

2nd CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Project Evaluation Sheet

<i>Project Acronym:</i>	
<i>Project title :</i>	
<i>Lead partner :</i>	
<i>Register no.</i>	
<i>Priority axis:</i>	

Investment priority: 6c - Conserving, protecting, promoting and developing natural and cultural heritage

Specific objective: Valorize CB area cultural and natural heritage for tourist purposes

Evaluation Criteria

CRITERIA FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL COMPLIANCE

1. Administrative compliance (YES/NO)		Comments
a) The project proposal was submitted within the deadline set	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
b) The project proposal was submitted in the required formats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • hardcopy of the Application Form with the requested documents attached in 1 original • CD/DVD including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the Application Form in the excel format required, ○ Annex 1 “Scope of the Project and Sustainability” ○ the justification of the budget document in the excel format required 	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
c) The Application Form used has the official form specified by the Managing Authority and is properly filled in, in English, stamped and signed by the Lead Beneficiary	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	
d) The requested documents are properly filled in, in English, signed and stamped and are attached to the Application Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Partnership Declaration signed and stamped by all beneficiaries b. Declarations of not generating revenues or a cost-benefit analysis (in case of revenue generating projects) signed and stamped by every beneficiary 	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	

Evaluation Criteria

<p>c. State Aid declaration (standard form provided) signed and stamped by every beneficiary</p> <p>d. Declaration of non distribution of profits (standard form provided) signed and stamped (applies for the specific beneficiaries only, according to the call)</p> <p>e. Decision of the designated body of each beneficiary (e.g. Municipal Council, Board of Directors, etc.) stating its agreement for submitting the particular project proposal, according to the internal rules/statute of each beneficiary or the national legislation</p> <p>f. Justification of Budget Costs presented in the requested format</p> <p>g. Annex 1 “Scope of the Project and Sustainability” - signed and stamped by the Legal Representative of the Lead Beneficiary</p> <p>h. Documentation for Infrastructure Projects (if applicable)</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><i>N/A= Not Applicable</i></p>	
<p>2. Eligibility criteria (YES/ NO)</p>		<p>Comments</p>
<p>a) The project proposal fulfils minimum and maximum requirements for partnership (number of partners and countries involved).</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>b) The project proposal is assigned to the open in the Call for Proposals Programme’s priorities and their specific objectives.</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

Evaluation Criteria

<p>c) The project beneficiaries cooperate¹ in:</p> <div style="margin-left: 40px;"> <p>Development of the operation (mandatory) YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Implementation of the operation (mandatory) YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Staffing of the operation YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>or/and</p> <p>Financing of the operation YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p> </div>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>d) The beneficiaries fall under the eligible categories of beneficiaries according to the Call for Proposals</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>e) The project budget and costs are in line with the limits set in the Call for Proposals</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
<p>f) The duration of the project is in line with the time frame set out in the Call for Proposals</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>	

Assessor 1	Name	
	Signature	

¹ According to Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on specific provisions for the support from the European Regional Development Fund to the European territorial cooperation goal, Article 12, paragraph 4: "Beneficiaries shall cooperate in the development and implementation of operations. In addition, they shall cooperate in the staffing or the financing of operations, or in both."

Evaluation Criteria

Assessor 2	Name	
	Signature	

Evaluation Criteria

2nd PHASE – QUALITY ASSESSMENT

PROJECT QUALITY (Obligatory requirements for IP6c)			
Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Comments
a) The project complies with Article 65, par.6 of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 stating: “Operations shall not be selected for support by the ESI Funds where they have been physically completed or fully implemented before the application for funding under the programme is submitted by the beneficiary to the managing authority, irrespective of whether all related payments have been made by the beneficiary.”	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	B.2	
b) The project is consistent with the horizontal principles of the Programme: - sustainable development - equal opportunities and non discrimination (including provision of accessibility for persons with disabilities) - equality between men and women	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	B.8.1	
c) In case the project includes small infrastructure interventions, they form part of a larger project.	YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <input type="checkbox"/>	B.1	

Evaluation Criteria

PROJECT QUALITY (Content related criteria)					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
Relevance of the proposal	a) Does the project demonstrate its ability to promote synergies with EU/regional/national strategies and synergies to other Programmes?	0=no 1=barely 2=satisfactorily 3=extensively	Annex 1, B.8.2		
	b) Does the project contribute to the achievement of the specific objective of the investment priority 6c?	0=no 1=basically 2=satisfactorily 3=extensively	Annex 1, Section B		
	TOTAL (max. 6)				

Evaluation Criteria

Quality of results – efficiency and effectiveness	a) Are the results specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound?	0=none 1=1 characteristic met 2=2 characteristics met 3=3 characteristics met 4=4 characteristics met 5=all characteristics met	B.1.4		
	b) Do the project results and main outputs clearly link to Programme priority and its indicators?	0=no 1=satisfactorily linked 2= clearly linked	B.1.4, B.1.3, Section F		
	c) To what extent do the project results provide added value to the Programme area?	0=none 1=barely 2=partially 3=satisfactorily 4= extensively	Annex 1, B.1.1, B.7.1		

Evaluation Criteria

	d) Does the project include pilot actions (investment activities and/or applications and tools)?	N/A 4=pilot actions included	B2		
	e) Does the project provide for the improvement of entrepreneurship conditions within the Programming period and sustains them afterwards?	N/A 1=improves 2=improves and sustains them after	B1.4, B.6.1		
	f) Does the project include sufficient measures that contribute to the increase and retention of the visitation of the assisted natural or cultural sites?	N/A 1=adequate measures included for increased visitation 2=sufficient measures included for increased and retained visitation	Section B Section F		
	TOTAL (max. 19)				
Impact and Sustainability					
	a) Is the proposal likely to have a tangible impact on	0=no	Annex 1, B.1.3,		

Evaluation Criteria

	the target groups? (Existence of tangible results and visible impact for lasting improvements and permanent opportunities for the target groups)	1=partially 2=satisfactorily 3=extensively	B.1.4		
	b) What is the scope of the impact/significance of the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - local impact only - local effect with transferable results to the rest of the eligible area - broad area impacts/significance 	1=local impact 2=local and transferable 4=broad impact	B.2.3, B.6.1		
	c) How does the project demonstrate its sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the proposal is likely to have multiplier effects (including scope for replication and extension of the deliverables, dissemination of information) - the financial sustainability of the project is clearly demonstrated (The degree to which the proposal clearly demonstrates how the activities will be financed after the Programme funding ends) - the institutional sustainability of the project is clearly demonstrated to allow the activities to continue to be in place after the end of the project 	0= no sustainability 1=1 characteristic met 2 =2 characteristics met 3=all 3 characteristics met	Annex 1, B.6, B4		
	TOTAL (max. 10)				

Evaluation Criteria

Innovation	Does the project contain innovative features (new ideas, more effective devices or processes: new solutions, new technologies and new products)?	N/A 1= partially 2=satisfactorily	B.1		
	TOTAL (max. 2)				
Cross Border Co-operation and Capitalization	a) Does the project demonstrate clearly the need for cross border approach to the addressed topic? (Is there a real demand for the project? Does it address common cross border challenges and opportunities in the Programme area?)	0=no 1= barely 2= partially 3=satisfactorily 4=extensively	B.1.1, B.7.1, B.7.2		
	b) In which way does the project capitalize previous cooperation and experience: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- capitalization of beneficiaries’ know-how experience- capitalization of beneficiaries’ experience in Cross border Cooperation activities- capitalization of previous cooperation among current beneficiaries- capitalization of previous relevant projects	0=no capitalization 1=1 characteristic met 2=2 characteristics met 3=3 characteristics met 4=all 4 characteristics met	B.7.3		
	TOTAL (max. 8)				
TOTAL For Category “Content Related Criteria” (max.45) (Threshold 27 points)					

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
Quality of the partnership (appropriate synthesis and organizational arrangements)	a) To what extent does the Lead Beneficiary demonstrate the capacity to coordinate, manage, control and monitor the overall implementation of the project? (previous experience of the institution, completed projects)	1= low 2=adequate 3=high	B.3		
	b) Is the professional capacity (structure and experience) of the other beneficiaries sufficient to implement successfully the project activities undertaken? (previous experience of the institution, completed projects)	1=low 2=adequate 3=high	B.3		
	c) Is the institutional and financial status of the partnership relevant to the activities to be implemented?	0= not relevant competence 1= partly competent partnership 2=fully competent partnership	B.3, Beneficiaries' supporting documents		
	d) To what extent are the specific roles (actions and responsibilities) clearly and appropriately distributed among the Lead Beneficiary and the other beneficiaries?	1=not clear enough distribution of responsibilities	B.2.1		

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
		and tasks 2= general distribution of tasks without specific references 4= clear, specific and appropriately distributed roles of the partners			
Quality of the methodological approach	a) Is the overall design of the project coherent? In particular, does it take into account external factors and the analysis of the problems involved? Is the relation between the activities-outputs-results-objectives well structured?	1= work plan containing some incoherent activities/outputs /results 3= clear work plan of activities but external factors not fully considered 5= clear, realistic and appropriate	B.1, B.2		

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
		work plan of activities leading to the achievement of the expected results and the objectives of the project			
	b) Does the proposal contain objectively realistic and relevant indicators for measuring the results of the project?	0=no 1=yes	B.1.4, Section F		
	c) How mature is the project (in which stage of completion are the administrative procedures that allow the implementation of the project (licenses, designs, permits, land acquisition, tenders, etc.)?	0=no implementation of any necessary procedures 1=low implementation level of required procedures 2=basic implementation of required	B.5, Documentation for Infrastructure Projects		

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
		<p>procedures</p> <p>3=medium stage of implementation of required procedures</p> <p>4= Advanced stage of implementation of required procedures</p> <p>5= all necessary procedures completed, all approvals obtained</p>			

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
	d) Is the methodology for management of the project clearly defined and efficient? In particular, is the proposed approach for internal project monitoring and assessment satisfactory?	1=minimum project management methodology 2=adequate project management methodology 3=well developed methodology connected to outputs and results	B.2.1, B.3.2		
	e) Are the Information and Publicity measures for external communication of project's outputs and results appropriate and efficient? (How are the anticipated project results going to be promoted? Do they have high visibility and strong impact?)	1=minimum measures 2=adequate measures 3=well-developed measures	B.4		
Budget and	a) Is the proposed budget reasonable, realistic and	1=low value for	B.1.4,		

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
<i>finance</i>	justified? Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?	money 2= reasonable value for money 3= good value for money 4= high value for money	Section D, Justification of the Budget Document		
	b) Is the budget logically planned and distributed among the partners and the activities? (Distribution of the budget secures the active participation of each partner in relation to the activities described in the Application Form and secures the successful implementation of the foreseen activities)	1= planned budget but incoherent distribution to partners and/or activities with not justified costs 2= planned budget and distributed among the partners but some activities are not well justified and the	B.2.1, B.2.2, Section D, Justification of Budget Document		

Evaluation Criteria

Implementation-related criteria					
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
		participation of partners in not fully ensured 3= logically planned budget with some small discrepancies in the partners' budgets of some activities 4=logically planned and correctly distributed among the partners and the activities			
TOTAL For Category "Implementation Related Criteria" (max. 37) (Threshold 24 Points)					
GRAND TOTAL Score (max.82)					

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Summary	Overview graph
<p>Project Content Quality:</p> <p>Project Implementation Quality:</p>	

Assessor 1	Name	
	Signature	
Assessor 2	Name	
	Signature	
JTS Coordinator	Name	
	Signature	

Evaluation Criteria

COMPATIBILITY CHECK SHEET OF THE PROJECT WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME					
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	INTERREG V-A Greece–Bulgaria 2014-2020 Cooperation Programme				
PRIORITY AXIS					
INVESTMENT PRIORITY					
CALL CODE					
FINAL BENEFICIARY					
PROJECT TITLE					
ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES (The Directive 2001/42/EK determines the environmental issues for which the environmental consequences have to be appraised)	EXPECTED CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO THE S.E.A. OF THE OP GREECE-BULGARIA ²			ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACT	COMMENTS
	Priority Axis 1	Priority Axis 2	Priority Axis 4		
Biodiversity, Fauna and Flora	- to 0	+	0		
Human health and population	+	0 to +	+		

² Type of effects: Positive (+), Neutral (0) or Negative (-)

Evaluation Criteria

Soil	- to 0	+	0		
Water	- to 0	+	0		
Air	- to 0	- to +	0		
Climatic factors	0	- to +	0		
Material assets	+	0 to +	0		
Cultural heritage	0	0 to +	0		
Landscape	- to 0	- to +	0		
Conclusions					
Remarks					
Conditions that have to be met if the proposal is financed.					