

Annex THE APPLICATION FORM ADMINISTRATIVE, ELIGIBILITY AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

1. GENERAL INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT

1.1. Project No.	
1.2. Project title	
1.3. Lead Beneficiary/country	
1.4. Beneficiaries	
1.4.1 Beneficiary 1/country	
1.4.2 Beneficiary 2 ¹ /country	
1.5. Thematic objective under which funding is requested	
1.6. Priority under which funding is requested	
1.7. EU co-financing	
1.8. Application Form assessed by (name, surname, position, institution)	
1.9. Application Form assessed by (name, surname, position, institution)	

2. ADMINISTRATIVE AND ELIGIBILITY COMPLIANCE

I. Administrative criteria					
I.1	Meeting the AF submission requirements	Reference point	YES	NO	Comments
1.	The AF (was submitted before the application deadline and in a way described in chapter 3.1.1.1 of the Programme Manual for 3 rd CfP	submission date electronic form			
2.	The correct AF form, published for this call for proposals, was used (AF keeps strictly to the format generated by the application, a unique checksum has been attributed to the AF by the e-application, Declaration by the Lead Beneficiary and Partnership statements are signed and attached as scan copies)	AF			
3.	The e-version of the AF, scans of Declaration by the Lead Beneficiary and Partnership statements are identical (they include the same checksum) and they are in English	AF (e-version and scan copies)			

II. Eligibility Check					
II.1	Compatibility with Programme TO and priorities:		YES	NO	Comments
1.	The overall/specific objectives of the project will contribute to the achievement of Programme result indicator of TO and priority opened for the call for proposals	AF (pp. 3.1, 3.2)/ JOP (p. 3.1.6)			

¹ Add as many rows as needed

2.	The project will add to the achievement of at least one of the output indicators from the list defined in the Manual for the call for proposals	AF (p. 3.4)/ Manual			
II.2	Partnership eligibility		YES	NO	Comments
3.	The partnership composition is eligible - the project will be implemented by at least one beneficiary from Poland and one from Belarus and/or Ukraine	AF (pp. 9, 10)/ Manual			
4.	One beneficiary out of project partners plays the role of the lead beneficiary and meets the criteria required in this regard	AF (p. 9,)/ Manual			
II.3	Eligibility of the project and costs		YES	NO	Comments
5.	The project is eligible under criterion of its location (in the Programme area or partially outside the Programme area)	Manual / AF (pp. 1.10, 3.5, budget)			
6.	The duration of the project is equal to or lower than 12 months	AF (p. 1.7)			
7.	The requested EU contribution is within the range of 20.000 – 60.000 EUR	AF (p. 1.8, budget)			
8.	Investment costs (works, supplies) do not exceed 20% of the EU grant	AF (budget)			
9.	The requested EU contribution is equal to or lower than 90% of the total eligible costs. The lead beneficiary's (and beneficiaries', if applicable) financial contribution is equal to or higher than 10% of the total eligible costs (minimum percentage required)	AF (p. 1.8, budget)			
10.	The project does not generate profits (p. 9.2 of Programme Manual)	AF (p. 4.4, budget)			
11.	Staff costs and travel costs do not exceed maximum limits of lump sum for their categories	AF (budget)			
12.	The administrative costs do not exceed 7% of the total direct eligible costs excluding costs incurred in relation to the provision of infrastructure	AF (budget)			
13.	Based on the description of the activities and the lead beneficiary's declaration it is not likely that the project constitutes state aid ²	AF (pp. 3.5, 4.3)			
14.	Lack of overlapping or duplication with other aid programmes / other donors financing (e.g. EU programmes, EEA Financial Mechanism and Norwegian Financial Mechanism, Swiss-Polish Cooperation Programme)	AF (p. 4.2)			
FINAL ASSESSMENT:		POSITIVE	NEGATIVE		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
COMMENTS:					

1. ASSESSORS' REMARKS (Missing information/documents; correspondence with the applicant, etc.)

--

² If it cannot be defined by the JTS that the project does not constitute state aid the AF shall be examined by a state aid expert.

ASSESSORS' DECISION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND ELIGIBILITY COMPLIANCE

	YES / NO / N/A
The Application Form met the criteria of administrative compliance and eligibility and is subject to the quality assessment.	
The Application Form met the criteria of administrative compliance and eligibility after additional information/documents were provided and is subject to the quality assessment.	
The Application Form does not meet the criteria of administrative compliance and eligibility and is not subject to the quality assessment.	

Assessed by: <Name, surname, position>

Date: <dd/mm/yyyy>

Assessed by <Name, surname, position>

Date: <dd/mm/yyyy>

After positive assessors' decision on administrative and eligibility compliance, quality assessment takes place.

In case of missing information/documents, a request for clarification is sent to the lead beneficiary. Assessment of further parts of this grid is suspended.

In case of negative decision, information on the results of administrative and eligibility compliance is sent to the lead beneficiary.

2. APPLICATION FORM QUALITY ASSESSMENT

Scoring guidelines

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **subsections**. For each sub-section there is information about the maximum score which may be given for the relevant sub-section and bullet point (if sub-section is divided into bullet points). Depending on the importance of the specific issue from the Programme point of view, the maximum score possible to be attributed varies for each bullet point/sub-section. In case where the maximum possible score to be obtained is 5 the point shall be understood as follows:

- 0 zero (the information is not relevant or not provided);
- 1 very poor (the information is incomplete, not clear or not convincing for the evaluation criterion being assessed);
- 2 poor (weaknesses are more important than strengths and there are no specific aspects which single out the proposal from others);
- 3 adequate (the proposal demonstrates overall adequate features with regards to the evaluation criterion towards which it is being assessed even though it may contain some notable weaknesses);
- 4 good (the proposal has identifiable features which demonstrate that is of good quality with regards to the criterion towards which it is being assessed);
- 5 very good (the content of the proposal assessed cannot be improved with regards to the evaluation criterion towards which it is being assessed).

In case of bullet point with a maximum score making 1, 2, 3 or 4 point the scores shall be attributed by the assessors according to the completeness and relevance of information provided by the

applicant and following the spirit of evaluation described above (i.e. the highest possible score may be only attributed if the content of the proposal assessed cannot be improved with regards to the evaluation criterion towards which it is being assessed). Decimal scores (e.g. 2,5) may not be attributed. The assessors are obliged to provide the explanation of the scores awarded in each sub-section of the evaluation grid, if relevant.

The minimum score the application has to achieve in order to be taken into consideration for possible financing is **56 points**. **In addition**, it has to achieve **at least 60% from each of the parts of the quality assessment**, i.e. at least 27 points from the strategic assessment and at least 21 points from the operational assessment.

1. Strategic assessment criteria				
Assessment questions	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project...	Reference point	Numerical assessment	Comments
1. Project's context (relevance and strategy)	a) The problems and needs that justify the necessity of the project implementation are precisely defined and described	AF (p. 2.1)	/4	
<i>How well is a need for the project justified?</i>	b) The project proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ is relevant to the particular identified problems/needs and constraints of the target regions (solves problems/needs) ▪ is likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups ▪ its implementation is in line with Programme strategy (particularly takes into account needs of accessibility for the disabled) 	AF (pp. 2.1, 2.3)	/3x3 (9)	
	c) The project is relevant to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ particular TO (2 points) ▪ priority (2 points) ▪ specific added value elements, such as promotion of gender equality, human rights, democracy, environmental sustainability, struggle against HIV/AIDS, where relevant (1 point) 	AF (pp. 2.2, 2.4)	/2+2+1 (5)	
2. Cooperation character <i>What added value does the cooperation bring?</i>	The project contributes to the strengthening of cross-border cooperation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the results benefit both/three sides of the border ▪ there is a clear benefit from cooperating in the proposed project partnership (results cannot be fully achieved 	AF (p. 2.3 if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries)	/5x3 (15)	

	without cooperation in proposed partnership) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the project creates the basis to develop cross-border cooperation partners share their experience, methods, models, data, ideas, know-how, knowledge etc. AF analysis confirms joint initiatives in regard to common project preparation, implementation, staff and financing 			
3. Partnership relevance	a) The project involves the relevant partners needed to implement the project / The roles have been assigned to specific partners according to the organizations' competences	AF (pp. 7.1, 7.2), budget	/3	
<i>To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?</i>	b) All partners play a defined role in the partnership and get a real benefit from it	AF (pp. 7.1, 7.2), budget	/3	
4. Project's contribution to the Programme's expected results and outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project's implementation will contribute to the achievement of the Programme output and result indicators The project indicators have been properly chosen 	AF (pp. 3.2, 3.4,)	/2x3 (6)	
<i>To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of Programme's objectives?</i>				
Total score			/45	

2. Operational assessment criteria				
Assessment questions	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project...	Reference point	Numerical assessment	Comments
1. Management <i>To what extent are management structures and procedures in</i>	The lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries have presented sufficient management structures and procedures/the idea how the project is going to be managed.	AF (pp. 3.5, 5.1, 9.2, 10.2, if needed also relevant sections	/3	

<i>line with the project idea, size, duration and needs?</i>	They have monitoring and evaluation plan and main means for project implementation.	for all beneficiari es)		
2. Communication <i>To what extent are communication activities appropriate and forceful to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</i>	The project information and communication plan is appropriate to achieve project communication goals	AF (p. 5.2)	/3	
3. Work plan <i>To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?</i>	a) The overall design of the project is coherent. The intervention logic and project plan are clear and feasible. The subsequent AF parts include consistent information. Proposed activities are appropriate, practical and consistent with both the objectives and expected results.	AF (section 3, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiari es)	/5	
	b) All key activities have been clearly and exhaustively described. They are connected with each other and make logical whole. c) Activities outside the Programme area clearly benefit the Programme area (if applicable)	AF (section 3)	/5	
	d) The time schedule is realistic, the project is ready for implementation	AF (p. 3.5, 3.6)	/3	
4. Budget <i>To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money?</i> <i>To what extent is the budget coherent and proportionate?</i>	a) Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation (both the lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries who financially contribute to the project have stable and sufficient sources of financing)	AF (pp. 9, 10, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiari es), budget	/2	
	b) Project budget is adequately related to the planned activities – the ratio between the estimated costs	AF (section 3, p. 7.3), budget,	/3	

	and the expected results is satisfactory both in case of real costs and simplified costs options.			
	c) Total partner budgets reflect partners' actual involvement in the project (are balanced and realistic). The planned project financing ensures its stable implementation	AF (section 3, p. 7.3), budget	/2	
	d) The budget is transparent and clearly presented. Clarification and justification of budget items allow to find out what is included in the cost and to assess its necessity	budget	/ 5	
	e) The costs are eligible and properly calculated	budget	/2	
5. Sustainability	a) Project is likely to have a long-lasting impact on its target groups. The project main outputs will be further used once the project has ended. b) Project is likely to have multiplier effects (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the project and dissemination of information) c) Project shall bring no negative effects on the environment	AF (section 6)	/2	
Total score			/35	

	Strategic assessment	Operational assessment
Score	/45	/35
Total score	/80	
FINAL ASSEMENT:	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS:	<p><summary, justifications></p> <p>< In case of positive assessment please add:</p> <p>ENI support requested: _____ EUR;</p> <p>Max recommended amount of ENI support: _____ EUR. ></p>	

Assessed by: <name, surname, position>
Date: <dd/mm/yyyy>

Assessed by: <name, surname, position>
Date: <dd/mm/yyyy>

