

Annex no. 7

Full Application Form administrative and eligibility check and quality assessment criteria

Administrative and eligibility criteria

I. Administrative criteria		
I.1	Meeting the FAF submission requirements:	Reference point
1.	The FAF (paper and e-version) was submitted to the right location before the application deadline	submission date
2.	The FAF together with the supporting documents was submitted in closed and sealed envelope	envelope
3.	The correct FAF form, published for this call for proposals, was used (FAF keeps strictly to the format generated by the application, a unique checksum has been attributed to the FAF by the e-application)	FAF
4.	The paper version of the FAF was signed by the authorised representative(s) of the lead beneficiary (head of the organisation or another authorised person(s). In the latter case the authorisation is enclosed).	FAF and annexes
5.	The e-version of the FAF and its paper version are identical (they include the same checksum) and they are in English	FAF (e-version and paper-version)
6.	All required supporting documents (Annexes A1-A15) are included. Supporting documents are valid and in compliance with Polish / Ukrainian / Belarusian legal system (if relevant)	Manual Part I / annexes
7.	The Declaration by the lead beneficiary was signed by the authorised representative(s) of the lead beneficiary (head of the organisation or another authorised person(s). In the latter case the authorisation is enclosed).	Declaration by the lead beneficiary / A5
8.	The separate Partnership statements were submitted, filled in and signed by the authorized representative(s) (head of the organisation or another authorised person(s). In the latter case the authorisation is enclosed) of each beneficiary organization (except for the lead beneficiary)	Partnership statements

II. Eligibility Check		
II.1	Compatibility with Programme TOs and priorities:	
1.	The project is covered by the Programme TO/priority open in the CfPs (the project can only be attributed to a single TO/priority)	FAF (pp. 1.1, 1.2)/ Manual Part I
2.	The overall/specific objectives of the project correspond to the TO and priority selected by the lead beneficiary	FAF (p. 2.3)/ Manual Part I
3.	The overall/specific objectives of the project will contribute to the achievement of at least one Programme result indicator	FAF (p. 3.1)/ JOP (p. 3.1.6)
4.	The project will add to the achievement of at least one of the output indicators from the list defined in the Manual Part I	FAF (p. 3.4.1)/ Manual Part I
II.2	Partnership eligibility	
5.	The partnership composition is eligible- the project will be implemented by at least one beneficiary from Poland and one from Belarus and/or Ukraine)	FAF (p. 9 and 10)/ Manual Part I
6.	It is declared that at least three out of four cooperation criteria has been met by the project proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> joint project preparation (obligatory) joint project implementation (obligatory) joint project staff (optional) joint project financing (optional) 	FAF (p. 7.3 and 7.4)



7.	One beneficiary out of project partners plays the role of the lead beneficiary and meets the criteria required in this regard	FAF (p. 9, 11)/ Manual Part I
II.3	Eligibility of beneficiaries	
8.	The lead beneficiary and all beneficiaries meet the eligibility criteria listed in point 2.2 of the Manual Part I.	FAF (p. 9, 10), A2, A6 of each beneficiary/ Manual Part I
II.4	Eligibility of the project and costs	
9.	The project keeps strictly to the idea provided in the CN (criteria mentioned in p. 3.1.1 of the Manual Part I are fulfilled)	Manual Part I / CN / FAF
10.	The project is eligible under criterion of its location (in the Programme area or partially outside the Programme area)	Manual Part I / FAF (pp. 1.11, 3.3.1, budget)
11.	The duration of the project is equal to or lower than 24 months.	FAF (p. 1.8)
12.	The requested EU contribution is within the range of 100 000 – 2 500 000 EUR	FAF (p. 1.9, budget)
13.	Amount allocated to acquisition of infrastructure is lower than 2 500 000 EUR	FAF (budget)
14.	The project has been correctly classified in both categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ soft, investment or infrastructure ▪ integrated, symmetrical or single-country 	Manual Part I / FAF (p. 1.10)
15.	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)	FAF (p. 1. 9, budget) / A4
16.	The project does not generate revenues or revenues to be generated are considered while calculating EU contribution (EU contribution is reduced by the amount of estimated revenues)	FAF (p. 4.4, budget)
17.	The costs are not regarded as ineligible according to point 6 of the Manual Part I. The costs are properly calculated.	Manual Part I / FAF (budget)
18.	The administrative costs do not exceed 7% of the total direct eligible costs excluding costs incurred in relation to the provision of infrastructure	FAF (budget)
19.	Based on the description of the activities and the lead beneficiary's declaration it is not likely that the project constitutes state aid ¹	FAF (p. 4.3)
20.	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)	FAF (p. 4.2)
FINAL ASSESSMENT:		POSITIVE
		NEGATIVE
COMMENTS:		

1. If it cannot be defined by the JTS that the project does not constitute state aid the Full Application Form shall be examined by a state aid expert.

Quality assessment criteria

1. Strategic assessment criteria			
Assessment questions	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project...	Reference point	Numerical assessment
1. Project's context (relevance and strategy) <i>How well is a need for the project justified?</i>	a) The problems and needs that justify the necessity of the project implementation are precisely defined and described	FAF (p. 2.1)	/5
	b) The project proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> is relevant to the particular identified problems/needs is relevant to particular constraints of the target regions is likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups 	FAF (pp. 2.1 and 2.4)	/3x3 (9)
	c) The project demonstrates added value to implementation of the Programme strategy and relevant national/regional strategies	FAF (p. 2.2)	/5
	d) The project is relevant to the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> particular TO (2 points) priority (2 points) (including also specific added value elements, such as promotion of gender equality, human rights, democracy, environmental sustainability, struggle against HIV/AIDS, where relevant) (1 point) 	FAF (pp. 2.3 and 2.5)	/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 without cooperation in proposed partnership) the project creates the basis to develop cross-border cooperation partners share their experience, methods, models, data, ideas, know-how, knowledge etc. 	FAF (p. 2.4)	/4x4 (16)
3. Project's contribution to the Programme's expected results and outputs <i>To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of Programme's objectives?</i>	a) The project's implementation will contribute to the achievement of the Programme output and result indicators Note: a score 5 (very good) may only be allocated if the project includes at least one output indicator presented in the JOP – point 3.1.6 "Programme Indicators".	FAF section 3.4, A8	/5
	b) The project indicators have been properly chosen	FAF (section 3.4), A8	/5
4. Partnership relevance <i>To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?</i>	a) The project involves the relevant partners needed to implement the project	FAF (pp. 7.1 and 7.2), budget	/4
	b) All partners play a defined role in the partnership and get a real benefit from it	FAF (pp. 7.1 and 7.2), budget	/3
	c) The roles have been assigned to specific partners according to the organizations' competences	FAF (pp. 7.1 and 7.2), budget	/3
Total score			/60



2. Operational assessment criteria			
Assessment questions	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project...	Reference point	Numerical assessment
1. Management <i>To what extent are management structures and procedures in line with the project size, duration and needs?</i>	a) The lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries have sufficient experience on project management	FAF (pp. 9.2 and 10.2, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries)	/2
	b) The lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries demonstrate sufficient technical expertise and management capacity, including staff, equipment, knowledge and ability to handle the budget of the project	FAF (pp. 9.2, 9.3, 10.2 and 10.3, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries), A1 and A3	/3
	c) How satisfactory is the level of involvement and activities of the cross-border beneficiaries, whether the project: was jointly prepared/will be jointly implemented/will have shared staff/will be jointly financed.	FAF (p. 7.3, section 3.)	/3
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	FAF (p. 5.2), A8	/4
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, it clearly presents the proposed activities, results and objectives. The intervention logic and project plan are clear and feasible. If applicable: to what extent is the brief feasibility study is realistic and consistent and coherent with the project activities?	FAF (section 3), A8	/4
	b) Proposed activities and deliverables are appropriate, practical and consistent with the objectives and expected results	FAF (section 3), A8 AF (p. 3.3)	/3
	c) Activities outside the Programme area clearly benefit the Programme area (if applicable)		
	d) The time schedule is realistic (contingency included)	FAF (section 3), A8	/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)	FAF (pp. 5.1, 9, 10, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries), A3, budget	/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>	b) Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for (the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results is satisfactory)	FAF (section 3, p. 7.4), budget, A8	/2
	c) Total partner budgets reflect partners' actual involvement in the project (are balanced and realistic). The planned project financing (financial flows) ensures its stable implementation. It refers to the payment options that may be used by the project.	FAF (section 3, p. 7.4), budget, A8	/2
	d) The budget is transparent and adequately related to the planned activities	FAF (section 3, p. 7.4), budget, A8	/3
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)	FAF (section 6)	/4
	c) The expected results of the proposed project are sustainable in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> financial sustainability (there are sources of revenue for covering all future operating and maintenance costs during the period of project results sustainability, for financing of follow-up activities etc.) institutional level (there are structures that would allow the results of the project to be continued after the end of the action- local "ownership" of the project results) environmental sustainability (there are conditions put in place to avoid negative effects on natural resources on which the project depends and on the broader natural environment). 	FAF (section 6)	/4
Total score			/40

	Strategic assessment	Operational assessment
Score	/60	/40
Total score	/100	
FINAL ASSESSMENT:	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
COMMENTS:		

Important!

- The maximum score the application can obtain is 100 points.
- The minimum score the application has to achieve in order to be taken into consideration for possible financing is 70 points. In addition, each project to be taken into consideration for possible financing has to achieve at least 60% from each of the parts of the quality assessment, i.e. at least 36 points from the strategic assessment and at least 24 points from the operational assessment.
- If the deadline has not been respected the application will be rejected.

