

## EVALUATION GRID

### TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL EVALUATION

I. Consistency with the Programme and other strategic documents		Maximum score
	Sub-criteria	36
A.	To what extent is the project expected to contribute to the implementation of EU, national, regional and local development strategies or other programmes	10
No.	Criterion/ Description	
1.	Does the project contribute to the implementation and achievement of proposed results of the EU 2020 strategy? (2 points)	
2.	Does the project contribute to the implementation of the Danube strategy? (2 points)	
3.	Are the project objectives/implementing priorities in line with other EU, national, regional, local strategy or programmes? (criteria relevant only for Priority Axis 1 and 4)  Is there a direct connection/clear positive impact to TEN-T infrastructure? (criteria relevant only for Priority Axis 2 and 3)  (2 points)	
4.	Is the project capitalizing the results of another EU-funded project? (2 points)	
5.	Is the project planning to have synergies (complementarities) with implemented/ongoing projects (if relevant) carried out under this or other EU-funded programmes? (max. 2 points)	
B.	To what extent is the project expected to provide a significant contribution to the results of the priority axis/specific objective of the programme	8
1.	To what extent is the project contributing to the accomplishment of at least one of the	

	<p>outputs of the programme priority axis/specific objective?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 points in case considerable contribution to more than one indicator exists</li> <li>- 2 points in case considerable contribution to one indicator exists</li> <li>- 1 point in case there is a proportionate contribution (considering also the budget)</li> </ul> <p>0 points for other cases</p>	
2.	<p>To what extent is the project contributing to the accomplishment of the results of the programme priority axis/specific objective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 points in case considerable contribution to more than one indicator exists</li> <li>- 2 points in case there is a considerable contribution to one indicator</li> </ul> <p><b>In case no contribution to the accomplishment of a result indicator is demonstrated in the application form, the project is proposed for rejection!</b></p>	
<b>C.</b>	<b>Does the project show a strong cross border character with a strategic approach?</b>	<b>14</b>
1.	<p>Are the project beneficiaries accomplishing the cooperation criteria?</p> <p><b>In case the four mandatory criteria are not fulfilled, the project is proposed for rejection!</b></p>	
2.	<p>Is the project generating a clear and tangible cross-border impact?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6 points in case a common challenge is widely addressed in the programme area by the project and it is proven that the cross-border approach is the best way of tackling it</li> <li>- 4 points in case a common challenge is addressed in the programme area by the project and it is duly justified that the cross-border approach is the best way of tackling it</li> <li>- 1 point in case a common challenge is addressed in the programme area and some cross-border impact is generated</li> </ul>	
3.	<p>Complexity: the project involves many different stakeholders and / or covers a large portion of the eligible area. (max. 4 points)</p>	

4.	The project produces a long lasting effect, creating permanent structures and services, producing permanent shifts in local markets, capable to ensure a long term growth. (max. 4 points)	
D.	<b>To what extent is the project proposing specific elements of added value for the cross-border area as a whole in promotion of non-discrimination, equality between men and women and sustainable development, environmental protection</b>	<b>4</b>
1.	Is the project proposing specific measures to contribute to the promotion of equal opportunities and non-discrimination? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 point if at least one specific measure is foreseen</li> <li>- 0 points if only neutral (minimum required by law) specific measures are foreseen</li> </ul>	
2.	Is the project proposing specific measures to contribute to the promotion of equality between men and women? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 point if at least one specific measure is foreseen</li> <li>- 0 points if only neutral (minimum required by law) specific measures are foreseen</li> </ul>	
3.	Is the project proposing specific measures to contribute to the promotion of sustainable development? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1 point if at least one specific measure is foreseen</li> <li>- 0 points if only neutral (minimum required by law) specific measures are foreseen</li> </ul>	
4.	Are green solutions used instead of grey solutions? (max. 1 point).	
II.	<b>Operational capacity / Project Maturity</b>	<b>32</b>
E.	<b>Is the partnership composition well justified and able to contribute to the implementation</b>	<b>11</b>

	of the project?	
1.	<p>Did the project beneficiaries implemented projects financed from EU funds before?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4 points in case this partnership previously implemented at least another EU project</li> <li>- 2 points in case all project beneficiaries have previously implemented at least another EU project</li> <li>- 1 point in case at least one of the partners implemented at least one project financed by EU funds before</li> <li>- 0 points otherwise</li> </ul>	
2.	<p>Do the project beneficiaries have the necessary experience in the field addressed by the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 points in case there are implemented projects/actions in the field addressed by the project by most of the beneficiaries</li> <li>- 1 point in case there are implemented projects/actions in the field addressed by the project by at least one of the beneficiaries</li> <li>- 0 points in case no beneficiary has implemented projects/actions in the field addressed by the project</li> </ul>	
3.	<p>Do the project beneficiaries have the necessary capacity in order to be able to implement the project, the allocated human and material resources are necessary and in line with the proposed activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 5 points in case each beneficiary is allocating for project implementation the necessary resources which are in line with the proposed activities.</li> <li>- 0 points in case most of the resources beneficiaries are allocating for the project are neither necessary nor in line with the proposed activities <b>(Project is proposed for rejection)</b></li> </ul>	

<b>F.</b>	<b>Is the project conceptual approach and action plan well designed and realistic?</b>	<b>9</b>
1.	<p>Is there a logical link (correlation) between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 3 points in case there is a logical link between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results</li> <li>- 0 points in case there is no logical link between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results (<b>Project is proposed for rejection</b>)</li> </ul>	
2.	Are the project activities clearly described, realistic and achievable? The proposal is realistic and consistent from a technical point of view? (max. 3 points)	
3.	Do the activities follow a logical time-sequence? (max. 3 points)	
<b>G.</b>	<b>Is the communication / dissemination of project results clearly addressed?</b>	<b>2</b>
1.	Are the proposed information and publicity activities sufficient in order to be able to achieve dissemination of project results and visibility among target groups? (1 point)	
2.	Are all the proposed information and publicity activities necessary? Are the proposed information and publicity activities proportional with project activities as a whole? (1 point)	
<b>H.</b>	<b>Are project deliverables clearly defined and are the assumptions on their use realistic?</b>	<b>10</b>
1.	Are the project results realistic? (max. 3 points) In case the project results are not realistic, the projects is proposed for rejection.	
2.	Are the target groups clear and correctly correlated with the proposed activities? (max. 3 points)	
3.	Are target groups needs properly tackled by the project? (max. 2 points)	

4.	<p>Do the beneficiaries have a clear and feasible plan for the sustainability of project results and the capacity to implement it?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2 points in case the continuation of some project activities is well described and feasible</li> <li>- 0 points in case no project activity will be continued after the EU financing will cease <b>(Project is proposed for rejection)</b></li> </ul>	
III.	<b>Value for money</b>	<b>32</b>
I.	<b>Does the requested amount of the grant represent value for money?</b>	<b>32</b>
1.	<p>Is the proposed project budget directly connected and reflected in the project activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Depending on the correlation between activities and budget the evaluators will score max. 10 points).</li> </ul> <p><b>Project is proposed for rejection if insufficient connection between project budget and activities.</b></p>	
2.	Is project budget well justified, considering the proposed activities? Are the prices connected with the market prices? (max. 12 points)	
3.	The expenditure is realistic and cost-effective for the proposed activities. (max. 10 points)	
4.	The project is not net-revenue generating. <b>If the project is net-revenue generating it will be rejected.</b>	
5.	<p>The expenditure is in line with the list of eligible expenditure annexed to the Applicant's Guide.</p> <p><b>If the project is not in line with the list of eligible expenditure annexed to the Applicant's Guide it will be rejected.</b></p>	

6.	The budgetary provisions are correlated between the Application Form and its Annexes. If the budgetary provisions are not correlated between the Application Form and its Annexes the project will be rejected.	
FINAL SCORE (max. 100)		

Final score and recommendation: