

*Technical assistance for the elaboration of  
the future Interreg Programme Romania-  
Hungary 2021-2027 (including the  
realisation of SEA)*

*Operations of Strategic Importance (OSIs)  
Concept and Methodology<sup>1</sup>*

---

<sup>1</sup> Methodology for the identification and the definition of the operations of strategic importance concept, including the appraisal procedure and associated grids (deliverable under the service contract no. 147/2020)

## Contents

Preamble .....	3
1. Steps for identification of Operations of Strategic Importance (OSIs) .....	4
2. The Operations of Strategic Importance Concept .....	6
Annex 1 OSI Project Identification Fiche.....	8
Annex 2 Preliminary proposal for assessment grids for future restricted calls dedicated to OSIs...	9
Annex 2.1. Strategic criteria .....	9
Annex 2.2 Quality criteria .....	14
Annex 2.3 Operational criteria .....	16

## Preamble

The purpose of this paper is to define the procedural steps and the working methodology for the identification of the indicative list of operations of strategic importance to be included in Appendix 3 of the future Interreg Programme between Romania and Hungary 2021-2027.

When a Member State submits the programme, it shall ensure that the programme is accompanied for information purposes by a list of planned operations of strategic importance and a timetable – Article 17 of REGULATION (EU) 2021/1059 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 24 June 2021 on specific provisions for the European territorial cooperation goal (Interreg) supported by the European Regional Development Fund and external financing instruments.

“Operation of strategic importance” means an operation which provides a significant contribution to the achievement of the objectives of a programme and which is subject to particular monitoring and communication measures – according to Article 2 (5) of REGULATION (EU) 2021/1060 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 24 June 2021 laying down common provisions on the European Regional Development Fund, the European Social Fund Plus, the Cohesion Fund, the Just Transition Fund and the European Maritime, Fisheries and Aquaculture Fund and financial rules for those and for the Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund, the Internal Security Fund and the Instrument for Financial Support for Border Management and Visa Policy.

Regarding the operations of strategic importance, the lessons learnt from the current and previous Interreg Programmes suggest:

- The need to ensure a more rapid launch of the Programme, in order to increase the absorption rate and outputs delivered in the mid-term;
- The need for simplification, by remodulation of the two-steps procedure, with more accent on the strategic component in the initial formulation and identification phases, with the direct involvement of stakeholders and Member States and reduced administrative burden on potential beneficiaries;
- The cross-border impact: the concentration of resources under selected POs and priorities that better address common challenges and valorise common resources builds, by itself, the conditions for higher cross-border relevance of future strategic projects. The projects with strategic relevance shall address common problems, build on common possibilities and their results can be achieved better through cross-border cooperation.

## 1. Steps for identification of Operations of Strategic Importance (OSIs)

After the approval of the *Operations of Strategic Importance (OSIs) Concept and Methodology* by the Programming Committee (PC), in December 2021, the following procedural steps will be taken:

### 1. Collection of OSIs proposals, responding to the following elements:

- a. address one of the fields of intervention identified in the Interreg Programme, where clear need is identified, relevant solutions are presented;
- b. target earmarked achievements for the cross-border region with an innovative approach;
- c. contribute to the fulfilment of the strategic vision and the strategy of the Interreg Programme with cooperation across borders;
- d. have a significant impact at territorial and cross-border level, targeting at least 2 counties (1 from RO and 1 from HU) with a competent partnership;
- e. directly address extended/broad target groups with clear, ongoing communication throughout the project cycle;
- f. make a significant change/contribution in the addressed field, on long term producing long lasting results, sustainable outputs;
- g. will be implemented within the 2021-2027 programming period;
- h. fit within the financial limits set out in *The Operations of Strategic Importance Concept and Methodology*, bearing in mind the value for money principle, respectively:
  - i. in case of PO2 and PO4: up to 8.75 million EUR ERDF;
  - ii. in case of ISO1: up to 3.5 million EUR ERDF.

The OSIs proposals will be formulated by the Programming Committee voting members (ideally, maximum two OSI per each voting member with a recommended summed value of EUR 8.75 million ERDF), using the Project Identification Fiche (see Annex 1) in a period of 2 weeks after the approval of *The Operations of Strategic Importance Concept and Methodology*, which includes the following information:

- General data about the project (identity of the potential partners, estimated duration of implementation, estimated budget, etc.);
- Description of the project (target area, needs addressed, objectives, estimated impact, anticipated results, strategic relevance, etc.).

2. Approval of the indicative list of OSIs to be listed in the programme as Appendix 3, by the PC voting members in January 2022 by checking the strategic relevance and by respecting the compliance with relevant development strategies. In case of Hungarian applicants, in line with Article 11 of Hungarian Act XXI of 1996 on Regional Development and Spatial Planning on duties of the county councils related to regional development, the strategic relevance must be proved by a compliance letter issued by the County Council which confirms the synergies and compliance of the project with the relevant county strategy.

3. The financial allocations on Policy Objectives / Specific Objectives and of the Performance Framework indicators will be decided in the period December 2021-January 2022, taking into consideration:

- The threshold of maximum 50% of the total ERDF budget of the Programme (up to approx. 70 million EUR ERDF<sup>2</sup>) established for OSIs, as well as the balanced impact in the entire Programme area through funding;
- the relevant thresholds established by the EU Regulations for POs/ISO1;
- the stakeholders' interest in the fields of intervention of strategic importance as resulted within the consultation process (workshops, surveys, interviews, etc);
- historical data (2007-2020).

## 2. Provisional timeline

- Approval of OSIs Concept and Methodology – December 2021;
- Submitting OSI concepts to the Programme – December 2021 – January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022;
  - In case of Hungarian applicants, the OSIs concepts shall also be submitted to the relevant County Council, who should issue the “compliance letter” until the date for organizing the PC meeting.
- Launching the invitation and relevant documents (including proposed Appendix 3 to the IP) – mid- January, 2022;
- Organizing PC meeting for approval of the complete draft of the Interreg Programme (Decision issued) – end of January 2022.

---

<sup>2</sup> including potential TA flat rate in line with EU regulation

## 2. The Operations of Strategic Importance Concept

In line with CPR Art. 2 (5)<sup>3</sup>, an 'operation of strategic importance' (OSIs) means an operation which provides a significant contribution to the achievement of the objectives of a programme and which is subject to particular monitoring and communication measures.

The following table presents the main strategic and quality features and related fields of verification and assessment sub-criteria that may be applied by the future MC when selecting projects of strategic importance. Concepts listed in Appendix 3 will have the opportunity to be selected through restricted call. However, Appendix 3 is indicative and can be further amended.

<b>Strategic features - main strategic assessment criteria</b>	<b>Fields of verification</b>	<b>Related sub-criteria</b>
A. Impact component	Policy relevance Cross-border needs Cross-border impacts Demonstrative value	Project rationale and policy relevance Project cross-border impact and relevance Project innovative and demonstrative character (value added of the intervention logics)
B. Cooperation and sustainability component	Components of the partnership Governance competences and territorial coverage Sustainable financial and institutional support Use of results and their integration in the institutional working methods	Partnership (in terms of governance competences and territorial coverage) Ownership and durability
<b>Quality features</b>	<b>Fields of verification</b>	<b>Related sub-criteria</b>
C. Quality of the rationale	Coherence of the intervention logics and distribution of tasks among partners Expenditures' ceilings and distribution of expenditures among partners Planned procurement procedures Description of the contribution to the horizontal issues Identification of risks and barriers and related mitigation / management strategy	Project workplan Cost-effectiveness Contribution to the horizontal principles Compliance with the DNSH principle Risk assessment Analysis of barriers to cooperation
D. Capitalisation component	Partners' previous experience and lessons learnt from other initiatives	Complementarity, synergy and continuity with other funds and projects (capitalisation of previous initiatives and lessons learnt) Lessons learnt capitalisation

<sup>3</sup> Common provisional understanding.

*The indicative assessment grids are presented in the annex to the methodology. These are only attached for information purposes in support of project generation phase. The final assessment grids and the full projects' selection procedure and methodology shall be adopted by the future MC.*

The strategic and cross-border nature of a project stands on **the scope and coverage of the project**, which will be also specifically aimed at increasing the cooperation level through more sustainable institutional relations and specific measures to reduce barriers to cooperation, as preconditions to demonstrate a strategic character. In this respect, in line with CPR definition, projects of strategic importance will:

- have a **demonstrated impact on programme objectives**, especially in relation to the improvement of cooperation patterns, by contributing to change the “business as usual” with more effective and sustainable institutional cooperation (i.e. establishing a common vision and reaching a joint objective, through shared systems, tools and working procedures, beyond project implementation) and
- ensure the **maximal contribution to the horizontal principles** applicable to the field of intervention (i.e. contribution to sustainable development targets, the Paris Climate Agreement (2015) and the Glasgow Climate Pact (2021), the “do no significant harm principle” and the environmental acquis for PO2, contribution to the European Charter of Fundamental Rights and sustainable development targets for PO4) through measurable results and outputs to be delivered by the projects to the benefits of cross-border population and territories.

The concept for projects of strategic importance for PO2 and PO4 thus includes a focus on providing **holistic impacts on territories and population**.

On the other hand, under ISO1, which is, by its nature, more oriented towards soft type interventions (hard ERDF-type measures are still eligible)<sup>4</sup>, strategic projects may encompass drafting plans, strategies and / or implementing pilot actions without investments in infrastructures and / or equipment, but still having a **high cross-border impact on improving cooperation patterns and governance**.

---

<sup>4</sup> Although not compulsory, ERDF type measures, encompassing expenditures in equipment and infrastructure, are eligible under any Interreg operations, also under ISO1, if they are justified by the project objective.

## Annex 1 OSI Project Identification Fiche

### GENERAL DATA

<b>Programme priority:</b>	
<b>Programme priority specific objective:</b>	
<b>Project title:</b>	
<b>Name of the lead partner organisation/original language &amp; English</b>	
<b>Name of potential Partner 1 organisation/original language and English version</b>	
<i>Add lines to insert more potential partners</i>	
<i>Add lines to insert more potential partners</i>	
<b>Indicative project duration (in months):</b>	
<b>Indicative budget (euro)</b>	

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION (in English language)

Please give a short overview of the project and describe:

- The envisaged potential type of partners;
- The territorial area covered;
- The common challenge of the programme area jointly tackled in the project;
- The overall objective of the project and the expected change the project will make to the current situation;
- The specific objectives and the main outputs the project will produce and who will benefit from them (target groups);
- The planned approach and why a cross-border approach is needed;
- The strategic relevance of the operation;
- What is new/original about the project.

\_\_\_\_\_0 / 4000 characters



## Annex 2 Preliminary proposal for assessment grids for future restricted calls dedicated to OSIs

### Annex 2.1. Strategic criteria

	Criteria Description	Sub-criteria scoring description	Maximum score
<b>A. Impact</b>	<p><b>Project policy relevance and impact on needs and target groups is an essential feature of the strategic projects. This is reflected in the highest score that can be assigned to this criterion. The territorial coverage, targeting the widest possible areas and population with special needs, and development of new joint solutions to tackle these common needs are also essential features, which differentiate a strategic project from a “normal project”, that shall have a smaller scale impact, without the ambition to change the “business as usual” approach nor to contribute to attain a specific target established under national / local policies. In this respect, strategic projects shall show high value added, be demonstrative and have a high replicability and leverage effect.</b></p>		
A.1 Project rationale	A.1.1 Does the project contribute to policies and strategies relevant to the Programme area and specific sector, at different governance levels (local / regional / national / bilateral / macro-regional)?	The project clearly correlates its objectives with local, regional, national, bilateral (if applicable) and EUSDR level (if applicable) strategic framework, providing details on the contribution to the implementation of specific priorities (5 p: extensively; 3 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)	5 points
A.2 Project impact and cross-border relevance	A.2.1 Have the common cross-border needs to be tackled or resources to be valorised been clearly defined? Partially/ Insufficient: 0 p; Satisfactorily: 10 p; Extensively: 15 p. <b>Attention! The minimum score to this sub-criterion is 10</b>	<p>The project clearly identifies needs / target groups / resources to be valorised on BOTH sides of the border and quantifies them, based on statistics and / or data and specifies why these needs can be better addressed at cross-border level 15 p</p> <p>The project identifies needs / target groups / resources to be valorised on BOTH sides of the border, however these are not fully quantified through reliable data 10 p</p> <p>The project partially identifies needs / target groups / resources to be valorised (i.e. only on one side of the border), so there is no clear justification of the cross-border intervention 0 p</p> <p><i>See box below, after the table, with details for each specific objective</i></p>	30 points

	Criteria Description	Sub-criteria scoring description	Maximum score
	A.2.2 Does the project clearly detail the change and impact on territories / population / cooperation? 15 p		
A.3 Project innovative and demonstrative character (value added of the intervention logics)	A.3.1 Does the project demonstrate added value, innovation and replicability potential? No: 0 p; Partially / Insufficient: 4 p; Satisfactorily: 12 p; Extensively: 20 p.	The project fully demonstrates, through planned deliverables (such as guides, follow up / evaluation of pilot actions) added value, the potential for replication and innovation 20 p The project partially presents the potential for replication, added value and innovation (i.e. no evaluation for evidence-based replication and proof of effectiveness are included in the project) 12 p The project demonstrates some innovation potential and added value but limited replicability (i.e. due to the specificity of solutions) 4 p The project has low replicability and added value as compared to the state of the art 0 p	20 points
<b>B. Cooperation and sustainability</b>	<b>The cooperation component is the cornerstone of cross-border projects. Increased cooperation is part of the general objective of the Interreg Programme and shall thus be mainstreamed in the strategic projects' intervention logics. In this respect, strategic projects shall demonstrate the adequate level of coverage in terms of partnership governance competences and stakeholders' representativeness and shall reflect the long-term objective of consolidating cooperation through joint strategic planning, the reduction of barriers to cooperation and the incidence of any external factor on cross-border relations. This will also help attaining higher sustainability of results. Sustainability is also a key feature of strategic projects, encompassing the expected "system change". In order to be sustainable, partners shall be committed to fructify project outcomes and to incorporate them in their joint strategy, as well as in working procedures / systems / institutional strategy.</b>		
B.1 Partnership	B.1.1 Does the proposed partnership cover the needed institutional and professional competencies in order to tackle the common challenge / valorise the common resources? No: 0 p; Partially/ Insufficient: 14 p; Satisfactorily: 22 p; Extensively: 30 p.	The partnership covers the proper governance level on both sides of the border (such as national, regional / multi-county and / or local level), as well as additional public or non-governmental actors relevant for the field of intervention (if applicable), from both sides of the border (or a CB legal body/EGTC with members from both countries). The project explains how relevant stakeholders will be further involved and committed during the project 30 p The partnership covers the proper governance level on both sides of the border, however the national / regional / multi-county level,	30 points

	Criteria Description	Sub-criteria scoring description	Maximum score
		<p>additional public or non-governmental actors relevant for the field of intervention (if applicable), are not covered for both sides of the border. The project explains how relevant stakeholders will be further involved and committed during the project 22 p</p> <p>The partnership misses some relevant actors needed to plan and deliver the joint action effectively, however the project explains how relevant stakeholders will be further involved and committed during the project 14 p</p> <p>The partnership misses some relevant actors needed to plan and deliver the joint action effectively 0 p</p>	
B.2 Ownership and sustainability	B.2.1 Does the project detail how the partners will ensure full ownership and durability of the intervention?	<p>The project describes who will ensure the financial and institutional support for the outputs/deliverables developed by the project (e.g., tools) 5 p (5 p: extensively; 3 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p> <p>The project explains how these outputs/deliverables will be integrated in the work of the institutions 5 p (5 p: extensively; 3 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p> <p>The project describes how the outputs / deliverables will be used after project closure and by whom 5 p (5 p: extensively; 3 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p>	15 points

*Details on criteria A.2.2*

Specific objective	Criteria (A.3.2)	Yes	No
2.1	Will the project support the protection of local population, homes, business infrastructure, strategic infrastructure especially exposed to climate and non-climate change related risks (high – medium risk areas)?	The project provides details on the expected change in terms of increased coverage of population and socio-economic infrastructure, especially exposed to climate and non-climate change risks, with risk prevention and / or emergency systems. 15 p To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p	0 p
2.2	Will the project support the development of multistakeholder cooperation covering a wide range of the PA population/territory in the field of renewable energy?	The project provides details on the expected change and possible leverage effect, in terms of increased number of stakeholders involved in renewable energy initiatives and / or with an increased number of future projects and initiatives related to renewable energies as compared to the state of the art To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p	0 p
2.3	Will the project contribute to increase the share of the cross-border natural areas jointly protected (including the reduction of pollution) or rehabilitated for socio-economic development?	The project provides details on the expected change in terms of increased share of natural / green areas jointly protected / managed – including the improvement of pollution monitoring and the reduction of pollution. OR on the impact of protection / rehabilitation measure in terms of future re-use for socio-economic purposes, thus generating better ecological livelihoods. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p	0 p
4.1	Will the project contribute to increase the access to quality and personalise the health-care services of the cross-border area? OR Will the project contribute to increase the resilience of the health care services in the cross-border area?	The project provides details on the expected change in terms of improved quality and coverage of the health care services access, including minor urban and rural centres and special target groups. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p  OR The project provides details on the expected change in terms increased response capacity / resilience of the health-care system in the PA. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p	0 p
4.2	Will the project contribute to increase social and / or territorial cohesion of the PA through the valorisation of tangible and intangible common assets?	The project provides details on the expected change in terms of increased social / territorial cohesion, deriving from the valorisation of cultural and / or touristic resources under a common vision shared by PA stakeholders. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p	0 p

Specific objective	Criteria (A.3.2)	Yes	No
ISO 1 barriers to cooperation	Will the project contribute to assess and solve barriers to cooperation that are currently reducing the cooperation opportunities in the PA?	The project clearly explains the expected change in terms of improving the cooperation, in view of adopting solutions to barriers, at the proper governance level, with the ownership of national authorities. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p .	0 p
ISO 1 stakeholders' capacities	Will the project contribute to increase stakeholders' capacities to plan and / or deliver joint interventions based on common needs?	The project will contribute to improve cross-border data set at micro level (in fields such as: cross-border value chains, people movement across the border, waste management and circular economy, proximity communities along the border, migrant flows) or will focus on the elaboration of plans and/or joint studies facilitating movement across the border, and proposes joint strategies based on collected data. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p  Or The project will contribute to consolidate PA stakeholders' capacities to deliver joint interventions in fields not covered under PO 2 and PO 4, through shared systems / working methods / renewed facilities. To a large extent 15 p To some extent 8 p	0 p

C. Quality of the rationale	The quality of the project is a key criterion for the further prioritisation of strategic projects: a clear intervention logic, a solid partnership framework, a deep analysis of risks and barriers, and a direct contribution to horizontal principles are among most important elements underlying a viable and added-value project proposal.		
C.1 Project work plan	C.1.1 Is the overall design of the action coherent? Is the action feasible and consistent in relation to the objectives and expected results?	<p>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 10 p. (10 p: extensively; 6 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p> <p>The distribution of tasks among partners is appropriate (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the project, etc.) 8 p. (8 p: extensively; 5 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p> <p>Time plan is realistic (contingency included) 7 p. (7 p: extensively; 4 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p>	25 points
C.2 Cost-effectiveness	C.2.1 Are the estimated costs realistic and sufficient in relation to the objectives set?	<p>The costs estimations for human resources are in line with applicable ceilings included in national legislations (ex. for civil servants) and are justified in terms of planned activities (ex. number of hours per month and per activity) 7 p (7 p: extensively; 4 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p> <p>The procurement of good, works and services is duly justified in relation to project activities and objectives 7 p (7 p: extensively; 4 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p> <p>Total partner budgets reflect real partners involvement (are balanced in terms of tasks and responsibilities within the partnership and realistic) 6 p. (6 p: extensively; 3 p: satisfactory; 0 p: partially / insufficient)</p>	20 points

<p>C.3 Project contribution to horizontal issues</p>	<p>The proposal contains specific added-value elements related to horizontal principles, and environmental issues? No: 0 p; Partially/ Insufficient: 1 p; Satisfactorily: 3 p; Extensively: 5 p.</p>	<p>The project details the contribution of the activities to all relevant horizontal issues (sustainable development, equal opportunities and non- discrimination, gender issues, DNSH) identifying specific deliverables and target groups 5 p The project describes the contribution of the specific objectives to all relevant horizontal issues (sustainable development, equal opportunities and non- discrimination, gender issues, DNSH) without mentioning the operational approach 3 p The project partially / generically explains the contribution of the proposal to horizontal issues (no specific mention of project objectives nor to activities and deliverables) 1 p. The project does not approach the horizontal principles 0 p.</p>	<p>5 points</p>
<p>C.4 Risk assessment</p>	<p>C.4.1 Does the project fully describe risks and quality management strategies?</p>	<p>Necessary provisions for risk and quality management are in place 10 p Risks or quality management are not described (one of the two is missing) 6 p Risks are only listed, without analysis 3 p</p>	<p>10 points</p>
<p>C.5 Analysis of barriers to cooperation and proposed solutions</p>	<p>C.5.1 Does the proposal include an assessment of potential barriers to cooperation and propose solutions (e.g. also if integrated in project activities)? No: 0 p; Partially / Insufficient: 3 p; Satisfactorily: 6 p; Extensively: 10 p</p>	<p>Potential barriers to cooperation are extensively presented and related solutions are taken into account or their exploration and solution is fully integrated within the project activities 10 p Or There are no barriers to cooperation (and this is demonstrated in the project description)10 p  Potential barriers to cooperation are briefly mentioned and their exploration (but not solutions) is integrated in the project activities 6 p Potential barriers to cooperation are briefly mentioned, but neither further exploration nor solutions are proposed 3 p Potential barriers to cooperation are not considered 0 p</p>	<p>10 points</p>
<p><b>D. Capitalisation</b></p>	<p><b>Capitalisation, continuity and complementarity are important assents for priority strategic projects as they create leverage effects and allow to optimise the use of EU / national funds, through synergies and valorisation of both tangible and intangible outcomes.</b></p>		

<p>D.1 Complementarity and continuity with other funds and projects (capitalisation of previous initiatives)</p>	<p>D.1.1 Is the project complementary with other initiatives/projects relevant for the same domain of intervention and builds on lessons learnt? No: 0 p; Partially / Insufficient: 14 p; Satisfactorily: 22 p; Extensively: 30 p.</p>	<p>The complementarity with other initiatives / projects is fully described (i.e. description of lessons learnt / valorisation of previous and on-going projects' results, etc) and is linked to the direct experience of the partners 30 p The complementarity with other initiatives / projects is fully described, but it deals with the experience of other organisations 22 p The complementarity with other initiatives / projects is presented only generically (i.e. reference to the projects, without argumentation) 14 p The complementarity with other initiatives / projects is not described 0 p</p>	<p>30 points</p>
--	--	--	------------------

### Annex 2.3 Operational criteria

	Criteria Description	Sub-criteria scoring description
<p><b>E. Management and administrative capacity</b></p>	<p><b>Management and administrative capacities encompass crucial criteria to assess the feasibility and quality of the proposal from the perspective of its operationalisation in the workplan, management and working procedures. The different components of the management capacity shall be assessed before the inclusion of the strategic projects in the programme, in order to secure its smooth implementation, thus avoiding risks related to lack of potential beneficiaries' capacities to implement their projects effectively.</b></p>	
<p>E.1 Management capacity</p>	<p>E.1.1 Does the project partnership demonstrate an adequate project management capacity?  Ex. total 20 points</p>	<p>Both the Lead Applicant and project partners demonstrate capacity to manage EU co-financed projects or other international projects (previous experience) 20 p Only the Lead Applicant demonstrates capacity to manage EU co-financed projects or other international projects (previous experience) 12 p The previous experience of the partnership in relevant fields is not fully relevant for the topic of the project 6 p The previous experience of the partnership in relevant fields is not fully described 0 p  The Project Management structures/team (ex. Steering Committee and technical implementation teams) and procedures (project coordination, and monitoring and</p>



	Criteria Description	Sub-criteria scoring description
	E.1.2 To what extent is the project management structures/team in line with the project size, duration and needs? Ex. total 10 points	evaluation) are fully described and proportionate, to the project needs (ex. evaluation of pilot actions results) and foresees coordination methods allow partners' involvement in decision-making during the whole project duration 10 p. Project management structures (ex. Steering Committee) and procedures for Project reporting allow partners' involvement in decision-making (however project coordination is not fully described) 6 p. Main management structures and procedures are established but they are not fully described (responsibilities among partners are not clear) 3 p Management structures and / or procedures are not established 0 p
E.2 Project team	E.2.1 Does the project core management team cover all the needed professional competences to ensure sound project management? Ex. total 20 points	The project management team covers the needed professional competences (at least: coordination / management, public procurement, financial management, communication) at the level of all partners. Experience (of the team) is proven for being involved in a previous similar project/activity 20 p The project management team covers all professional competences (as mentioned above) but is described only for the lead partner / experience (of the team) is proven for being involved in a previous smaller projects/other activities 12 p The project management team lacks some key positions (from those mentioned above), no experience (of the team) is proven 6 p The project management team is not described 0 p.
E.3 Communication	E.3.1 Does the project demonstrate an adequate communication strategy in line with established project objectives and basic communication and visibility requirements? Ex. total 20 points	The communication objectives, target groups and means are clear, and the project includes added value measures for visibility and knowledge sharing 20 p. The communication objectives, target groups and means are clear, and the project covers minimum communication and visibility requirements 12 p. The description of the communication activities covers only minimum communication and visibility requirements 6 p The description of the communication activities is not complete 0 p  <i>N.B. The project communication activities will be detailed in the application form</i>

	Criteria Description	Sub-criteria scoring description
<b>F. Budget</b>	<b>Cost effectiveness is another key operational criterion encompassing the project feasibility and realistic construction, from the perspective of sound EU funds' management, in line with EU Regulations and programme specific financial management rules. Budget cost-effectiveness shall also be assessed before the inclusion of the strategic projects in the programme, in order to secure its sound financial management. Although project budget might be further detailed and refined following the realisation of technical studies, in the pre-selection phase the overall coherence and preliminary justification of expenditures shall, in any case, be assessed.</b>	
F.1 Cost-effectiveness	F.1.1 Are the estimated costs realistic and sufficient in relation to the objectives set? Ex. total 30 points	<p>The costs estimations for human resources are in line with applicable ceilings included in national legislations (ex. for civil servants) and are justified in terms of planned activities (ex. number of hours per month and per activity) 10 p</p> <p>The procurement of good, works and services is duly justified in relation to project activities and objectives 10 p</p> <p>Total partner budgets reflect real partners involvement (are balanced in terms of tasks and responsibilities within the partnership and realistic) 10 p.</p> <p>30 points</p>