

Methodology and criteria for assessment and selection of flagship projects

INTERREG V-A ROMANIA-HUNGARY PROGRAMME



"Partnership for a better future"

www.interreg-rohu.eu

Version 2

Approved by the Monitoring Committee on September 14th, 2017

Table of Contents

1. Foreword.....	3
2. Procedures and actors.....	4
2.1 General principles of the assessment and selection.....	4
2.2 Role of Programme' bodies.....	4
2.3 Requirements of impartiality and confidentiality	5
3. Steps of the assessment process.....	7
3.1 PHASE I - Concept Notes.....	8
3.1.1. Administrative and eligibility check	8
3.1.2. Quality assessment	9
3.1.3. Ranking of project proposal per Ip's and re-evaluation, if necessary	10
3.1.4. Procedure for assuring the balanced budget allocation.....	12
3.1.5. Selection of projects, setting up the lists for Projects for financing, Reserve list and List of rejected projects.....	14
3.2 PHASE II - Full Applications.....	16
3.2.1. Administrative and eligibility check	17
3.2.2. Quality assessment	17
3.2.3. Selection of the Full Applications	19
4. Contracting.....	20
5. Arrangements for the examination of complaints.....	20
6. Annexes.....	24

1. Foreword

The purpose of this methodology is to specify the terms, methods and criteria for assessment and selection of the projects submitted in the framework of the restricted Call for proposal of the **Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary programme**.

The present methodology is approved by the Monitoring Committee (MC). After its adoption, it will be handed over to all persons participating in the assessment and selection process, including external assessors, as working guidelines.

The aim of this document is to provide the basic rules and guidelines for the assessment of project proposals submitted in the frame of the Programme, under the Restricted Call. The Joint Secretariat (JS) prepared the specific assessment grids for Call for proposal (CfP) taking into consideration the specificity of the investment priorities under which flagship projects might be supported.

The strategic projects are projects of key importance that address the most important needs of the eligible area. They are intended to help to achieve the programme's expected results, through reaching the result and output indicators and, therefore, have a tangible impact on a significant part of the programme area.

Flagship projects must fulfil the following key criteria:

- to have a strategic relevance with impact on the border region
- to directly contribute to fulfilling the objectives and targets of Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme
- to have a clear cross-border dimension

When examining proposals, all experts/assessors, as well as the staff of the JS and InfoPoints (IPs) will apply only the criteria set out in this methodology. All those participating at any stage of the project assessment and selection process will not be allowed to apply other criteria than those set out in this methodology and the programme-specific documents.

2. Procedures and actors

2.1 General principles of the assessment and selection

The assessment and selection process within the **Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary programme** will be carried out with regard to:

- a) Transparency
- b) Equal of treatment
- c) Non-discrimination
- d) National integrity
- e) Sustainable development

The assessment and selection procedure promotes the fulfilment of these principles and excludes any opposite behaviour or action.

2.2 Role of Programme' bodies

The role of each Programme body involved in the assessment of project proposals is clearly described in the Regulation (EC) No. 1303/2013 and the Cooperation Programme (CP).

The MC shall examine and approve the methodology and criteria used for selection of project proposals. These will be made available to applicants through the CfP, prepared by the MA with the support of the JS and the NA, where the case.

The MA ensures during the entire process that effective and proportionate anti-fraud measures are in place. In this regard, but not only, MA and NA have the right to observe the assessment process by designating persons to participate to the process, which may be organized at JS premises. The MA may perform checks, by sample, in order to make sure that the assessment process is working correctly.

The assessment and selection of projects will be organized as follows: the responsibility of the assessment belongs to the MA, while tasks related to administrative and eligibility assessment are delegated to the JS and IPs, in line with the provisions stipulated in the agreement for delegated tasks. The JS will also ensure the secretariat of the AWG (Assessment Working Group).

The assessment working group shall be established for each call. MA and NA may observe the assessment process by designating dedicated persons, who will be able to participate to meetings of AWG.

The assessment process will have two steps: the *administrative and eligibility check*, performed by the JS and IPs, and *quality assessment*, performed by external experts/assessors. The contracting of external experts shall be the attribute of the MA, according to the approved CP.

After the projects are assessed, JS receives the assessment grids and elaborates the assessment reports containing the ranking of all the project proposals, submits them to the MA for approval. The list of the projects proposed to be financed, the reserve list and the list of the rejected proposals are submitted to the MC for decision on selection.

The quality of the project proposals, as reflected in their compliance with the selection criteria, is very important, in order to ensure that the Programme delivers concrete and visible outputs and results that tackle, in a cross-border and integrated manner, the challenges and needs affecting the programme area. All projects will have to comply with the set of horizontal quality requirements detailed in the CfP.

2.3 Requirements of impartiality and confidentiality

All actors within the assessment and selection process have to be impartial from all project proposals submitted in the framework of the Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary programme. The contracted external experts as independent assessors, as well as members of the JS and IPs involved in these processes have to sign a declaration of confidentiality and impartiality. Similarly, members and observers of the MC also have to sign a declaration when they start their work in one of this body. Any failure of any of the mentioned actors to comply with the impartiality and confidentiality principle shall lead to his/her removal from the concerned programme structure or body.

Any attempt by an applicant to influence the process in any way (whether by initiating contact with the members of the MC, MA, NA, JS, IPs, or with the contracted assessors) will result in the immediate exclusion of the relevant proposal from further consideration. The MC and MA will be immediately informed of any attempt to influence the independent assessment, in a written manner. Such situation will lead to the exclusion of the respective project from the assessment procedure.

Programme bodies will ensure that all the documents submitted by project applicants under the Call are kept confidential. The content of the project proposal may not be published or forwarded to persons or institutions, which are not directly engaged in the project assessment or decision making procedure, especially not to project applicants or the wider public.

The project idea itself, as well as the description and concept of the project are the property of the project applicant and can be made available to relevant institutions, where the case (e.g. short summary of the project should be made available in order to obtain compliance / support letters).

All actors within the assessment procedure have to guarantee that the privacy and confidentiality of all project proposals submitted and documents (including assessment grids and other results of the assessment) for the Call will be kept and that all national laws of privacy and the EU- directive¹ on the protection of personal data (95/46/EC) will be respected.

Nevertheless, after the final ranking of the projects, the data of the projects financed will be made public according to the transparency requirements of the EU. Furthermore, each rejection of project proposals will have to be justified based on the assessments made.

The application packages, as well as the assessment grids and other supporting documents can only be accessible for the following relevant programme actors, according to their specific attributions:

1) Members of the Monitoring Committee;

¹ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31995L0046:en:HTML>

- 2) Employees of the Managing Authority;
- 3) Employees of the National Authority;
- 4) Employees of the JS;
- 5) Employees of the InfoPoints;
- 6) Members of the Audit Authority.

Relevant parts of these documents, necessary for the MC decision making and/or for the participation of the MA and NA in the assessment process, will be made accessible after ensuring that all security conditions are met. If possible, the access will be assured through the eMS. In each case, security conditions will be foreseen based on the existing and possible IT solutions. Each actor has to subscribe with his/her own password and commit not to disclose any information to any third party. Forwarding of document will not be permitted.

3. Steps of the assessment process

The assessment process, for both Concept Notes (CN) and Full Applications (FA) submitted under this programme will be divided into two main steps, as it follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE and ELIGIBILITY CHECK

Project proposals will be checked concerning admissibility and completeness, according to the defined administrative criteria. Also, project proposals will be checked against defined minimum eligibility criteria. The administrative and eligibility check will be carried-out by JS and IPs. Only compliant proposals will be passed for the quality assessment.

The Monitoring Committee will be asked by the JS, on behalf of the MA, to approve via Written Procedure², the lists of projects rejected / recommended for the quality check, based on compliance after the administrative and eligibility check. The Lead Applicant will be notified accordingly.

² According to the MC Rules of Procedure, version approved in August 2017: Yet, in case of Rule 1, (4), i), exceptions are permitted and written procedure could be launched in relation to the MC function of examination and approval of the lists of the projects proposed for rejection/proposed for financing/recommended for the quality assessment, based on: the result of

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

The assessment of the cross-border character and relevance of the project, the economic and organizational capacity of applicants and accordance with European and national policies/strategies will be checked, as well as, the cost efficiency of the projects and their sustainability, etc. The whole process will be managed, coordinated and administered by the JS, with the support of external experts, as independent assessors. The role of the independent assessors is very important to provide a fair, impartial, consistent and accurate assessment of project proposals.

The assessment reports containing the ranking of all the project proposals will be submitted to the MA for approval. The list of the projects proposed to be financed, the reserve list and the list of rejected project proposals are forwarded to the MC for decision regarding the selection of the best project proposals; either it is the Concept Note or the Full Application phase.

The Restricted Call is launched to select flagship projects, having the two following phases:

3.1 PHASE I - Concept Notes

All the Concept Notes (CNs) submitted between the first day of this Call for proposals and the established deadline will be included in the assessment process. All CNs will be assessed and selected according to the assessment criteria hereby approved by the MC.

The assessment of CN will be carried out in two steps:

3.1.1. Administrative and eligibility check

the administrative and eligibility check performed by the Programme; the quality assessment performed by independent assessors and the pre-ranking done by the JS, only in the case of the flagship projects, the Full Application phase; decisions on the result following the complaint handling procedure, if in line with initial MC decision

First step, the **administrative and eligibility check** is carried out by internal assessors from the Joint Secretariat and InfoPoints.

The purpose of the administrative and eligibility check is to:

- Verify that the proposal fulfils minimum requirements of the Programme;
- Avoid further assessment of ineligible project proposals;
- Ensure equal treatment of all proposals to be selected for funding.

Failure to comply with the formal requirements (administrative compliance) and established eligibility criteria will lead to the rejection of the project proposal; thus, the Concept Notes that do not fulfil the formal requirements and eligibility criteria shall not be passed for the quality assessment.

Clarifications and/or completions will be requested in 2 (two) rounds by the JS within the administrative and eligibility check. The requests will be made in writing to the Lead Applicant, who will have **5** and respectively **3 working days** to submit the necessary documents/clarifications.

The JS will provide assistance to the applicants, in case they need clarification on the content of the requests formulated with regards to their application. A dedicated email address is to be created for this purpose only.

Whereas the deadline is not met, or the documents/clarifications submitted are not satisfactory, or prove incompliance with the formal and eligibility requirements, option NO should be ticked and the CN deemed to be rejected. The Lead Applicant will be notified, after the MC approves the lists of projects rejected / recommended for quality assessment as a result of the administrative and eligibility check.

3.1.2. Quality assessment

In order to provide high quality, impartial and professional assessment, independent external assessors will be contracted for the

quality assessment of project proposals. As a general rule, a minimum of two independent external assessors will examine each admissible proposal during the quality assessment. Independent external assessors will be contracted by the MA. **The assessors must make sure that expected results are correlated with the estimated budget!**

E.g.: a project with a total estimated budget covering 50% of the Ip will ideally contribute with minimum 50% to the output indicators of the axis/relevant Ip!

IMPORTANT!!!! The relevance of the project idea, its strategical potential and the opportunity of the cross-border approach are assessed exclusively in the Concept Note phase.

Therefore, the CONCEPT NOTE should mainly be focused on gathering information upon the project to be developed. Several sections in the CN application form are dedicated to the whole PROJECT proposal to be developed in case the Concept Note is selected for support.

Considerable contribution to the programme's result and output indicators is expected and will receive higher scores during assessment!

Applicants will be strongly advised to properly ground all estimated costs, so that the projects are not over budgeted. Also, all the activities will have to link directly to the costs, while leading to the envisaged results and contributing to the programme's output indicators.

If certain information is not very clear, supplementary clarifications, but not completions, will be requested only once during the quality assessment. The Lead Applicant is invited to submit this information within a deadline of maximum 5 working days.

In case the Lead Applicant does not provide the supplementary clarification within the deadline as required, the Concept Note will be assessed based on the initial information.

3.1.3. Ranking of project proposal per Ip's and re-evaluation, if necessary

Only projects with a score of at least 65 points (out of a total of 100) will be proposed for approval. Also, the minimum threshold for the strategic assessment criteria will be 50 points (out of a total of maximum 80 points).

The Concept Notes are ranked by Investment Priorities in descending order, taking into account the scores awarded, and considering their contribution to the programme's indicators (output and result).

The final score awarded for a CN is the average of the scores awarded by both assessors. The president of the assessment working group (AWG) may organise a reconciliation meeting with both assessors in the following situations:

- a. One assessor awards the project proposal a total score which recommends it for financing, but the second assessor awards a score which recommends it for rejection;
- b. The difference between the scores awarded for a project proposal by the two assessors is more than 10 points;
- c. For the section "strategic criteria", one of the assessors gives a score under the established threshold, whilst the other gives a score above the relevant threshold.
- d. The difference between the scores awarded for a criterion by the two assessors is more than 50% of the total points of the respective criterion (mentioned in the first column of the quality assessment grid).

The reconciliation will be a free discussion, each assessor arguing for his/hers position. The president will arbitrate the debate. Following the reconciliation meeting, if agreement is reached, one or both assessors will change the relevant grid. All the grids, initial and final, are attached to and archived with the rest of the assessment documents.

In case the reconciliation fails, the AWG president will appoint a third assessor for quality assessment. The third assessor will assess the CN independently from the previous two assessors. For situations a. and c. the final score for the CN will be the average score calculated for the two similar opinions, representing scores either above or below the mandatory threshold. For situations b. and d. the final score for the CN will be the average between the three awarded scores by the independent assessors.

The highest scored Concept Notes will be proposed for financing, under the condition that they obtain at least the minimum set scores (65 points – overall; 50 points – for the strategic criteria) for the quality assessment also, their budgets shall contain only eligible expenses³ which do not exceed the limit set forth for the present Call.

Furthermore, the recommendation for support will be also based on how the Concept Note tackles the output indicators stated in the Performance Framework of the Programme. In case of Ips 7/b, 7/c and 9/a key implementation steps defined by the targets set for the 2018 milestone are also relevant.

The assessment of the Concept Notes will be finalised after JS conducts the checks and calculations for ensuring that the condition stipulated in the approved CP on ensuring a *balanced allocation of funds among the 8 eligible counties* is respected (see Annex V.4).

3.1.4. Procedure for assuring the balanced budget allocation⁴

Based on the final scores provided by the external assessor for Concept Notes, the JS sets up the ranking lists of projects per Investment priorities. Based on that ranking list, the MC makes decision on financing projects.

³ If during the assessment, an assessor considers that a cost is non-eligible, budget-cuts will be proposed, and the project will be approved under condition. So, the approved budget will not contain non-eligible costs.

⁴ Please, note that when launching the first Call for Proposal for Flagship Projects by opening only Ip 7/b this procedure cannot be applied.

Only after the selection of the projects by the MC, the balanced financial allocation can be ensured. Therefore still during that MC meeting, also the conditions (meaning budget cut to comply with CP provision) can be approved.

To support the process, the JS will make the calculations for fitting into the balanced allocation in 2 steps, in a pre-programmed excel sheet.

1. County-level
2. Programme-level

County-level calculations

1. Budgets of project parts per each county will be summarized and compared to county allocation (11.815.000 euro ERDF), admitting a variation of +/-10% per county. This means that sum of ERDF budgets of project parts for each county have to range between: 10.633.500 euro and 12.996.500 euro.
2. In case the maximum limit is exceeded in one or more counties, the budgets of project parts of those counties will be decreased proportionally to their share to the total budget per county.

(Note: those budget cuts will be approved as conditions by the MC)

1. Programme-level calculations

1. Budgets of all project parts proposed for financing will be summed up in order to check if the programme level allocation for flagship projects is kept in line with CP provision (94.569.336 euro ERDF).
2. If the total allocation is exceeded, further budget cuts are necessary for project parts of counties that exceeded their county-level allocation (in the range of 10%). The amounts to be cut from project part budgets will be calculated as a proportion of the project part budget to the amount with which the total allocation for flagship projects per programme is exceeded.

The 2-step calculations will provide the amounts to be cut from some of the project budgets at partner level (as sum of budget cuts in the 2 steps). As a result the list of projects to be proposed for financing fitting in the county allocations with the +/-10% variation and fitting in the programme allocation for flagship projects can be set up. At the same time, the amounts that need to be decreased from the project part budget will have to be approved by the MC as a condition for financing.

After the MC decision (approval, approval with condition, rejection, reserve list) the MA/JS notifies the Lead Applicants about the decision of the MC. If the budget cut is a condition during the pre-contracting phase they have to adjust their budget accordingly.

There are two options provided:

1. to increase their own contribution to compensate for the oversized ERDF
2. to manage the project in the limits of a decreased budget and adapt the full application accordingly

However, the modifications shall not affect the results and/or the output indicators described in the project proposal.

3.1.5. Selection of projects, setting up the lists for Projects for financing, Reserve list and List of rejected projects

The Monitoring Committee will approve the list of all the evaluated Concept Notes, in a descending order according to the scores that have been granted, as well as the list of rejected projects, and the proposed possible reserves list, per Ip.

The selection of Concept Notes will be based on the available funds for flagship projects set in the GfA and depending on the available budget on Investment priority level. The indicative number of projects to be supported under each Ip is also a pre-condition. Also, due to management and financial capacity needs, one applicant will be selected as Lead Beneficiary in max 3 projects and in total in 6 projects, in the context of Interreg V-A Romania-Hungary Programme.

The reserve list contains Concept Notes which have obtained the minimum total score of 65 points (out of 100) per total and minimum 50 points (out of 80) for the strategic criteria, but due to limited available budget of the Call, cannot be proposed for financing.

In case two or more Concept Notes under the same Ip obtain equal scores, the selection of the Concept Note to be financed shall be made taking into account the following criteria, in the mentioned / listed order:

- a. the score obtained for Strategic criteria (Quality Assessment Grid for CN/section A);
- b. the score obtained for criterion regarding the proportionality between the ratio of estimated output indicators of the operation and total output indicators per Ip versus ratio of costs of the operation and the total allocated budget per Ip.? (Quality Assessment Grid for CN/section A);
- c. the one addressing directly the Performance Framework Output Indicators.

The projects which have scored less than 65 points (out of 100) per total and/or less than 50 points (out of 80) for the strategic criteria in the CN phase are considered rejected.

The list of Concept Notes proposed for financing shall be approved at the first meeting of the Monitoring Committee, organized following the completion of the assessment process.

Within maximum 3 working days after the decision of MC, the JS sends notification letters to all the Lead Applicants who have submitted project proposals which were analysed within the respective assessment session and were successful. For applicants whose proposals were put on reserve list or rejected, the deadline for communication is of 5 working days from the MC' decision.

The decision of the Monitoring Committee is followed by the pre-contractual phase and then the financing contracts will be concluded.

Since the focus on 2014-2020 period is on the results, please note that if the on-going analysis during the selection process shows that the Programme's indicators (in theory, by contracting) are tackled in a percent of at least 110%, so that the indicators from the Performance framework are secured (including the financial ones), the Monitoring Committee may decide to stop contracting although the financial allocation was not entirely reached.

In case a Concept Note contracting fails, the next one from the reserve list under the given Ip, if any, shall be invited to move forward and enter the contracting phase.

In the situation the *reserve* also fails for contracting purposes, or there is no alternative under the reserve list, the amount shall be transferred to Open Calls or as decided by the MC.

Furthermore, if a FA for a project developed under CN fails to be submitted in the given deadline, or for any reason, until that time, the JS and MA become aware that the respective project shall not apply for phase II – FA, the amount shall be transferred to Open Calls or as decided by the MC.

3.2 PHASE II - Full Applications

Full Applications will be submitted on on-going basis, any time after the conclusion of the subsidy contract for the implementation of the Concept Notes, but not later than the time indicated in the Guide for Applicants. All Full Applications submitted in this range of time will be included in the assessment process, in a continuous manner.

Therefore, each FA recommended for funding as result of the quality assessment, shall be submitted to the MC for approval, in written procedure. As the Full Applications are included in the assessment process in a continuous manner, this approach will ensure an efficient decision-making process, in terms of time and resources.

All FAs will be assessed and selected according to the criteria hereby approved by the MC.

Please note that no fundamental modification of the project proposal is allowed between the Concept Note and the Full Application phases, in terms of objectives, results and targeted indicators.

Just as well, the partnership may not change between the Concept Note and the Full Application phases. Only generated by legislative changes, where the powers, prerogatives and liabilities of the beneficiary concerned are taken over (i.e. reorganisation/restructuring etc.), may be accepted.

Also, the estimated total budget for the intervention in the FA should suffer modification of maximum 10% as opposed to the estimations within the CN, and up to the limit set by Programme.

The assessment of FAs will be carried out in **two steps**:

3.2.1. Administrative and eligibility check

First step, **administrative and eligibility check** carried out by internal assessors from the JS and IPs. The purpose of the administrative and eligibility check is to verify that the Full Application fulfils the minimum requirements of the Programme.

Clarifications and/or completions will be requested in 2 (two) rounds by the JS within the administrative and eligibility check. The requests will be made in writing to the Lead Applicant, who will have **5** and respectively **3 working days** to submit the necessary documents/clarifications.

The JS will provide assistance to the applicants, in case they need clarification on the content of the requests formulated with regards to their application. A dedicated email address is to be created for this purpose only.

In case the Lead Applicant does not provide the supplementary information, documents or clarification within the deadline as required, the Full Application will be automatically rejected. Whereas the documents/clarifications submitted are not satisfactory, or prove incompliance with the formal and eligibility requirements, the FA application shall be deemed rejected.

The Lead Applicant will be notified, after the MC approves the lists of projects rejected / recommended for quality assessment as a result of the administrative and eligibility check.

3.2.2. Quality assessment

The **quality assessment of FAs** will be carried out by external assessors contracted by the MA.

IMPORTANT!!! The maturity of the project proposal is assessed exclusively in the Full Application phase⁵.

Regarding the quality assessment of FA, each Application will be scored against technical and financial assessment criteria and given a maximum score of 100 points.

If certain information is not very clear, supplementary clarifications, but not completions, will be requested only once during the quality assessment. The Lead Applicant is invited to submit this information within a deadline of maximum 5 working days.

In case the Lead Applicant does not provide the supplementary clarification within the deadline as required, the Full Application will be assessed based on the initial information.

Only projects with a score of at least 65 points (out of a total of 100) will be proposed for approval. Projects implementing positive specific measures to clearly promote horizontal themes shall get higher score during assessment!

The final score awarded for a FA is the average of the scores awarded by both assessors. The president of the AWG may organise a reconciliation meeting with both assessors in the following situations:

- a. One assessor awards the application a total score which recommends it for financing, but the second assessor awards a score which recommends it for rejection;
- b. The difference between the scores awarded for an application by the two assessors is more than 10 points.
- c. The difference between the scores awarded for a criterion by the two assessors is more than 50% of the total points of the respective criterion (mentioned in the first column of the quality assessment grid).

⁵ The relevance and the strategical character of the project idea is only assessed in the Concept Note phase.

The reconciliation will be a free discussion, each assessor arguing for his position. The president will arbitrate the debate. Following the reconciliation meeting, if agreement is reached, one or both assessors will change the relevant grid. All the grids, initial and final, are attached to and archived with the rest of the assessment documents.

In case the reconciliation fails, the AWG president will appoint a third assessor for quality assessment. The third assessor will evaluate the FA independently from the previous two assessors. For situation a. the final score for the FA will be the average score calculated for the two similar opinions, representing scores either above or below the mandatory threshold. For situations b. and c. the final score for the FA will be the average between the three awarded scores by the independent assessors.

The Full Application, selected to be supported for financing, is approved by the Monitoring Committee. The decision of the MC is communicated, in writing, by the JS to the Lead Applicant. The compliant Full Applications will be therefore selected to be supported for financing under the Call.

3.2.3. Selection of the Full Applications

The Full Applications are included in the assessment process in a continuous manner. Therefore, each FA recommended for funding / rejected as a result of the quality assessment, shall be submitted also in continuous manner to the Monitoring Committee for approval, in written procedure. The approach will ensure an efficient decision-making process, in terms of time and resources.

For Full Application phase, the projects proposed for financing are those projects which have obtained the minimum score (65 points) in the quality assessment and whose budgets contain eligible expenses⁶ which do not exceed the limit set forth for the Call.

⁶ If during the assessment, an assessor considers that a cost is non-eligible, budget-cuts will propose, and the project will be approved under condition. So, the approved budget will not contain non-eligible costs.

Also, having in mind that a balanced allocation of funds is to be ensured among the eight eligible counties, the final selection of projects will be conditioned by the estimate county allocation of EUR 11.815.000, 00. Therefore, as the estimated total budget for the intervention in the FA is allowed to suffer modification of maximum 10% as opposed to the estimations within the CN, and up to the limit set by Programme and in case, due to these deviations, the county allocation is overtaken, the related amounts will be cut proportionally from the respective projects budgets. The selection of the project proposals will be therefore conditioned.

The projects which have scored less than 65 points in the FA phase are deemed rejected.

4. Contracting

The decision of the Monitoring Committee is followed by the pre-contractual phase and then the contracts will be concluded.

Whereas there are firm recommendations of the external assessors impacting / conditioning the approval and contracting of a FA, the respective project may be put forth for approval by the MC “under conditions”. The MC decision shall also stipulate the **deadline** when conditions must be met, and this shall not exceed 3 months. **Contracting of such project may occur only when these conditions are fully satisfied.**

If, for any reason, the FA fails to be contracted, the full amounts shall be made available to Open Calls or as decided by the MC.

5. Arrangements for the examination of complaints

In accordance with Art 74(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 “Member States shall ensure that effective arrangements for the examination of complaints concerning the ESIF are in place”.

The procedure established will cover complaints against decisions taken by the Programme during the project assessment and selection process, with the purpose of effectively examining complaints.

The decision of the MC can be appealed by the Applicants, by sending the notifications to the MA. Only the project's Lead Applicant as the one representing the project partnership affected by the funding decision is entitled to file a complaint. It is therefore the task of the Lead Applicant to collect and bring forward the complaint reasons from all project applicants.

The complaint must be submitted by the Lead Applicant in no more than 10 working days from the date of receiving the rejection letter sent by the JS.

Any complaint received later than 10 working days from the date when the notification was received by the Lead Applicant will not be taken into consideration.

The complaints shall be formulated in respect to the provisions of the procedure presented below.

The complaint should be lodged in writing by mail or fax to the MA, and may only be lodged against the following criteria:

- ⇒ The outcomes of the quality assessment of the project proposal (CN or FA phase) do not correspond to the information provided by the Lead Applicant;
- ⇒ The project assessment and selection process failed to comply with specific procedures laid down.

The complaint shall include:

- a. name and address of the Lead Applicant;
- b. reference number of the project proposal which is a subject of the complaint;
- c. clearly indicated reasons and justifications for the complaint, including listing of all elements of the assessment which are being complaint and/or failures in adherence with procedures limited to those criteria mentioned above;
- d. signature of the legal representative of the Lead Applicant;
- e. any supporting documents;
 - ✓ the relevant documentation shall be provided for the sole purpose of supporting the complaint and may not alter the quality or content of the assessed project proposal.

No other grounds for the complaint than indicated above will be taken into account during the complaint procedure.

A complaint will be rejected without further examination if submitted after the deadline set above, or if the formal requirements are not observed. Should the complaint be rejected for this/these reason/s, the MA conveys this information within 5 working

days to the Lead Applicant.

Within maximum 10 working days after the receipt of the complaint, the MA confirms to the Lead Applicant in writing having received the complaint. The complaint will then be examined by the MA assisted by the JS on the basis of the information brought forward by the Lead Applicant in the complaint, and technical examination will be performed regarding the merit of the complaint. Then, the complaint is forwarded to the Complaint Panel to be convened for this purpose by the Head of the MA.

The members of the Complaint Panel are nominated by the MA, ensuring impartiality of members of the Complaint Panel towards the case under review. Meetings of the Complaint Panel are called by the Head of the MA, and the Panel examines the complaint based on:

- the complaint, with the technical examination by the MA;
- the original project proposal and all supporting documents;
- all documents relating to the assessment of the project proposal;
- any other document requested by the Members of the Complaint Panel relevant to the complaint.

The MA and the JS are invited to the meeting to present the position of the technical examination and the Lead Applicant may also be invited for a hearing.

The decision if the complaint is justified or needs to be rejected is taken by the Complaint Panel, desirably by consensus. However, if consensus cannot be reached, the decision shall be deemed adopted if at least 2/3 of the members present at the meeting agree with it.

In case it is justified, the case will be sent back to the Monitoring Committee to review the project application and its assessment. The MA communicates the decision of the Complaint Panel to the Lead Applicant within 10 working days.

The decision of the Complaint Panel is final, binding to all parties and not subject of any further complaint proceedings within the Programme based on the same grounds and in the same Phase of the procedure.

The complaint procedure - from the receipt of the complaint by the MA to the communication of the Complaint Panel's decision to the Lead Applicant - should be resolved within maximum 90 calendar days.

6. Annexes

Phase I – Concept Note

ADMINISTRATIVE AND ELIGIBILITY CHECK GRID

Project identification

Project title	
Project acronym	
Project number	
Official name of the Lead Applicant organization	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
A. Administrative criteria						
A.1	The application package is compiled in English.	Application form, annexes and supporting documents are submitted as requested in the Guide for Applicants	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.2	Application Form is correctly filled in.	All applicable sections of the Application Form are correctly filled in (no missing ⁸ information).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

⁷ If follow up is needed (in case of unfulfilled criterion that may be satisfied through clarification/completion), option NO should be ticked and the requirement could be described in the “comments” field, awaiting for the relevant documentation. Shall be settled upon receipt /failure to comply.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
A.3	Where the case, the provided templates ⁹ are used.	e.g. (Lead) Applicant Declaration, (Annex V.2), etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.4	There is a pre-agreement signed among participating partners ¹⁰ .	Annex V.1 To be provided in EN language	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.5	Project (Lead) Applicant Declaration¹¹ /Associated Partners Declaration (if the case) is included, properly filled-in, dated, stamped and signed by the legal representative.	Annex V.3; Annex V.7 To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.6	Copies of the establishing documents of the Applicants/Associated Partners ¹² are included: Articles of Association, Statutes, Deed of foundation, establishing resolution law, or equivalent documents according to the national legislation, etc. Additionally, establishing documents are provided for the related branch office, proving its existence and the relationship with the headquarter.	Exception: public institutions, authorities do NOT need to submit this document! With regard to Churches in Hungary: In case the religious organization is listed in the register kept by the Minister of Human Capacities (http://egyhazi.emmi.gov.hu/), the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

⁸ According to our latest tests, there is a technical error detected in what concerns the eMS application system. The application – in .pdf file – does not automatically retrieve some of the fields. Due to identified technical error – in assessment process, the electronic eMS version of the Applications will be prevailing in terms of content.

⁹ The applications are not to be rejected based on not using the provided templates, but clarification/completion is to be requested

¹⁰ Stipulating the partners' commitment to develop and submit the complete project documentation

¹¹ Stipulating that all eligibility criteria are properly complied with; to be submitted for Lead Applicant and all Applicants/Associated Partners (if the case) also.

¹² To be submitted for Lead Applicant and all Project Applicants/Associated Partners (if the case) also.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
		extract issued by the Minister must be attached. In case the Church is not listed in the register, official confirmation issued by the Main Church must be attached. To be provided in RO/HU language.				
A.7	The official statement¹³ of the relevant decision-making body regarding the support of the project and the availability of the own contribution for the planned investment, during the implementation of the project is attached.	i.e. County Council Decision, Local Council Decision, Board of Directors Decision, authorized person etc. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.8.	Compliance letters¹⁴ , at least one letter from Romanian authorities (county/regional or national level) and one from Hungarian County Councils, as required by the national legislation, are included. In case the County Council is not professionally and/or legally competent or if it applies in the relevant Call for Proposal, the letter of compliance will be issued by a national ministry,	i.e. Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration, Ministry of Culture, National Park Directorate, Environmental and Water Management Directorates, State Forestry Service/National Forest Administration Romsilva, National Administration Apele Române, Ministry of Public Health,				

¹³ To be submitted for Lead Applicant and all Project Applicants also.

¹⁴ The National Authority takes full responsibility that HU applicants will receive their compliance letters in due time (taking into account that it may happen that the County Council has to forward the documentation to national level, etc), so that they can apply for funding. Therefore, if the County Council receives the request, including the concept note, for checking the compliance, the head of the National Authority shall be informed within 3 working days about the receipt of such request and if applicable, also about the situation if it is forwarded to the relevant ministry.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
	according to competence. If, during the evaluation, question will be raised by the Assessment Working Group (AWG), the relevant member/observer of the AWG will contact the relevant authority to ask for opinion with justification	Ministry of Education, Ministry of National Development, Department for Transport Infrastructure, Ministry for National Economy, Ministry of Human Capacities, Ministry of Agriculture, Prime Minister's Office - etc. Annex V.2 To be provided in EN language.				
A.9	Extracts of relevant strategies and / or other relevant development strategic documents, proving the project's compliance are attached.	i.e. National Health Strategy 2014 - 2020, General Master Plan on Transport, county strategy, etc. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.10	In case of Romanian applicants: Justifying document stating the method of representation (according to the national legislation). In case of Hungarian applicants: Original specimen of signature , containing the method of representation of the legally authorized representative(s), certified by a public notary in original language, is included.	For HU applicants: In case of double representation, e.g. if the mayor and the notary can represent the local government only together, the specimens of signature of both are required! To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.11	Letter of empowerment: For RO applicants: signed and stamped by the legal representative of the applicant institution For HU applicants: Certified by a public notary in original language, if the case.	Necessary when a person, other than the legal representative, is to sign certain official documents. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
A.12	The job descriptions for all positions included in the proposed management team AND/OR the Terms of references , in case the management is externalized ¹⁵ are included;	The tasks / requirements will be proportionate with the complexity of the project. To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.13	<u>In case of Romanian Applicants:</u> Urban planning certificate (certificat de urbanism) is attached. <u>In case of Hungarian Applicants:</u> Preliminary declaration of construction works is attached.	Annex V.8, for Hungarian Applicants To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.14	Title deed (<i>extras de carte funciară / tulajdoni lap másolat</i>) issued by the Land Registry, not older than 30 calendar days, of each real estate (land and / or building) affected by the investment is attached. In case the land and / or building is in concession / administration, it must be proved that the duration of the concession / administration of the land and / or building is based on a long term contract/enactment (i.e. min. 5 years after the estimated month for the financial closure of the project) and that the owner of the real estate has	Exceptions: title deeds for <i>road construction where land acquisition (purchase/expropriation) deems necessary</i> , in case they are not yet available due to non-completion of the acquisition procedures. See Criterion A.16. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

¹⁵ Flagship Projects are projects of significant complexity and the capacity of the partners is of high importance in the efficient and sustainable management of the projects. Therefore, the Programme strongly recommends avoiding the externalization of the project management. Moreover, maximum score will be granted only to applications ensuring the project' management staff.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
	given his written agreement (no standard format) that the applicant is free to perform the investment.					
A.15	Declaration from the land and / or building/ item of infrastructure owner is included, stating that the land and / or building / item of infrastructure is: free of any encumbrances, not the object of a pending litigation, not the object of a claim according to the relevant national legislation.	Exceptions for purchase/ expropriation, in case of roads, as described above, under A.13 To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.16	At least the administrative act approving the opportunity to develop the technical documentation/plans/design for the investment objective subject to the grant application is attached, or a document of a similar value (i.e. Government/County/Local Council Decision for approval the start of the preparation of the planned investment/design of the feasibility study related to the planned investment)	In case of road infrastructure. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.17	Affidavit regarding the land acquisition (purchase / expropriation) process	Annex V.9 Only in case the road infrastructure involves purchase / expropriations of land. The document will state that purchase / expropriation is necessary and that the respective applicant understands its obligation to complete the purchase/expropriation process and to	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
		submit the title deed in maximum 3 months after the notification of approval for FA, ensuring they understand the penalties in case they fail. To be provided in EN language.				
A.18	Copy of the prior bilateral agreement with the commitment of the Member States to set up Schengen-compatible border-crossing checkpoints (or other existing solutions according to the legislation in force at the time of submission of the project proposals) at the completion of any such projects, and to operate it for at least 5 years or until the enlargement of the Schengen zone, for projects that include cross-border road infrastructure, is submitted.	To be provided in RO/HU/EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.19	Copy of the bilateral agreement , in force at the time of submission of project proposals, in case of CB infrastructure, for projects financing CB infrastructure other than roads, is submitted.	To be provided in RO/HU/EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.20	The total project estimated budget is attached.	Annex V.4 To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.21	Programme output indicators - project commitment is attached.	Annex V.5 To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.22	Environmental Indicators list is attached.	Annex V.6 To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
A.23	For RO applicants: Template MMP, signed/stamped by Environmental Protection Agency at county level.	Annex.V.10 To be provided in RO language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B. Eligibility criteria						
B.1	The Lead Applicant is Romanian or Hungarian public body.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.2	The Applicants (other than Lead Applicant)/Associated Partners ¹⁶ are Romanian or Hungarian public bodies / bodies governed by public law / state owned companies / non-profit bodies / EGTC, established according to the relevant national legislation as described in the CP, for each Investment priority.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.3	The (Lead) Applicant/Associated Partner ¹⁷ has legal competencies the project relevant field ¹⁸ .	For all project proposals, it is compulsory that the Applicants / Associated Partners have among their attributions, according with its statute or according to the national legislation, the implementation of the proposed activities or they must prove that they have a partnership agreement with the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

¹⁶ In case an Associated Partner fails to comply with the eligibility rules of the present Call for Proposal, the project can be approved by the Monitoring Committee under conditions that the respective associated partners is eliminated as such.

¹⁷ Idem footnote 8 above.

¹⁸ The criterion applies to all Applicants/Associated Partners.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
		institutions competent to implement such activities, according with their statute or according to the national legislation.				
B.4	The (Lead) Applicants fulfil the location criteria, set out in section 2.2.1.1. Eligibility of applicants.	All partners (including the national / regional organizations' branch offices) are located in the eligible area of the programme. In case the public entity's headquarter is registered outside the eligible programme area, the public entity has legal competencies for implementing operations in the programme area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.5	The Associated Partner ¹⁹ fulfils the location criteria, set out in section 2.2.1.1. Eligibility of applicants.	The Associated Partners (including the national / regional organizations' branch offices) are located in the eligible area of the programme.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.6	There are at least two eligible partners, one from each country, involved in the project.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.7	The maximum number of partners in the project is 8, including the Lead Applicant.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.8	The maximum number of Associated Partners in the		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

¹⁹ In case an associated partner fails to comply with the eligibility rules of the present Call for Proposal, the project can be approved by the Monitoring Committee under conditions that the respective associated partners is eliminated as such.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
	project is 4: 2 RO and 2 HU.					
B.9	The partnership has maximum one potential beneficiary with previous average weighted financial execution rate (considering the value of their part of the projects' budgets) of less than 50% for projects financed under HURO Programme 2007-2013. The respective potential beneficiary, if the case, is not the Lead Applicant.	Annex V.3	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.10	The full project implementation period reaches the limit of the minimum and does not exceed the limit of the maximum monthly limits set in the Call.	Start and end dates (i.e. depending on the closure of the Call of proposals or the end of the programme period) and duration of the project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.11	All the 4 joint criteria are described, involving all Applicants (including the Lead).	Joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.12	Minimum 2 joint criteria are described, in case of Associated Partners.	Joint financing is not applicable in case of Associated Partners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.13	The proposal demonstrates a level of proportionality of at least 40% between the contribution to the programme' output indicators and the necessary financial resources	Annex V.4 (estimated total budget of the project (CN+FA)) Proposals demonstrating a level of proportionality lower than 40% shall not be further assessed, and may not be recommended for support	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.14	In case of Ip 7/b, the road proposed to be developed		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
	provides or improves direct access of secondary and tertiary nodes to TEN-T ²⁰ core or comprehensive network and related infrastructure (as settled in the Cooperation Programme).					
B.15	The total amount of the budget for Concept Note is ranged between the limits set in the Guide for Applicants (0-350,000 Euro)	Concept Note budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.16	The percentage of the financial support requested from ERDF and state budgets are within the limits indicated in the Guide for Applicants (GfA).	Concept Note budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.17	The estimated amounts/percentages of the financial support requested from ERDF and state budgets (CN+FA) is between the limits set in the GfA.	Annex V.4., chapter 1.4 of GfA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.18	The proposal complies with the rule setting the maximum ceiling for the small-scale infrastructure investments (lp 6/c and 8/b).	Annex V.4. This limitation concerns exclusively investments in cultural and tourism infrastructure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.19	The total estimated budget of the project (CN+FA) is between the limits set in the GfA	Concept Note Budget Annex V.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

²⁰ The maps of the TEN-T core and comprehensive networks in Romania are provided by the Transport Master Plan, published in the Romanian Official Monitor nr. 778bis/14.X.2016

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ⁷
B.20	Total budget of activities to be carried out outside the programme area is up to maximum 10% from the total support requested from ERDF at project level.	Concept Note Budget Annex V.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.21	Total cost of investments in roads under Investment priorities other than Priority Axis 2 does not exceed 30% of the total eligible budget of the project.	Annex V.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.22	If any, the costs of land acquisition (purchase /expropriations) will be included in the CN/AF budget up to 5% of the ERDF estimated costs for the investment objective.	Concept Note Budget/AF Budget Annex V.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.23	The value of <i>site supervision</i> is limited to 5% of the total estimated works related cost.	Annex V.4	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
The project proposal is formally compliant.			<input type="checkbox"/> ²¹	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Recommendations²²:						

²¹ Conditioned by the formulated recommendations (if any).

²² In case the proposal is not fully compliant, in the case of the costs limitations (criteria B20-B23), the project proposal will be passed for quality assessment under the condition that the necessary budget-cuts will be made in the quality assessment phase.

Methodology and criteria for assessment and selection of flagship projects

Phase I – Concept Note

QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID

Project identification

Project title	
Project acronym	
Project number	
Official name of the Lead Applicant organization	

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in CN
A. Strategic criteria The assessment will focus on the information regarding the project proposal to be developed. All the sections of the Concept Note regarding the relevance of the project, the strategic character and/or the importance of the cross-border partnership are being assessed in this phase, while the maturity of the project proposal is going to be the exclusive subject of the Full Application assessment.					
A.1	The project is relevant to the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals (10 p).	Do the challenges addressed in the project match the thematic focus of the selected specific objective as set out in the CP? Maximum score will be given to project ideas directly contributing to the programme's	The project's results and main outputs clearly link to programme priority and its indicators: The project main overall objective clearly links to an Investment priority (Ip) of the Programme = 2 p. The project main results clearly link to a programme result indicator = 2 p. The project main outputs clearly link to the project specific objectives = 2 p.		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in CN
		objectives, having a significant contribution to achieving the output/results indicators, especially those listed in the Performance Framework of the CP.	The project main outputs clearly link to programme output indicators, stated in the Performance Framework of the Programme; for Ips 7/b, 7/c and 9/a, the key implementation steps defined by the targets set for the 2018 milestone are also relevant = 4 p.		
A.2	The proposed intervention is of considerable impact in the programme's area; strategic projects must be potential best-practices in their areas of intervention (including synergy with other EU initiatives and avoidance of duplication) (5 p).	<p>Is the proposal (the Concept Note) accompanied by support letters from relevant authorities, key professionals and targeted communities on national/regional/county level?</p> <p>What are the synergies with other past or current EU and other projects or EU initiatives the project makes use of?</p> <p>How does the project make use of building available knowledge?</p>	<p>The project is acknowledged and/or supported by relevant authorities, key professionals and the targeted communities. = 2 p.</p> <p>The project has synergies with implemented project carried out under previous cooperation programmes / EU programmes= 2 p.</p> <p>The project capitalizes the results of previous EU projects= 1 p.</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in CN
A.3	The proposed intervention is part of a relevant development strategy on county, regional or national level (5 p).	Does the project contribute to any of the policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area? All projects should demonstrate their contribution of planned interventions towards macro-regional strategy, subject to the needs of the programme area as identified by the Member States and taking into account, where applicable, strategically important projects identified in those strategies.	The project contributes to the implementation of the EUSDR ²³ = 1 p. The project is in line with a national / regional strategy, relevant for the Programme area = 3 p. The project is in line with the county strategy, relevant for the Programme area = 1 p.		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
A.4	The project addresses common territorial challenges and opportunities in the programme area -	What are the common territorial challenges that will be tackled by the project?	Common challenge is widely addressed in the Programme area by the project = 2 p. The approach is new and it is proven that the cross-border cooperation is needed = 1.5 p.		Project summary, Partner, Project Description,

²³ The EUSDR is a macro-regional strategy adopted by the EC on 08 December 2010 and endorsed by the European Council on 24 June 2011. The Strategy was developed by the Commission together with the Danube Region countries and stakeholders in order to address common challenges.

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in CN
	there is a real demand for the project; the project is of cross border value (5 p).	<p>What is the projects' approach in addressing these common challenges and / or joint assets?</p> <p>Does the project justify the need for cross border cooperation (does the proposed approach - activities, outputs and their use - and the partnership demonstrate the need for cross border cooperation)?</p> <p>The project demonstrates new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector / programme area / participating countries or adapts and implements already developed solutions.</p>	There is a real demand for the project = 1.5 p.		Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
A.5	The project proves all 4 joint cooperation criteria (5p).	Does the project show a strong cross border character?	<p>Partnership demonstrates strong commitment and contributions (observing joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing) = 5 p.</p> <p>Intermediate score can be granted,</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan,

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment				Comments	Sections in CN								
			depending on the provided information. Minimum 2 joint criteria are described, in case of Associated Partners are involved (joint development and joint implementation).					Project Budget, Attachments								
A.6	The project addresses clearly identified needs and constraints of the target country (ies) and/or region(s) (10 p).	Have the local specific needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	Addressed needs are clearly described = 3 p. The proposed solutions are relevant for the identified needs and constraints = 4 p. There are verifiable information sources to support the data presented (statistics, published surveys, etc.) = 3 p.					Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments								
A.7	The target groups and the final beneficiaries are clearly defined and strategically chosen Clear rationale is given on the necessity of the intervention in relation with the identified needs of the target group (10 p).	Are the selected target groups relevant in relation to the selected specific objective? Are they defined in terms of provenience and number? Is the selection methodology clearly described?	The target groups are strategically chosen considering the specifics of the project = 4 p. The target groups are clearly defined in terms of provenience = 2 p. There are numerical indicators attached regarding the size of the target groups = 2 p. The selection methodology is clearly described = 2 p.					Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments								
A.8	The proposal contains specific added-value elements related to horizontal principles, and environmental issues (5 p).	Does the project plan outputs that will bring additional value in the field of horizontal principles?	<div>Contribution to the following horizontal principles is clearly demonstrated:</div> <table><tr><td>lp</td><td>6/c, 7/b, 7/c</td><td>8/b</td><td>9/a</td></tr><tr><td>Sustainable development</td><td>3 p.</td><td>1 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td></tr></table>				lp	6/c, 7/b, 7/c	8/b	9/a	Sustainable development	3 p.	1 p.	0,5 p.		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
lp	6/c, 7/b, 7/c	8/b	9/a													
Sustainable development	3 p.	1 p.	0,5 p.													

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment				Comments	Sections in CN
			Equal opportunities and non-discrimination	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	3 p.		
			Equality between men and women	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	0,5 p.		
				4 p.	4 p.	4 p.		
			Clearly demonstrated contribution to any of the programme level environmental indicators (Annex II.2 of the GfA and Annex V.6) = 1 p. ;					
A.9	The proposal demonstrates relevant impact in terms of approach, in relation to the output indicators of the relevant Investment priority (15 p).	Is there proportionality between the ratio of estimated output indicators of the operation and total output indicators per Ip versus ratio of costs of the operation and the total allocated budget per Ip? Please consult the relevant Fact Sheet.	90%-100% = 15 p. 80% - 90% = 12 p. 70%-80% = 8 p. 60%-70% = 4 p. 50%-60% = 1p. 40%-50% = 0 p.					Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
A.10	The size of the proposed partnership is in line with the proposed objectives, activities and the overall volume of the project; The project involves the	The foreseen partnership covers the needed professional competencies; The Lead Applicant and his partners / associated	Score will be maximum 10 points depending on the organization's experience in participating in and/or managing EU co-financed projects or other international projects of similar size and complexity. The role and responsibilities of the Applicants					Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget,

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in CN
	relevant partners needed to address the territorial challenge/opportunity and the objectives specified (10 p).	partners have relevant experience for implementing the proposed project ²⁴ ;	<p>/ Associated Partners are well justified and the contribution to the project is properly defined = 2 p.</p> <p>Partner organisations have proven experience in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.) = 2 p.</p> <p>With respect to the project's objectives, the project partnership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is balanced as regards the levels, sectors, territory = 2 p. - consists of partners / associated partners that complement each other = 2 p. - all partners / associated partners play a defined role in the partnership = 2 p. 		Attachments
B. Operational criteria The following two operational criteria are related to the Concept Note, in terms of financial allocation versus activities planned in order to develop full mature project proposals.			0-20		
B.1	The overall design of the action is coherent; The action is feasible and consistent in relation to the	In particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved; take into account external	<p>There is a logical link (correlation) between problems, objectives, resources, activities, outputs and results= 2 p.</p> <p>The project activities are clearly described,</p>		Project summary, Partner, Project Description,

²⁴ Flagship Projects are projects of significant complexity and the capacity of the partners is of high importance in the efficient and sustainable management of the projects. Therefore, the Programme strongly recommends avoiding the externalization of the project management. Moreover, maximum score will be granted only to applications ensuring the project' management staff.

No.	Criteria	Description	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in CN
	objectives and expected results (10 p).	factors and relevant stakeholders? There is coherence between the expected results and the proposed approach. Can the listed results described be achieved through the proposed approach (do the planned outputs and activities lead to the described results? Is the proposed approach realistic?)	realistic and achievable = 2 p. The proposal is realistic and consistent from a technical point of view = 2 p. The project results are realistic = 2 p. The activities follow a logical time-sequence = 2 p.		Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
B.2	The estimated costs are realistic, eligible in terms of destination and sufficient in relation to the objectives set (10 p)	The planned budget of the project is adequate in relation to the planned activities, outputs, results, and involvement of current and planned partners.	Maximum score will be granted for the CN estimated budget, if well justified, balanced against the planned activities and eligible = 10 p. Intermediate score can be granted, depending on the provided information.		Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments
The concept note is recommended for support : <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO			Total score²⁵:	Comments	

²⁵ The minimum threshold for the Quality Assessment is of 65 points out of the total possible score of 100 points. Also, the minimum threshold for the strategic criteria total score is of 50 points out of the total possible score of 80 points.

Phase II – Full Application

ADMINISTRATIVE AND ELIGIBILITY CHECK GRID

Project identification

Project title	
Project acronym	
Project number	
Official name of the Lead Applicant organization	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
A. Administrative criteria						
A.1	The application package is submitted until the deadline.	Full Application is submitted no later than 1 month after the end of the implementation period of the Concept Note.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.2	Application form is correctly filled in and compiled in English.	All applicable sections of the Application Form are correctly filled in (no missing information ²⁷). Application form, annexes and supporting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

²⁶ If follow up is needed (in case of unfulfilled criterion that may be satisfied through clarification/completion), option NO should be ticked and the requirement could be described in the "comments" field, awaiting for the relevant documentation. Shall be settled upon receipt /failure to comply. However, please be advised that 2 rounds for clarifications/completion are allowed and assistance is provided by the JS.

²⁷ According to our latest tests, there is a technical error detected in what concerns the eMS application system. The application – in .pdf file – does not automatically retrieve some of the fields. Due to identified technical error – in assessment process, the electronic eMS version of the Applications will be prevailing in terms of content.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
		documents are submitted as requested in the Guide for Applicants				
A.3	Where the case, the provided templates are used.	e.g. (Lead) Applicant Declaration, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.4	Partnership Declaration , signed and stamped by all parties/entities is attached, separately submitted by each of the partners.	Annex VI.1 To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.5	Project (Lead) Applicant Declaration²⁸/Associated Partners Declaration (if the case) is included, properly filled-in, dated, stamped and signed by the legal representative.	Annex VI.2; Annex VI.6. To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.6	Copies of the establishing documents²⁹ of the Applicants/Associated Partners are included: Articles of Association, Statutes, Deed of foundation, or establishing resolution law, equivalent documents according to the national legislation, etc., if	Exception: public institutions, authorities do NOT need to submit this document! With regard to Churches in Hungary: In case the religious organization is listed in the register kept by the Minister of Human	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

²⁸ Stipulating that all eligibility criteria are properly complied with; to be submitted for Lead Applicant and all Project Applicants/Associated Partners (if the case) also.

²⁹ To be submitted for Lead Applicant and all Applicants/Associated Partners (if the case) also, ONLY if the establishing documents have been modified since submission of the Concept Note application pack.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
	the case. Additionally, establishing documents are provided for the related branch office, proving its existence and the relationship with the headquarter.	Capacities (http://egyhazi.emmi.gov.hu/), the extract issued by the Minister must be attached. In case the Church is not listed in the register, official confirmation issued by the Main Church must be attached. To be provided in RO/HU language.				
A.7	The official statement³⁰ of the relevant decision-making body regarding the support of the project and the availability of the own contribution for the planned investment, during the implementation of the project is attached.	i.e. County Council Decision, Local Council Decision, Board of Directors Decision, authorized person, etc. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.8	In case of Romanian applicants: Justifying document stating the method of representation (according to the national legislation) In case of Hungarian applicants: Original specimen of signature containing the method of representation of the legally authorized representative(s), certified by a public notary in original	In case of double representation, ex. if the mayor and the notary can represent the local government only together, the specimens of signature of both are required! To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

³⁰ To be submitted for Lead Applicant and all Applicants also.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
	language, is included.					
A.9	Letter of empowerment: For RO applicants: signed and stamped by the legal representative of the applicant institution For HU applicants: Certified by a public notary in original language, if the case.	Necessary when a person, other than the legal representative, is to sign certain official documents. To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.10	The job descriptions for all positions included in the proposed management team AND/OR the Terms of references , in case the management is externalized, are included ³¹ .	The tasks/requirements will be proportionate with the complexity of the project. To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.11	Feasibility study³² / Documentation for approval of intervention works³³ is included, according to the format provided as Annex VI.3 / Annex VI.4 for each investment, including geotechnical, geological, hydrological, hydro	For the projects involving the construction / upgrading / modernization of transport infrastructure, a <i>traffic study</i> must be presented containing data on the current and the estimated traffic. To be provided in EN language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

³¹ Flagship Projects are projects of significant complexity and the capacity of the partners is of high importance in the efficient and sustainable management of the projects. Therefore, the Programme strongly recommends avoiding the externalization of the project management. Moreover, maximum score will be granted only to applications ensuring the project management staff.

³² For new investments.

³³ For already existing investment objects.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
	geotechnical, photometric and stability surveys concerning the investment location. The Feasibility Study/Documentation for approval of intervention works or its revised version is valid according to the national legislation (the document must bear the date of elaboration / revision). However, this/these document(s) should be submitted as supporting documents to the Application Form and should be accompanied by the legal agreements and approvals (e.g. Local / County Council Decision, proof of the reception of the service, etc.)					
A.12	Other relevant studies/surveys not older than one year (evaluations, strategies, design plans, opportunity studies, impact assessment, location studies, etc.).	Multiyear documents, adopted as such will also be considered! To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.13	Title deed (<i>extras de carte funciară / tulajdoni lap másolat</i>) issued by the Land Registry, not older than 30 calendar days, of each real estate (land and/or building) affected by the investment is attached. In case the land and / or building is in	Exceptions: title deeds for road construction where land acquisition (purchase/expropriation) deems necessary , in case they are not yet available due to non-completion of the acquisition procedures.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
	concession / administration, it must be proved that the duration of the concession / administration of the land and / or building is based on a long term contract / enactment (i.e. min. 5 years after the estimated month for the financial closure of the project) and that the owner of the real estate has given his written agreement that the applicant is free to perform the investment.	To be provided in RO/HU language.				
A.14	Declaration from the land and / or building / item of infrastructure owner is included, stating that the land and / or building / item of infrastructure is: free of any encumbrances, not the object of a pending litigation, not the object of a claim according to the relevant national legislation.	Exceptions for purchase/ expropriation, in case of roads, as described above, under A.13 To be provided in RO/HU language.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
A.15	<p>For RO applicants: At least the Government/ county/ local council Decision approving the start of the purchase / expropriation procedure and the approval of the technical and economic indicators for the respective investment</p> <p>For HU applicants: If available, the Building Permit, OR the proof that the process of obtaining the building permit has started, issued by the competent authority.</p>	<p>Only in case the road infrastructure involves purchase / expropriations of land. To be provided in RO/HU language.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A.16	Environmental indicators list, proposed to be fulfilled is attached.	<p>Annex VI.5. To be provided in EN language.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B. Eligibility criteria						
B.1	The identity of the (Lead) Applicants /Associated Partners is the same as presented in the Concept Note.	Information provided in Project partner section of FA and Concept Note	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.2	The Full Application Form is developed based on the information provided within the Concept Note.	The partnership, objectives, main activities, estimated results and the defined output indicators are the same as presented in the CN.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
B.3	The (Lead) Applicant ³⁴ has legal competencies in the project relevant field.	For all operations, it is compulsory that the applicants have among their attributions, according with its statute or according to the national legislation, the implementation of the proposed activities or they must prove that they have a partnership agreement with the institutions competent to implement such activities, according with their statute or according to the national legislation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.4	All Applicants (including the Lead Applicant fulfil the location criteria set out in section 2.2.1.1. Eligibility of Applicants.	All Applicants (including the national / regional organizations' branch offices with or without legal entity) are located in the eligible area of the programme. In case the public entity's headquarter is registered outside the eligible programme area, the public entity has legal competencies for implementing operations in the programme area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.5	The Associated Partner ³⁵ fulfils the location criteria, set out in section 2.2.1.1. Eligibility	All Associated Partner (including the national / regional organizations' branch offices) are	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

³⁴ The criterion applies to all Project Partners/Associated Partners. However, in case an associated partner fails to comply with the eligibility rules of the present Call for Proposal, the project can be approved by the Monitoring Committee under conditions that the respective associated partners is eliminated as such.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
	of applicants.	located in the eligible area of the programme.				
B.6	The project implementation period reaches the limit of the minimum and does not exceed the limit of the maximum monthly limits set in the Call.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.7	All the 4 joint criteria are described, involving all Applicants (including the Lead).	Joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.8	Minimum 2 joint criteria are described, in case of Associated Partners are involved.	Joint financing is not applicable in case of Associated Partners.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.9	The financial support requested from ERDF and state budgets are ranged between the limits set in the Call.	Chapter 1.4 and 2.1. of GfA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.10	The percentage of the financial support requested from ERDF and state budgets are within the limits indicated in the Applicant's Guide.	Chapter 1.4 of GfA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.11	The proposals complies with the rule setting the maximum ceiling for the small-scale infrastructure investments (Ip 6/c and 8/b).	Approved CN budget and estimated budget for FA This limitation concerns exclusively investments in cultural and tourism infrastructure.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

³⁵ In case an associated partner fails to comply with the eligibility rules of the present Call for Proposal, the project can be approved by the Monitoring Committee under conditions that the respective associated partners is eliminated as such.

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
B.12	Total cost of investments in roads under Investment priorities other than Priority Axis 2 does not exceed 30% of the total eligible budget of the project.	Approved CN budget and estimated FA budget	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.13	The total budget is similar with the estimation made in the Concept Note. The variation does not exceed +/-10% and the total budget (CN+FA) is within the limits indicated in the Applicant's Guide.	Chapter 2.1. of GfA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.14	Total budget of activities to be carried out outside the programme area is up to maximum 10% from the total support requested from ERDF at project level.	The information must be available in the Full Application, FA budget and approved CN budget.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.15	If any, the costs of purchase/expropriations are included in the budget up to 5% of the ERDF estimated costs for the investment objective.	FA budget+CN budget	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
B.16	The value of site supervision is limited to 5 % of the total estimated works related cost.	Estimated budget for FA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

No.	Criteria	Description	Yes	No	NA	Comments ²⁶
The project proposal is formally compliant.			<input type="checkbox"/> ³⁶	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Recommendations ³⁷ :						

³⁶ Conditioned by the formulated recommendations (if any).

³⁷ In case the proposal is not fully compliant, in the case of the costs limitations (criteria B12-B16), the project proposal will be passed to quality assessment under the condition that the necessary budget-cuts will be made.

Phase II – Full Application
QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID
Project identification

Project title	
Project acronym	
Project number	
Name of the Lead Applicant organization	

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA
<p>Management (20 p.)</p> <p>To what extent are management structures and procedures in line with the project size, duration and needs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management structures are proportionate to the project size and needs and allow partners' involvement in decision-making = 4 p. • Management procedures (such as reporting and evaluation procedures in the area of finance, project content, communication) are clear, transparent, efficient and effective = 4 p. • Project management includes regular contact between project partners and ensures transfer of expertise across the partnership (internal communication within the partnership) = 4p. • Necessary provisions for risk and quality management are in place; the project demonstrates a proper risks assessment and a concerted risk management plan; = 4 p. • The Lead Applicant demonstrates capacity to manage EU co-financed projects or other international projects or can ensure adequate measures for management support; The partnership and/or the project management team cover the needed professional competences; = 4 p. 			<p>Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments</p>

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA
<p>Communication (10 p.)</p> <p>To what extent are communication activities appropriate and forceful to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The communication objectives clearly link to the project specific objectives = 3 p. • The approach/tactics chosen are appropriate to reach communication objectives = 3 p. • Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders = 4 p. 			<p>Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments</p>
<p>Work plan (25 p.)</p> <p>To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed activities (including the activities outside the programme area) and deliverables are relevant, clearly benefit for the programme area and lead to the planned main outputs and result/s = 6 p. • Distribution of tasks among partners is appropriate (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the project, etc.) = 3 p. • Time plan is realistic (contingency included) = 3 p. • Activities, deliverables and outputs are in a logical time-sequence = 3 p. • The importance of investments and their cross-border relevance is demonstrated to reach the project objectives - = 5 p. • The proposed activities serve the needs of the identified target group = 5 p. 			<p>Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments</p>
<p>Impact and sustainability (25 p.)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project has a mid and long-term impact on the eligible area and target groups = 3 p. • The financial and operational sustainability of the project is assured for at least 5 years after final payment effected by the MA = 3 p. • The results of the project has a catalysing and multiplying effect in the eligible programme area = 3 p. • Innovative methods are to be implemented in the project = 3 p. • The project might become a best practice model = 3 p. 			<p>Project summary, Partner, Project Description, Workplan, Project Budget,</p>

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA																								
	<div>Contribution to the horizontal principles is clearly demonstrated = 4 p.</div> <table><tr><td>lp</td><td>6/c, 7/b, 7/c</td><td>8/b</td><td>9/a</td></tr><tr><td>Sustainable development</td><td>3 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td></tr><tr><td>Equal opportunities and non-discrimination</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>1,5 p.</td><td>2,5 p.</td></tr><tr><td>Social inclusion of disadvantaged groups</td><td>-</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td></tr><tr><td>Equality between men and women</td><td>0,5 p.</td><td>1,5 p.</td><td>0,5 p.</td></tr><tr><td></td><td>4p</td><td>4p</td><td>4p</td></tr></table> <div>•Clearly demonstrated contribution to any of the programme level environmental indicators (Environmental Indicators Checklist) = 1 p •The applicant indicates the project's contribution to EU Strategy for the Danube Region (encourages synergistic effects, innovative solutions, replication capacity at macro regional level, convergence with other EUSDR relevant projects) =1p •Partnership demonstrates strong commitment and contributions (observing joint development, joint implementation, joint staffing and joint financing) = 4 p.</div>	lp	6/c, 7/b, 7/c	8/b	9/a	Sustainable development	3 p.	0,5 p.	0,5 p.	Equal opportunities and non-discrimination	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	2,5 p.	Social inclusion of disadvantaged groups	-	0,5 p.	0,5 p.	Equality between men and women	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	0,5 p.		4p	4p	4p			Attachments
lp	6/c, 7/b, 7/c	8/b	9/a																									
Sustainable development	3 p.	0,5 p.	0,5 p.																									
Equal opportunities and non-discrimination	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	2,5 p.																									
Social inclusion of disadvantaged groups	-	0,5 p.	0,5 p.																									
Equality between men and women	0,5 p.	1,5 p.	0,5 p.																									
	4p	4p	4p																									
Budget (20 p.) To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for	<div>•The budget is clear and realistic; the project budget only contains eligible costs = 5 p. •Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation; the project will be implemented in line with the principle of cost-effectiveness = 5 p. •Total partner budgets reflect real partners' involvement (are balanced in terms of</div>			Project summary, Partner, Project Description,																								

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:	Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA
money? To what extent is the budget coherent and proportionate?	tasks and responsibilities within the partnership and realistic) = 5 p. • Project budget appears proportionate to the proposed work plan ³⁸ and the main outputs and results aimed for = 5 p.			Workplan, Project Budget, Attachments

<p>Total score³⁹ : _____</p> <p>The project proposal is recommended for support:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> YES</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> NO</p>	<p>Comments:</p>
--	------------------

³⁸ Financial allocation per budget line is in line with the work plan; distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan.

³⁹ The minimum threshold for score obtained in the Quality Assessment is of 65 points.