in Section 1.7 of the Application Form?**
- **Has the Applicant provided all the details for each item: unit, number of units, unit rate, total costs, (number of participants, duration of events, etc)?**
- **Are all the costs put under the relevant budget items (salaries, overheads, etc)?**

➤ **Are there overheads included under other budget items?**

Expenditures proposed for the implementation of the action are described:

| | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Very good 5</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the costs are in compliance with the activities described in Section 1.7 - All costs are clearly stated and justified - All costs are stated under the relevant budget items |
| <p>Good 4</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All the costs are in compliance with the activities described in Section 1.7 - A small number of costs are not clearly justified - All costs are stated under the relevant budget items |
| <p>Adequate 3</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are some activities described in Section 1.7 which are not covered in the budget - A small number of costs are not clearly justified - All costs are stated under the relevant budget items |
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are discrepancies between activities stated in Section 1.7 and the budget - A relatively high number of costs are not clearly justified - Costs are not stated under the relevant budget items - Mathematical errors |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are discrepancies between activities stated in Section 1.7 and the budget - Costs are not detailed and justified but given as lump sum - Serious mistakes in respecting budget format (itemisation of costs) - Mathematical errors |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- Costs are not stated under the relevant budget items
- Lack of detailed justification of costs

PAY ATTENTION!

In their comments, assessors should state:

- All the weaknesses in the budget (incl. arithmetical errors) – giving details!
- The amount of decrease (if any) of each of the budget items, especially if project is recommended for funding.
- The total amount of the project budget decrease.

5.3 Are costs well balanced across the border?

To assess this criterion please give an answer to the following questions:

- Does the budget foresee expenditures on both sides of the borders?
- Are the costs between budgets well balanced? Is there a serious discrepancy between the costs of serious kind calculated in separate budget sheets (i.e. discrepancy of costs of purchasing similar equipment, human resources, travel expenses, etc)?
- Does the separate budget sheets overlap and double count the costs related to the same project action?

Expenditures proposed for the implementation of the action are described:

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Very good 5 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The budget is splitted between the cross-border parnters based on their responsibilities and activities described in the Section 1.- There is no discrepancy between the costs of a similar nature presented in separate budget sheets- The costs are not overlapping between the budgets |
| Good 4 | When, <ul style="list-style-type: none">- The budget is splitted between the cross-border parnters based on their responsibilities and activities described in the Section 1.- There is a small discrepancy between the costs of a similar nature presented in separate budget sheets- Some costs are overlapping between the budgets |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Adequate 3</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The budget is splitted between the cross-border parnters based on their responsibilities and activities described in the Section 1. - There is a small discrepancy between the costs of a similar nature presented in separate budget sheets - Some costs are overlapping between the budgets |
| <p>Poor 2</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority of costs are alocated to one side of the border - There is a small discrepancy between the costs of a similar nature presented in separate budget sheets - Some costs are overlapping between the budgets |
| <p>Very poor 1</p> | <p>When,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Majority of costs are alocated to one side of the border - There is a significant discrepancy between the costs of a similar nature presented in separate budget sheets - Significant number of costs are overlapping between the budgets |

Serious weaknesses in the proposal related to these criteria:

- The budget is assigned to only one side of the border
- Only the leading partner has budget responsibilities