

Project Selection Criteria

Transnational Cooperation Programme Interreg

Balkan-Mediterranean 2014-2020

CCI 2014TC16M4TN003

Adopted by the Monitoring Committee in Corfu, on 26.11.2015.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
Assessment and decision-making process	3
Eligibility criteria of projects.....	4
1st PHASE	5
2nd PHASE	9
3rdPHASE.....	14
COMPATIBILITY CHECK OF THE PROJECT WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME	22
SCORING	30
Selection decisions	31
Confidentiality and independence	32
ANNEX 1	33

INTRODUCTION

The present guide describes the ‘Project Selection Criteria’ for the 1st Call for Project Proposals in the framework of the Transnational Cooperation Programme ‘Balkan-Mediterranean 2014-2020’ and illustrates clearly and transparently the project selection system. This system is made public in order to make all stakeholders and project partners aware of the selection procedure and criteria before preparing their applications.

Assessment and decision-making process

After submission, each project proposal will be evaluated based on specific selection criteria and be subjected to a **three-phase selection procedure** carried out by the Joint Secretariat(JS) with the support of National Coordination Points (NCPs) and, if necessary, external experts. The procedure and the criteria for the selection of these experts will be mutually agreed by the participating countries and will be approved by the Monitoring Committee (MC).

The external experts, if selected, will evaluate the technical content of the projects in coordination with the evaluation made by the MA/ JS. The experts must be independent of the project.

The MA/ JS will get information from national bodies in charge of the Programme in participating countries about the legal status of the partners and their relevance according to the project and according to the functions they will hold.

The selection process consists of three different phases:

Phase 1: Administrative check

The first phase consists of the **administrative criteria**. Projects will be checked for their **administrative compliance**, in order to confirm that a proposal has arrived within the set deadline and that the Application Form is complete and conforms to the requirements. This check will be carried out by the MA/ JS. This is an **on-off procedure**. Project proposals that do not meet the formal criteria are rejected;

Phase 2: Eligibility check

The second phase consists of the **eligibility criteria**. Projects will be checked for their **compliance with the eligibility criteria**, in order to confirm that the minimum requirements are met. These criteria examine whether the proposal fulfills the minimum requirements on e.g. the structure of the transnational partnership, the general compatibility with the Programme objectives and principles, the funds requested etc. Eligibility criteria can be answered with a “Yes” or “No”. This phase will be carried out by the MA/ JS and assisted by the NCPs. This is an **on-off procedure**. Project proposals, which do not fulfill the eligibility criteria, are rejected.

Project proposals that do not meet the administrative and eligibility criteria are rejected.

The results of the administrative and eligibility assessment will be approved by the Monitoring Committee via a written procedure. The applicants of the rejected projects will be informed accordingly.

Phase 3: Quality assessment

The third phase consists of the **quality criteria** - an in-depth assessment of the project, namely the **quality assessment**. Only projects that demonstrate administrative compliance and satisfy the eligibility criteria will be subjected to quality assessment. This phase will be carried out by the JS and assisted by the NCPs. In case JS is not in place at the time of the evaluation, the evaluation of project proposals shall be carried out by a common evaluation body comprised of MA staff and NCPs or other appointed body/ person of all participating countries, upon relevant decision of the MC. These criteria form the basis for an assessment of the application with the aim of bringing the projects into a certain ranking for selection based on a scoring system. Quality criteria are supplementary grouped into two categories: 1) Quality of the content and 2) Quality of the implementation potential.

External expertise and support from the National Coordination bodies or corresponding national procedures can be acquired as and if required.

Furthermore, all project proposals will be examined for their compatibility with the strategic environmental assessment of the cooperation programme.

All applicants will be informed about the result of the assessment only after the Monitoring Committee's decision.

Eligibility criteria of projects

To be eligible, the projects of the BalkanMed Programme must necessarily fit the administrative and eligibility criteria provided by the *official eligibility chart* of the BalkanMed Programme in the framework of each Call for Project Proposals within the *Application Package*.

1st PHASE

Phase 1: Administrative Compliance				
Project Identification				
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	TNCP INTERREG 'BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN 2014-2020'			
PRIORITY AXIS				
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE				
CALL CODE				
LEAD PARTNER				
PROJECT TITLE				
PROJECT ACRONYM				
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER				
A	Administrative criteria			
Nr	Criteria	Compliance		Comments
A.1	The Application Package was delivered to the right location, with the correct indication on the envelope, by the set deadline;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	

	The Application Package was submitted in the required number of versions:				
A.2	• The 'Application Form' and all obligatory Application Documents in one (1) original paper version and one (1) paper copy;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• Two 'CD/DVD-ROMs'; in the event of differences, the paper version is the binding one;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	The Application Package was delivered in the correct format, in English and fully completed:				
A.3	• The 'Application Form' in the <i>MS Excel format</i> ;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• The CD/DVD-Rom includes the 'Application Form' and the 'Specification of Budget Form' in the <i>MS Excel format</i> required and all other obligatory Application Documents in scanned format or pdf format;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
A.4	The Application Package is compiled in English language (apart from the supporting documents (a) for the eligibility of project partners and (b) the maturity of project activities which shall be in the national language);	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
A.5	The Application Package (the 'Application Form' and all obligatory Application Documents) (a) is signed by the authorised signatory, (b) is submitted in full, (c) is correctly filled in (no automatic errors or missing/ wrong information) and (d) administrative and formal data is consistent (e.g. co-financing amounts, partner names, etc.):				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Application Form’ (standard excel form provided), officially signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Partner; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Partnership Declaration’ (standard form provided), officially signed and stamped by the legal representatives of the participating partners; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Observer Declaration per partner’ (standard form provided), officially signed and stamped by the legal representatives of the observer partners (where applicable); 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Co-financing – Non Double Financing Statement per partner’ (standard form provided), officially signed and stamped by the legal representative of each partner separately; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Declaration of non generating Revenues’ (standard form provided), completed, officially signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Partner; In case a project generates revenue, the Managing Authority shall be notified in due time and a cost - benefit analysis shall be prepared and submitted to the MA and a decreased co-financing rate will be applied to the project; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Specification of Budget Form’ completed, in the requested format, expressed in euro, officially signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Partner; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Maturity Sheet per partner’ (for equipment, small-scale infrastructure and services per partner) completed, officially signed and stamped by the legal representative of each partner separately; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Authorization document from the legal representatives of LP (if applicable) in case the Application Form and declarations are not signed by the legal representatives of the Lead Partner – original or notary certified copy; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	NA <input type="radio"/>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Documentation for small-scale investment activities’ (if applicable) 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	NA <input type="radio"/>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Documentation for the eligibility of Project Partners’ for: 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>Bodies governed by public law</i> (if applicable); 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	NA <input type="radio"/>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>Non profit Bodies governed by private law</i> (if applicable); 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	NA <input type="radio"/>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ‘Documentation for IPA Partners’ (if applicable): 				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>The ‘Legal Entity Form – for IPA Public, Private, Governed by Public Law’ (for IPA LP & PPs)</i> 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>The ‘Financial Identification Form’ (for IPA LP)</i> 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		

2nd PHASE

Phase 2: Eligibility Compliance				
Project Identification				
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	TNCP INTERREG 'BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN 2014-2020'			
PRIORITY AXIS				
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE				
CALL CODE				
LEAD PARTNER				
PROJECT TITLE				
PROJECT ACRONYM				
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER				
B	Eligibility criteria			
Nr	Criteria	Compliance		Comments
B.1	The Project Proposal is in line with the relevant EU legislation and policies;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>	

B.2	The Project Proposal is assigned to programme priority and its specific objectives;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.3	The project objectives and the proposed activities are clear and in-line with the programme priorities and both have an impact on the Balkan-Mediterranean area;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.4	The project partnership and the observer partners are in line with the limits set:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project partners from at least three (3) participating countries, at least one (1) of which shall be from an EU Member State; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At least three (3) project partners with a maximum of eight (8); • Maximum two (2) observer partners; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.5	All partners shall co-operate in:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint development 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		

	• Joint implementation	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	In addition, they shall cooperate in at least one of the following ways:				
	• Joint staffing	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• Joint financing	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.6	The Lead Partner is eligible organisation (legal status, territorial eligibility - area);	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.7	The Lead Partner is officially registered at least 24 months before the publication of the Call for Project Proposals	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	All project partners are officially registered at least 12 months before the publication of the Call for Project Proposals				
B.8	All project partners (incl. observer partners) are eligible organisations (legal status, territorial eligibility - area, correctly attributed to NUTS3);	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		

B.9	The project budget, size and costs are in line with the limits set:				
	• Project budget requirements (incl. co-financing rate and EU & National funds);	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• Partners budget requirements (incl. EU & National funds) - Limitation on ERDF & IPA contribution;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• Thresholds on the financial balance between partners;	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• Preparation costs shall be calculated on a real costs basis up to 4% and not more than 20.000 euro of the total project budget. The preparation costs are eligible if they are incurred and paid between January 1 st , 2014 and within two months after the date of last signature at the Subsidy Contract for the present Call for Project Proposals. Payments made after this date cannot be considered as preparation costs.	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	• Staff costs shall be calculated at partner level on a real cost basis or on a flat rate basis (up to) 20% of direct costs other than the staff costs related to the project (Art. 19 of the ETC Regulation), where direct costs are the sum of Travel & Accommodation, External Expertise & Services, Equipment and Infrastructure & Works. Staff costs for each project partner cannot exceed 40% of its total budget (<u>having subtracted before the amount of staff costs and office and administration costs from the initial total budget</u>), regardless of the calculation option selected.				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office & Administration costs shall be calculated at partner level on a real cost basis or on a flat rate basis (up to) 15% of direct staff costs (Art. 68(1)(b) of the Common Provisions Regulation). <p>Office and Administration costs for each project partner cannot exceed 7% of its total budget (<u>having subtracted before the amount of office & administration costs from the initial total budget</u>), regardless of the calculation option selected.;</p>	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to management costs, each project partner cannot exceed 10% of its total budget (having subtracted before the amount of management costs from the initial total budget); the management costs for the Lead Partner shall be limited to 15% of its total budget. For the above limits, costs related to (1) <u>WP1 - Deliverable 1.x.1 – Cost item xxx</u> for the preparation activities’ and (2) <u>WP1 - Deliverable x.x.x – Cost item: Audits</u> for the verification of expenditure – external auditors (First Level Control) are not considered. 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First Level Controllers costs shall be according to specific national regulations and limitations applicable in each country; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget of activities to be carried out outside the Programme area (if the case) is within the 20% limit of the total ERDF project budget; 	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.10	<p>The time limits (start and end dates, project duration) are in line with the time frame set;</p>	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		
B.11	<p>The limitation in the number of Project Proposals that each partner as Lead Partner can participate is set to a maximum of two (2) project proposals; in case universities and research centres the above-mentioned limitation is considered per department.</p>	Yes <input type="radio"/>	No <input type="radio"/>		

3rdPHASE

Phase 3: Quality Assessment					
Project Identification					
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	TNCP INTERREG 'BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN 2014-2020'				
PRIORITY AXIS					
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE					
CALL CODE					
LEAD PARTNER					
PROJECT TITLE					
PROJECT ACRONYM					
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER					
C	Quality of the Content				
Nr	Criteria groups	Assessment Questions	Analysis	Numerical Assessment	Comments - Justification

C.1	Relevance & Strategy - How well is a need for the project justified? (max 12 points)	To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme's objective? What evidence is there of real demand for the project, of addressing a gap in the programme area?	Very Good reference, analytical and precise analysis based on a strategic analysis (5 points) Good reference (4 points) Adequate reference (3 points) Basic reference (2 points) Minimum reference (1 points)		
		To what extent will the project contribute to a wider strategy on one or more policy levels [EU (incl. macroregional)/ national/ regional/ local]; in particular, those concerning the project or programme area?	At all four levels (4 points) At 3 out of four levels (3 points) At 2 out of four levels (2 points) At 1 out of four levels (1 points)		
		Does the project contribute to the programme horizontal principles: •promotion of sustainable development, •promotion of equal opportunities and non-discrimination between persons, • promotion of equality between men and women.	All three issues (3 points) 2 out of three issues (2 points) 1 out of three issues (1 point)		
C.2	Outcomes - To what extent will	- Do the results and main outputs of the project contribute to the achievement of Programme indicators?	1-7 points (degree of contribution)		

<p>the project deliver useful outcomes contributing to the programme's objectives?</p> <p>(max 28 points)</p>	<p>- Are the results specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-based?</p>	<p>All five characteristics (9 points) 4 out of five characteristics (7 points) 3 out of five characteristics (5 points) 2 out of five characteristics (2 points) 1 out of five characteristics (1 points) The results do not comply with the above characteristics (0 point)</p>		
	<p>- Does the project have the concrete and realistic possibility to have a follow up and/ or to be sustainable/ durable after the end of the Programme contribution?</p>	<p>Secure funding and commitment of stakeholders (8 points) Commitment of stakeholders (6 points) Initiatives by stakeholders (5 points) Basic planning (3 points) Minimum provisions (2 point) No guarantees for the project's sustainability (0 points)</p>		

		Are the main outputs of the project applicable and replicable by other organisations/ regions/ countries outside of the current partnership and be further used and promoted by other projects/ programmes after the end of the project?	1-4 points (degree of sustainability/ durability/ transferability)		
C.3	Added Value - What is the added value of the project? (max 16 points)	in terms of socio-economic effect: - How significant is the impact of the results and to what extent do the project results provide added value for the programme area?	1-5 points (degree of continuation-improvement of existing outputs, structures, products, transfer of outputs, know-how, experience, usability of results in other sectors, by other stakeholders etc)		
		in terms of innovation: - To what extent does the project clearly demonstrate innovative character that goes beyond the existing practice in the sector/ programme area/ participating countries?	Application of innovative results of the project (4 points) Development of new innovative methods, products, tools (3 points) Use of new methods, products, tools for the implementation of the project (2 points) Basic /minimum innovation references (1 point)		
		in terms of cooperation - To what extent is the transnational cooperation needed to achieve the project's objectives and results?	1-3 (degree of cooperation)		

		in terms of cooperation - To what extent does the project capitalize previous cooperation experiences, especially in the programme area?	1-4 points (Capitalization of partnerships, outputs, experiences etc.)		
C.4	Communication - How will the project be effectively communicated? (max 4 points)	To what extent are communication activities appropriate, efficient and well-structured to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?	Full Communication strategy existing (4 points) Well developed communication activities (3 points) Basic communication activities indicated (2 point) Poor communication activities indicated (1 point)		
	Maximum total score : 60 points			0	
	Minimum total score : 32 points				

C Quality of the Implementation Potential					
	Criteria	Assessment Questions	Analysis	Numerical Assessment	Comments - Justification
C.5	Partnership - To what extent is the	- To what extent does the partnership composition involve the relevant actors needed to address the territorial challenge and the	High (3 points) Very Good (2 points) Adequate (1 points) Basic (0 points)		

	<p>partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?</p> <p>(max 13 points)</p>	<p>objectives specified in the proposed project?</p>			
		<p>- To what extent is the project partnership balanced with respect to the sectors, territory? Does the partnership consist of partners that complement each other?</p>	<p>High (3 points)</p> <p>Very Good (2 points)</p> <p>Adequate (1 points)</p> <p>Basic (0 points)</p>		
		<p>- To what extent does the Lead Partner demonstrate the capacity to manage EU co-financed projects and to coordinate, control and monitor the overall implementation of the project (financial, human resources, premises, etc.)?</p>	<p>High (4 points)</p> <p>Very Good (3 points)</p> <p>Adequate (2 points)</p> <p>Basic (1 points)</p>		
		<p>- To what extent partner organisations have the experience and competence in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to successfully implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?</p>	<p>High (3 points)</p> <p>Very Good (2 points)</p> <p>Adequate (1 points)</p> <p>Basic (0 points)</p>		
C.6	<p>Management</p> <p>(max 7 points)</p>	<p>- To what extent is an appropriate project management methodology clearly demonstrated? To what extent are management structures in line with the project size, duration and needs and management procedures clear, transparent, efficient and effective?</p>	<p>Very well developed methodology connected to outputs and results (4 points)</p> <p>Well developed methodology connected to outputs and results(3 points)</p> <p>Basic Management procedures described connected to outputs and results(2 points)</p> <p>Minimum references connected to outputs and results (1 point)</p>		

		<p>- To what extent are the specific roles of project partners (transnational activities and responsibilities) clearly defined and appropriately distributed in the partnership among the Lead Partner and the Project Partners?</p>	<p>Clear and specific roles, distributed to the partners in relation to their capacity (3 points) General distribution of tasks without specific references (2 points) Not clear enough distribution of responsibilities and tasks (1 point)</p>		
C.7	<p>Methodology - Will the chosen methodology enable successful implementation of the project? (max 11 points)</p>	<p>- To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent in terms of distribution of tasks among partners, time plan and identified project objectives, expected outputs, results and deliverables?</p>	<p>High (4 points) Very Good (3 points) Adequate (2 points) Basic (1 points)</p>		
		<p>- To what extent is the project mature allowing the realization of the project (i.e. stage of completion of the administrative procedures, etc.)?</p>	<p>All necessary administrative procedures completed- no administrative procedures necessary (7 points) Advanced stage of realization of administrative procedures- light administrative procedures required (4 points) Medium realization of administrative procedures (2 points) Low – non realization of administrative procedures. (1 points)</p>		

C.8	Budget & Finance - Is the budget requested in reasonable relation with proposed outcomes? (max 9 points)	- To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money?	High value for money (3 points) Good value/money (2 points) Reasonable value for money/Justified costs (1 point) Low value for money/Overestimated costs (0 point)		
		- To what extent is the budget coherent and proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results?	Well justified/explained budget (3 points) Basically justified/explained budget (2 points) Insufficiently justified/explained budget (1 point)		
		- Is the budget logically planned and distributed among the partners and in accordance with the activities and their real involvement?	1-3 points (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)		
Maximum total score: 40 points [Minimum total score: 28 points]				0	
			Total Score [maximum total score: 100 points] [minimum total score: 60 points]	0	

COMPATIBILITY CHECK OF THE PROJECT WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME

PRIORITY AXIS 1: COMPATIBILITY CHECK SHEET OF THE PROJECT WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME

Project Identification				
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	TNCP INTERREG 'BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN 2014-2020'			
PRIORITY AXIS	1. Entrepreneurship & Innovation			
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE				
CALL CODE				
LEAD PARTNER				
PROJECT TITLE				
PROJECT ACRONYM				
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER				
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS [Directive 2001/42/EC determines the environmental factors (components) for which the environmental consequences have to be appraised]	INDICATORS	EXPECTED CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO THE S.E.A. OF THE BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMME	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACT	COMMENTS

General – Sustainable Development Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	POSITIVE		
Water Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to the water/waste efficient management	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Solid Wastes Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to the water/waste efficient management	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Soil Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Air Quality Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Climate Change and Energy Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to climate change prevention and adaptation measures	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Public Health Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		

	tested			
Biodiversity-Fauna-Flora Issues	Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Cultural Heritage Issues	Increase in expected number of visits to supported sites of cultural and natural heritage and attractions	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Landscape Issues	Designated areas addressed (of which Natura 2000 sites)	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Population-Asset Management	Trained stakeholders	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Sea Pollution Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to the water/waste efficient management	NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT		
Conclusions				
Remarks				
Conditions that have to be met, if the proposal is financed				

INSTRUCTIONS	
↑	expected increase in the value indicator
↔	no substantial change in the value indicator
↓	expected decrease in the value indicator
0	action is not related to the specific indicator
😊	positive change
😞	negative change

**PRIORITY AXIS 2: COMPATIBILITY CHECK SHEET OF THE PROJECT
WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT OF THE COOPERATION PROGRAMME**

Project Identification				
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	TNCP INTERREG 'BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN 2014-2020'			
PRIORITY AXIS	2. Environment			
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE				
CALL CODE				
LEAD PARTNER				
PROJECT TITLE				
PROJECT ACRONYM				
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER				
ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS [Directive 2001/42/EC determines the environmental factors (components) for which the environmental consequences have to be appraised]	INDICATORS	EXPECTED CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO THE S.E.A. OF THE BALKAN-MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMME	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACT	COMMENTS
General – Sustainable Development Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	POSITIVE		
Water Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to the water/waste efficient management	POSITIVE		

Solid Wastes Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to the water/waste efficient management	POSITIVE		
Soil Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	POSITIVE		
Air Quality Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	POSITIVE		
Climate Change and Energy Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to climate change prevention and adaptation measures	POSITIVE		
Public Health Issues	Number of strategies/policies/plans/models and tools jointly developed and tested	POSITIVE		
Biodiversity-Fauna-Flora Issues	Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status	POSITIVE		
Cultural Heritage Issues	Increase in expected number of visits to supported sites of cultural and natural heritage and attractions	POSITIVE		

Landscape Issues	Designated areas addressed (of which Natura 2000 sites)	POSITIVE		
Population-Asset Management	Trained stakeholders	POSITIVE		
Sea Pollution Issues	Number of environmental friendly technologies' implementation related to the water/waste efficient management	POSITIVE		
Conclusions				
Remarks				
Conditions that have to be met, if the proposal is financed				

INSTRUCTIONS	
↑	expected increase in the value indicator
↔	no substantial change in the value indicator
↓	expected decrease in the value indicator

0	action is not related to the specific indicator
😊	positive change
😞	negative change

SCORING

The afore-mentioned criteria will be taken into account by the evaluators to assess the projects. The purpose of the quality criteria is to assess the quality of the eligible project proposals. The quality assessment is based on a scoring system. Each criteria group (“Content-related” and “Implementation-related”) is assessed on a basis of eight assessment categories, based on a numerical assessment.

The assessment criteria are defined using a set of assessment questions for the evaluator to answer together with specific guiding principles for the assessment. An overall assessment score is set for the project proposal.

The maximum total score a project may achieve for the content related criteria and the implementation related criteria is **100 points**. Quality criteria are closely linked to the nature and objectives of the Balkan-Mediterranean Programme and are common to all Priority Axes or Specific Objectives.

Two assessors will be assigned for the evaluation of each project and the final score shall be the average of the two scores.

If there is deviation by more than 20% between the two scores, the project will be re-evaluated by a third assessor.

The Managing Authority/ Joint Secretariat carries out an evaluation of proposal, based on these selection criteria, approved by the Monitoring Committee. At the end of the evaluation process, the MA/ JS draws up a shortlist ranking the proposals per priority axis (from the highest score downward) which will serve as a basis for considering the project decision by the Monitoring Committee.

According to the ranking of the project proposals, the applications are divided in three categories:

- Applications proposed to be accepted;
- Applications proposed to be rejected;
- Applications proposed to be discussed for approval under conditions at the Monitoring Committee.

The Managing Authority submits to the Monitoring Committee:

- (i) the fiches of the submitted project proposals, summarising the most important information about the project proposals;
- (ii) a ranking list per priority axis of all evaluated project proposals;
- (iii) all evaluation forms.

In case of equal scoring of two or more project proposals, while the available budget is not enough to fund all of them, the MA/JS will present the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal to the members of the MC, who will decide on the proposal to be funded.

The Monitoring Committee examines all the proposals on the basis of the preliminary technical evaluation, carried out by the MA/ JS, and finalises the evaluation procedure.

A reserve list of projects may also be drawn up following the same criteria to be used if funds are available. The selection of a project from the reserve list will be made on the basis of its ranking. The Monitoring Committee may decide to finance projects from the reserve list.

Overall, a project proposal in order to be financed by the Programme must:

- obtain a rating equal or greater than the minimum score entitling a project to be financed (60 points);
- obtain at 60% of the maximum score of quality criteria;
- be selected according to the ranking list and the limits of the budget available per priority axis of each Call for Project Proposals;

The Monitoring Committee of the TNCP ‘Balkan-Mediterranean 2014-2020’ reserves the right not to award all the available Programme funds in the present Call for Proposals.

In case where the indicative amount foreseen for the specific Priority Axis cannot be used due to the insufficient quality or the low number of proposals received, the Monitoring Committee reserves the right to reallocate the remaining funds to another Priority Axis, upon a justified proposal of the Managing Authority.

Selection decisions

Following the assessment process, projects are either approved or rejected or approved with conditions by the MC.

All the Lead Partners of the submitted project proposals will be informed in writing on the results obtained on the performance of the administrative, eligibility and quality assessment after the completion of the decision procedure of the Monitoring Committees.

The Lead Partners of the rejected projects will be informed about the reasons for the rejection upon request.

Approved projects are expected to be ready-to-start after the approval. In case of approval of a project under conditions, the revised Application Form is a prerequisite for the signing of the Subsidy Contract and its annex (Partnership Agreement). The Managing Authority (MA), with the support of the Joint Secretariat (JS), verifies that the conditions have been met (not necessary a new approval by the Monitoring Committee).

The procedure for dealing with possible complaints is described in the Project Implementation Manual.

Confidentiality and independence

Project proposals and Application Forms submitted by project applicants will be kept confidential. The content of project proposals and application forms should not be published or forwarded to persons or institutions which are not directly engaged in the applications assessment procedure or decision making. The project idea itself, as well as the description and concept of the project and the structures of the applications remain the property of the project applicants.

All actors included (MC members, NCPs, MA/JS, assessors and external experts) participating in the assessment procedure have to guarantee that the privacy and confidentiality of all applications submitted in the framework of the call for proposals will be kept and that all national privacy laws and EU Directive related to the protection of personal data (95/46/EC) will be respected.

It is not allowed to forward applications and assessment documents to actors outside the regular assessment procedure, particular not to project applicants or the wider public.

Furthermore the MC members, NCPs, MA/JS, assessors and external experts will declare that they do not have a conflict of interest and/or political influence. All actors involved in assessment, evaluation and selection must sign a declaration of Confidentiality.

ANNEX 1

The fields of minimum criteria of joint character of the project will be interpreted as follows.

All partners shall co-operate in:

a) Joint development

- All partners should contribute to the development of the project;
- Partners should define how the project will operate, i.e. joint development of objectives and outcomes, budget, timing and responsibilities for work packages and tasks to achieve the objectives;
- Partners should identify knowledge and experience that each one of them brings to the project, as well as what each partner expects to get from the project.

b) Joint implementation

- The Lead Partner should bear the overall responsibility for the project. All partners should undertake responsibilities for different parts of the implementation;
- Each project partner responsible for a work package should coordinate and ensure that planned activities are carried out, interim targets are met and unexpected challenges to implementation are dealt with;
- Several partners may contribute to each work package.

In addition, they shall cooperate in at least **one** of the following ways:

c) Joint staffing

- All project partners should have a defined role and allocate staff to fulfill this role;
- Staff members should coordinate their activities with others involved in the activity or work package and exchange information regularly;
- There should be no unnecessary duplication of functions in different partner organizations.

d) Joint financing

- The project should have a joint budget with funding allocated to partners according to the activities they are carrying out (the budget split should reflect partner responsibilities);
- The budget should include annual spending targets and spending targets per work package;
- In general, all partners should contribute with co-financing.