

Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

Italy – Croatia

INTERREG ITALY-CROATIA PROGRAMME 2021 – 2027

Annex 1 – Project Selection Assessment Criteria

1st Call for Proposals

(Version 1.0 – 17th November 2022)

1. Administrative Compliance and Eligibility check

After the submission in JEMS, the JS will perform the assessment of the project proposals. The following criteria are part of automated checks which are carried out by Jems:

- submission by the deadline set for a Call;
- the total ERDF co-financing is not exceeding 80% of the total project budget;

and for this reason they are not included in the administrative compliance and eligibility check.

The following table specifies the criteria to be used for this stage of the Project Selection process:

	Criteria	Eligible
A	Submission and completeness of the AF	
A.1	The proposal is the only submitted for the given project	YES/NO
A.2	The proposal is complete and filled out in all its parts in English language	YES/NO
A.3	The proposal is duly signed by LP's legal representative/delegated person	YES/NO
B	General Call requirements	
B.1	The project duration is in line with the time limit set in the Call Announcement	YES/NO
B.2	The minimum and maximum number of partners is respected	YES/NO
B.3	The total financial dimension of the project proposal is in line with the Call Announcement	YES/NO
C	Eligibility of Lead Partner	
C.1	The Lead partner is an eligible applicant according to the Call requirements	YES/NO
C.2	The LP organization is involved as LP in only 2 proposals within the Call	YES/NO
D	Eligibility of Project Partners	
D.1	Project partners are eligible applicants according to the Call requirements	YES/NO
E	Annexes	
E.1	The Lead Partner Declaration is complete and correct	YES/NO
E.2	The Project Partner declarations are complete and correct	YES/NO
E.3	Information presented in the project proposal and in annexes is consistent	YES/NO
E.4	Financial capacity of the private LP is demonstrated	YES/NO/NOT APPLICABLE
E.5	For INVESTMENTS: Other supporting documents (e.g. the authorizations, permits, an assessment of expected impacts of climate change, etc.) are listed in the project proposal, and attached, otherwise it is indicated when the documentation will be available.	YES/NO/NOT APPLICABLE



Italy – Croatia

F	Cooperation criteria	
F.1	The Lead Partner commits to apply at least three cooperation criteria: joint development, joint implementation and joint staffing or joint financing	YES/NO
G	Horizontal principles	
G.1	The Lead Applicant commits to the respect of the horizontal principles (equal opportunities and non discrimination, equality between men and women and sustainable development)	YES/NO

2. Quality Assessment

2.1 Strategic assessment criteria

1	Cooperation character	Reference in the AF ¹	Points	Weight	Weighted score
1.1	What added value does the cooperation bring? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of cooperation beyond borders for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated; The results cannot (or only to some extent) be achieved without cooperation. 	C.2.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)
1.2	Is the implementation of effective cross-border activities (no mirroring) clearly demonstrated?	C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)
1.3	Is there a clear benefit from cooperating for all the involved project partners and both sides of the border?	B.n.6 ² C.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)
1.4	To what extent does the project demonstrate new cross-border solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/Programme area/participating countries?	C.2.2 C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR COOPERATION CHARACTER				20%	
2	Project relevance and strategy	Reference in the AF	Points	Weight	Weighted score
2.1	To what extent the proposal addresses common territorial challenges and opportunities on the basis of IP 2021-2027 and in the Programme area (is there a real need for the project)?	C.2.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
2.2	Is the project clearly contributing to a wider strategy on one or more policy levels (EU/national /regional)?	C.2.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)

¹ In addition to the mentioned chapters, also other parts of the AF can be used during assessment.

² The letter „n“ refers to the Jems section of each LP/PP in the proposal.



Italy – Croatia

2.3	Is the project clearly and consistently contributing to specified EUSAIR macro-regional strategy pillar objectives and flagships?	C.2.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
2.4	Are complementarities and synergies between the project proposal and projects supported by other programmes and initiatives clearly demonstrated?	C.2.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.5	To what extent the project makes use of available knowledge and builds on existing results and practices?	C.2.7	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.6	Do the actions proposed aim to effectively achieve the environmental sustainability objectives of the cooperation area as specified in Strategic Environmental Assessment?	C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.7	How effective and measurable is the contribution to Horizontal principles from Art. 9 CPR and art. 22(2) Interreg Regulation?	C.7.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.8	Is the proposal foreseeing the use of “sustainable development practices” (e.g. Green Public Procurement; Nature-based solutions; Lifecycle costing criteria; Standards going beyond regulatory requirements)?	C.7.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE AND STRATEGY				18%	
3	Contribution to programme’s objectives, expected results and outputs	Reference in the AF	Points	Weight	Weighted score
3.1	To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme’s objectives and indicators: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project contributes to the achievement of the programme’s objectives; the project’s overall objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the programme’s priority/specific objective; the project’s outputs clearly link to the programme output indicators and their contribution to programme targets is sufficient; the project’s contribution to the programme result indicators is realistic and sufficient. 	A.2 C.1 C.4 C.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
3.2	To what extent is the project intervention logic plausible? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> project specific objectives are specific, realistic and achievable; 	A.4 B.n.7 C.4 C.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> proposed project outputs are needed to achieve project specific objectives; project outputs and results are realistic (it is possible to achieve them with given resources; i.e., time, partners, budget - and they are realistically based on the quantification provided). 				
3.3	Are the proposal deliverables/outputs and results clearly addressing the identified needs of the selected target groups?	C.2.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
3.4	<p>To what extent will project outputs have an impact beyond project lifetime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the outputs durable? Are the outputs applicable by and replicable to the other organizations/ regions/ Countries outside of the current partnership? If applicable: in case of investment in infrastructure or productive investment, has the involved partner the necessary financial resources and mechanisms to cover operation and maintenance costs, so as to ensure its durability and financial sustainability? 	C.4 C.8.1 C.8.2 C.8.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
3.5	Cross-cutting issues: are circular economy approaches and digitalization valorised in the proposal?	C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTRIBUTION TO PROGRAMME'S OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED RESULTS AND OUTPUTS				16%	
4	Partnership relevance	Reference in the AF	Points	Weight	Weighted score
4.1	Does the project involve the relevant project partners with proven experience and competence in the thematic field to address the territorial challenges, implement the project and reach the target groups?	C.3 B.n.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
4.2	Does the LP and all the PPs have the necessary operational capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?	B.n.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
4.3	To what extent are the newcomers present as project partners?	B.n.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
4.4	To what extent is the partnership optimal (overall size of partnership including associated partners if present, thematic fields covered, governance levels, quadruple helix, country representation, etc.)?	B.n.6 C.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

4.5	To what extent the partners have a defined role in the project and complement each other?	B.n.6 C.3	(0-20- 40-60- 80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE				16%	
TOTAL SCORE FOR STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA				70%	

2.2 Operational assessment criteria

		Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
5	Management				
5.1	Are the management procedures, structures and internal coordination defined, sufficiently elaborated and effective?	C.7.1	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	3%	(points x weight)
5.2	Does the lead partner demonstrate the capacity to coordinate, manage and monitor project implementation, including financial management?	C.7.1 C.7.4	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	2%	(points x weight)
5.3	In what extent is ensured the quality of the project management (e.g. project management risks have been identified and mitigation measures foreseen, project evaluation is planned, etc.).	C.7.2	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR MANAGEMENT				7%	
6	Communication	Reference in the AF	Points	Weight	Weighted score
6.1	Are the communication objectives clearly linked to the project specific objectives and coherently integrated in the overall project strategy?	C.4 C.7.3	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	2%	(points x weight)
6.2	Are the proposed communication approach and activities relevant and sufficient to reach the target groups and stakeholders?	C.4 C.2.4	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	3%	(points x weight)
6.3	Are feedback mechanisms and evaluation measures envisaged for the communication activities?	C.7.3	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR COMMUNICATION				7%	
7	Work plan /Activity plan	Reference in the AF	Points	Weight	Weighted score
7.1	Are the proposed activities and deliverables:	C.4 C.5	(0-20- 40-60-	3%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	relevant and lead to planned outputs and results (in case of investments is it demonstrated the added value of investments and equipment purchases and their cross-border relevance to reach the project objectives).		80-100)		
7.2	Are the proposed activities and deliverables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • specific and measurable; • defined in a logical and realistic time-sequence. 	C.4 C.4 C.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
7.3	Is the distribution of tasks among partners coherent? (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the project, etc.).	C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR WORK PLAN /ACTIVITY PLAN				8%	
8	Budget	Reference in the AF	Points	Weight	Weighted score
8.1	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of efficiency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • financial allocation per cost category is in line with the work plan; • distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan. 	B.n.7 D E	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
8.2	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the available information on the budget is transparent and sufficient, and on that basis, the project budget appears proportionate to the proposed workplan, project outputs and project's contribution to programme indicators aimed for; • sufficient and reasonable resources are planned for investments and equipment purchases (if applicable) and their costs are realistic; • the distribution of budget between PPs is reasonable and coherent with their respective role in project activities. 	B.n.7 D E	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
8.3	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of economy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the budget allocated to staff and external expertise (if applicable) is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic; • sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation. 	B.n.7 D E	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR BUDGET				8%	
TOTAL SCORE FOR OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT				30%	

