**ANNEX : QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID**

The Quality Assessment criteria are divided into sections and subsections. The quality assessment criteria are divided into strategic and operational. Each section has the maximum score which consists of the sum of scores received in subsections. Each subsection will be given a score in accordance with the following guidelines:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4 points - Very good**  **(VG)** | The application fulfils the requirements to an excellent extent and the provided information is sufficient, clear and coherent for assessing it.  e.g. The need for transnational cooperation to address the identified challenge is clearly explained, the common challenges are tackled in a way providing results that are in scope of the Interreg NEXT Black Sea Basin Programme objectives; project work plan is very good, well-balanced and partners have the capacity to implement the project and reach the target group(s); partnership composition is relevant and the partners have competences to act in the thematic field concerned, reaching the results is foreseen in a cost-efficient way providing added value for the programme area; project provides sustainability of results and durability of actions, complements with other projects and activities. |
| **3 points - Good**  **(G)** | The application fulfils the requirements, however there are some shortcomings in tackling common challenges or planned joint actions.  e.g. There is a need for transnational cooperation, however there are shortcomings in the work plan; partners are relevant and have the competence to act in the area they are applying, results are in line and the cost-efficiency of reaching the results is ensured; results are of strategic importance to the programme area and bring added value; sustainability (where relevant) could be improved, durability of activities is ensured, project complement with other projects and activities. |
| **2 points - Weak**  **(W)** | The application has serious shortcomings fulfilling the requirements and/or the provided information is of low quality.  e.g. The transnational relevance of the project is not clearly justified; the main outputs are not clearly described; the target groups of main outputs are not described. There are serious shortcomings in regard of tackling common challenges or undertaking joint actions; the scope and the approach are having shortcomings either in work plan, relevance and competences to act in the thematic field concerned of the partners, the results are weak and the cost-efficiency is weak, or the results are not of strategic importance to the programme area or does not bring added value; sustainability of results (where relevant) is weak, the durability of the actions is weak. |
| **1 point - Unsatisfactory**  **(U)** | The application does not fulfil the requirements or information required is missing.  e.g. There is no transnational cooperation added value, there are no common challenges tackled or there is no joint actions planned, or the project is out of scope of the Interreg NEXT Black Sea Basin Programme objectives, or project work plan is weak, the partners do not have the capacity to implement the project or are not relevant, or the results are not targeted and achievable. Results are not cost-effective or not providing added value for the programme area. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Quality assessment (Award criteria)** | **Indicative description on how to understand the assessment criteria** | **Maximum**  **Score** | **Reference to Application Form section (s) and annexes** |
| 1. **STRATEGIC CRITERIA** | | | |
| 1. **RELEVANCE (If the score is less than 3 points for any sub-criteria below, the application will be rejected)** | | | |
| 1.1 The project proposal is relevant in relation to the targeted programme specific objective and the expected results | * The project overall objective is clearly in line with one of the Program’s specific objective; * The project’s main outputs and results are linked and will contribute to programme specific objective and its related indicators. | **4** | C1 |
| 1.2. The added value of transnational cooperation for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated | * The project clearly identifies and describes the common problems and needs for the targeted regions; * The planned approach is suitable for tackling at transnational level the identified problems and needs; * The planned objectives and results demonstrate the transnational added value for the topic addressed. | **4** | C.2.1, C.2.2, C.2.3 |
| 1. **COHERENCE** | | | |
| 2.1. The project intervention logic (i.e project specific objectives, activities, outputs and expected results) are consistent and clearly defined | * Project specific objectives are realistic and achievable; * Results and outputs are realistic based on the quantifications provided; * The proposed activities are consistent with the planned outputs and results and lead to their achievement. | **4** | C4, C5 |
| 1. **QUALITY OF THE RESULTS** | | | |
| 3.1 The project outputs will have an impact beyond project life time | * Project outputs are durable (the proposal is expected to provide a durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted); * Project main outputs are applicable and replicable by other organisations/regions/countries outside of the current partnership (transferability); * The developed durability concept include institutional and financial support to keep the outputs functional after the project end. | **4** | C8 |
| 3.2 Synergies and horizontal principles | * Project clearly contributes to the Common Maritime Agenda goals and priorities; * The project contributes to another macro-regional strategy (EUSDR[[1]](#footnote-2), EUSAIR[[2]](#footnote-3)) or to other relevant Black Sea strategy (e.g. SRIA[[3]](#footnote-4)); * The project creates synergies with past or current EU and other projects or initiatives;   The project describes well the contribution to the horizontal principles (i.e equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women, Environment protection and sustainable development) | **4** | C.2.5, C.2.6, C.7.6 |
| 3.3 Capitalization | * The project builds on available knowledge and builds on the outcomes of other projects. | **4** | C.2.7 |
| 1. **OPERATIONAL CRITERIA** | | | |
| 4. **PARTNERSHIP QUALITY** | |  |  |
| * 1. The project involves the relevant partners needed to address the challenge/needs identified and to achieve the specific objectives | * The partners have competence in the thematic field concerned; * The partners have a clear role to ensure that the activities shall achieve the forecasted results. | **4** | C3 |
| * 1. The project partners have the competences and financial capacity to manage a cooperation project. | * The lead partner demonstrates the capacities to manage the implementation of the planned activities and achieve the expected results; * All partners have the financial capacity to secure the cash-flow needed for the project implementation, according to Annex … – Financial Capacity Self-Assessment. | **4** | C3 |
| * 1. The proposed management approach shows good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation | * The proposed management approach shows good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation. | **4** | C.7.1, C.7.2, C.7.4 |
| **5. PROJECT WORKPLAN** | |  |  |
| * 1. The work-plan is realistic, consistent and coherent | * The proposed activities are clearly described, coherent and necessary to achieve the results; * The time-schedule is logical and appears as feasible to implement the forecasted activities and deliver the proposed outputs in the given timeframe; * In case of investments, they are relevant for reaching the project objectives and have a transnational character; * In case of activities outside the programme area, they meet the programme requirements regarding such activities. | **4** | C4 |
| **6. COMMUNICATION** |  |  |  |
| 6.1 The communication activities are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders | * The communication objectives are relevant and are expected to contribute to project specific objectives. Communication activities (and deliverables) are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders. | **4** | C.4, C.7.3 |
| **7. BUDGET AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS** | |  |  |
| * 1. The project budget demonstrates value for money | * The budget is justified and necessary in terms of the forecasted activities, outputs and results. | **4** | D |
| * 1. The costs included in the project budget are eligible and reasonable | * All of the expenditures are eligible in terms of the Programme requirements; * The proposed costs are reasonable; * There is no duplication of costs. | **4** | D |
| * 1. The budget is coherent with the work plan and the envisaged outputs | * The distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan and the envisaged outputs. * Planned outputs and activities are clearly reflected in the budget | **4** | D |
| **TOTAL SCORE**  **If the total score is less than 36 points, the application will be rejected** | | **\_\_\_\_/56** |  |

1. EU Strategy for the Danube Region [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Strategic Research and Innovation Agenda for the Black Sea [↑](#footnote-ref-4)