Assessment grid – Application Form (AF)

1. **General information about the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Reference number |  |
| 2. Project title |  |
| 3. Lead Partner/country |  |
| 4. Project Partners |  |
| 4.1 Project Partner 1/country |  |
| 4.2 Project Partner 2[[1]](#footnote-2)/country |  |
| 5. Priority/ specific objective (SO) under which funding is requested |  |
| 6. Full application form assessed by  (name, surname, position, institution) |  |
| 7. Date of the MC approval |  |

1. **Formal assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Administrative criteria** | | **Reference point** | ***YES/ NO*** | ***Comments*** |
| 1. | The AF was submitted in the electronic system WOD2021 (CST2021) before the application deadline | *WOD2021,*  *submission date* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 2. | All obligatory fields were filled in, all required supporting documents (Annexes A1-A12) are submitted in the electronic system. The AF and all annexes are in English | *AF* | *YES/ NO* |  |
| 3. | The annexes to the AF are:   * signed by authorised persons * consistent with the project * valid * in compliance with Polish/ Ukrainian laws (if relevant) | *Programme Manual/ annexes* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 4. | The Declaration by the lead partner was submitted, properly filled in, dated and signed by the legal representative (head of the organisation or another authorised person(s) | *Declaration by the lead partner* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 5. | The separate Partnership statement was submitted, properly filled in, dated and signed by the authorized representative(s) of each partner (except for the lead partner) | *Partnership statement(s)* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Eligibility Check** | | | **Reference point** | ***YES/***  ***NO*** | ***Comments*** |
| **Compatibility with Programme priorities/ specific objectives** | | | | | |
| 1. | The project is covered by the Programme priority/ SO open in the CfPs: the overall/specific objectives of the project correspond to the Programme Priority/specific objective selected and potential actions specified therein (the project can only be attributed to a single priority/ SO) | | *AF (p.\_)/* *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 2. | The project will contribute to the achievement of at least one Programme result indicator and at least one of the output indicators from the full list of indicators defined in the Programme Manual | | *AF (p.\_)/* *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| **Partnership eligibility** | | | | | |
| 4. | The partnership composition is eligible – the project will be implemented by at least one partner from Poland and one from Ukraine | | *AF (p.\_)/* *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 5. | It is declared and convincingly proved that at least three out of four cooperation criteria have been met by the project proposal:   * joint project preparation (obligatory) * joint project implementation (obligatory) * joint project staff (optional) * joint project financing (optional) | | *AF (p.\_)/*  *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 6. | One partner out of project partners plays the role of the lead partner | | *AF (p.\_)/* *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| **Eligibility of partners** | | | | | |
| 7. | The lead partner and all partners meet the eligibility criteria listed in point 3.5 of the Programme Manual | | *AF (p.\_)/ Programme Manual p. 3.5* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| **Eligibility of the project and costs** | | | | | |
| 8. | The project is eligible under criterion of its location | | *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 9. | The duration of the project is equal to or lower than 24 months | | *Programme Manual, p.\_\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 10. | The requested EU contribution is within the range of 200 000 – 2 500 000 EUR | | *AF budget* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 11. | All planned costs are eligible, in line with the Programme Manual. The costs are properly calculated | | *Programme Manual, p.\_\_/ AF (budget)* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 13. | The requested EU contribution is equal to or lower than 90% of the total eligible costs. The lead partner's (and partners', if applicable) financial contribution is equal to or higher than 10% of the total eligible costs (minimum percentage required) | | *AF (p.\_, budget)/ A\_* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 14. | Project is in line with the state aid rules[[2]](#footnote-3).  In case of project requesting state aid/de minimis – the costs are adequately indicated | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| 15. | Activities planned are not funded from other sources | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| **Horizontal pronciples** | | | | | |
| 16. | a) The project contributes to equal opportunities and non-discrimination, including accessibility for persons with disabilities:   * The project contains analysis of barriers and needs of persons with disabilities or other groups that are particularly exposed to discrimination in the context of the project area/theme; * The project contains activities which do not discriminate against specific groups of people on the basis of age, disability, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation[[3]](#footnote-4); * The project activities, including horizontal activities (promotion and management), are accessible to everyone, regardless of gender, age, disability, race or ethnic origin, religion or belief, sexual orientation, with particular emphasis on people with disabilities; * The project outputs are accessible to everyone / in line with the principle of universal design | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| b) The project contributes to equality between women and men and integrating the gender perspective:   * The project contains activities to comply with and promote the principle of equal opportunities for men and women to ensure equal access of representatives of all sexes to participation in project management, project activities and project outputs; * The planned activities in the area of ​​project promotion include building a message free from gender stereotypes | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/*  *NO* |  |
| c) Project is in line with 'do no sigificant harm' (DNSH) rule (in case of planned investments in infrastructure, the assessment basing on the filled in declaration – annex to AF) | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| **State aid test** | | | | | |
| 17. | a) Do any of the project partners meet the definition of an enterprise within the meaning of state aid (Article 107 of the Treaty on European Union). | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| b) Will any of the project partners gain an economic advantage/benefit from the implementation of the project? | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| c) Is there a risk of indirect aid in the project? | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| d) Does the co-financing granted to any of the project partners in connection with the implementation of tasks under the project affect trade and distort competition? | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| e) Is there a risk of state aid/de minimis aid in the project, which has not been indicated by the Lead Partner or Project Partner? | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| f) When applying for state aid/de minimis aid in the project, has the applicant attached the relevant attachments and declarations to the application? Are they complete and properly filled in? | | *AF (p.\_)* | *YES/NO* |  |
| **FINAL ASSESSMENT:** | | **POSITIVE** | **NEGATIVE** | | |
|  |  | | |
| **COMMENTS:** | |  | | | |

1. **Quality assessment**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Strategic assessment criteria** | | | |
| **Assessment questions** | **Guiding principles for the assessment** | **Reference point** | **Numerical assessment** |
| 1. Project’s context (relevance and strategy)  *How well is a need for the project justified?*  30 p. | a) The problems and needs that justify the necessity of project implementation are precisely defined and described | *AF (p.\_)* | /6 |
| b) The project:   * is relevant to the particular identified problems/ needs; * is relevant to particular constraints of the target regions (references to regional strategies); * is likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups | *AF (p.\_)* | /3x4 (12) |
| c) The project will contribute to achievement of the selected Programme priority and specific objective and demonstrates added value to implementation of the Programme strategy | *AF (p.\_)* | /6 |
| d) The project is complementary and brings added value to other initiatives in the field – it adds to the so far achievements and builds on them.  The results of other initiatives are used in the project | *AF (p.\_)* | /6 |
| 2. Cross-border cooperation potential and partnership  *What added value does the cross-border cooperation and that partnership bring?*  24 p. | a) The project contributes to strengthening of cross-border cooperation:   * it has objectives of common interest important for both sides of the border; * the results shall benefit both sides of the border (the project’s focus is not on individual country or region but rather on cooperation and shared ownership within and between neighbouring countries); * the cross-border cooperation generates synergy effect (thanks to the partners’ cooperation, the results of the project may have stronger impact, which would not be possible without their cooperation) | *AF (p.\_)* | /3x4 (12) |
| b) The partnership proposed is adequate to the addressed problem:   * it is proven that partners have sufficient experience, expertise and competences in the field as well as sufficient capabilities (financial, personnel, etc.); * there is a clear benefit from cooperating in the proposed project partnership (the results cannot be fully achieved without it), partners share their experience, methods, models, data, ideas, know-how, knowledge etc., each partner plays an important and well defined role in the project, the division of tasks between the cross-border partners is balanced | *AF (p.\_)* | /2x6 (12) |
| 3. Project’s contribution to the Programme’s expected results and outputs  *To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of the Programme’s objectives?*  6 p. | The project’s contribution to the achievement of the Programme output and result indicators is significant, realistic and well proven in the description | *AF (p.\_)* | /6 |
| **Total score** |  |  | **/60** |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Operational assessment criteria** | | | |
| **Assessment questions** | **Guiding principles for the assessment** | **Reference point** | **Numerical assessment** |
| 1. Overall logic of the project  6 p. | a) The overall design of the project is coherent, there is a clear link between problem addressed and proposed activities, results and objectives. The intervention logic and project plan are clear and feasible | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| b) The project’s indicators have been properly chosen, they are coherent with the addressed problem and expected project impact.  Foreseen products will lead to achievement of the results  Output and result indicators cover all main parts of the project and they are properly calculated | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| 2. Action plan and project organisation  9 p. | a) Proposed activities ensure achievement of the expected deliverables and results. They are practical and consistent with the project’s objectives and expected results.  If applicable - activities outside the Programme area are duly justified and clearly benefit the Programme area  If applicable - a detailed description of the infrastructure investment(s) and its (their) location is/are included in the application | *AF (section \_), A\_* | /5 |
| b) Schedule of activities is planned effectively and will enable their implementation on time, in consistence with the whole project.  Adequate time is foreseen for each activity’s implementation | *AF (section \_)* | /2 |
| c) The organizational issues crucial for the project are clearly described in the application, and they are adequate for implementation of the project, taking into account its size and complexity | *AF (section \_)* | /2 |
| 3. Budget  10 p. | a) The financial plan and the project budget are in line with the principles of sound financial management, the budget presents well ratio between costs and expected effects | *AF (section \_),*  *A\_* | /3 |
| b) All costs are necessary and clearly linked to the activities planned | *AF (section \_),*  *A\_* | /3 |
| c) The project budget appears proportionate to the proposed action plan, project outputs as well as to the project's contribution to Programme indicators | *AF (section \_),*  *A\_* | /2 |
| d) The costs are properly calculated and included in appropriate categories, SCOs are applied in line with the rules | *AF (section \_),*  *A\_* | /2 |
| 4. Sustainable development principle  3 p. | Is the project in line with:   * environmental protection requirements arising from applicable EU and national law? In case an environmental impact assessment has been carried out for a project, is the result positive (it must be such for the project to receive co-financing)? * the principle of sustainable development? Does, and if yes how, the project take into account the principle of sustainable development at the stages of its preparation and implementation, and the stage of use of the project's products following the completion of its implementation? * the *Rules for implementing actions in projects with infrastructure elements to ensure their compliance with the "do no significant harm" principle*?   For investments in infrastructure with an expected lifespan of at least five years – has an assessment of expected impacts of climate change been carried out? How have the risks associated with climate change, considerations regarding climate change adaptation and mitigation, and natural disaster resilience been taken into account?[[4]](#footnote-5) | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| 5. Readiness  3 p. | The project is ready for implementation.  Documents necessary to start implementation are in the possession of the partners | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| 6. Durability  3 p. | 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.  The expected results of the proposed project are durable:   * financially – there are sources of revenue for covering all future operating and maintenance costs during the period of project results durability, for financing of follow-up activities etc. * institutionally – there are structures that would allow the results of the project to be continued after the end of the action – local “ownership” of project results | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| b) Project is likely to have multiplier effects (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the project and dissemination of information) | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| 7. Communication  6 p. | a) Communication plan and goals are consistent with the scope of the project and its objectives | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| b) Communication activities are feasible and effective in achieving the communication goals. Communication tools and target values are adequately defined.  Target groups for the communication activities are properly specified and they are linked with the project | *AF (p.\_)* | /3 |
| **Total score** |  |  | **/40** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Strategic assessment** | **Operational assessment** |
| **Score** | **/60** | **/40** |
| **Total score** | **/ 100** | |
| **FINAL ASSEMENT:** | 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**, it 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.

**The minimum score** for the quality assessment – 1. Strategic assessment criteria – p. 2. “Cross-border cooperation potential and partnership” for a project in order to pass these criteria is **12 points** (out of 24). The project assessed with less than 12 points for CBC criterion will not be recommended for funding.

1. Add as many rows as needed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. If it cannot be defined by the JS that the project does not constitute state aid the Application Form shall be examined by  
   a state aid expert [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. According to Article 9(3) of Regulation (EU) 2021/1060, the projects with partners representing municipalities that have taken discriminatory measures such as signing the anti-LGBT declarations **cannot be granted** [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. "Technical guidance on the climate proofing of infrastructure in the period 2021-2027" (2021/C 373/01). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)