

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</p> <p>A.</p> <p>Project partners</p> <p>B.</p> <p>Work plan / work packages</p> <p><u>D.1.</u></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>Work plan / work packages D.1.</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>Work plan / work packages D.1., Define Periods D.3., Feasibility Study, relevant studies/surveys</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. • Contribution to the horizontal principles is clearly demonstrated = 4 p. 			<p>Project focus / Durability of project, outputs and results C.2., Work plan / work packages D.1., Horizontal</p>

Assessment Criteria	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project meet the following criteria:				Numerical assessment	Comments	Sections in FA
	lp	6/c, 7/b, 7/c	8/b	9/a			principles C.4., Project context C.3., Project relevance / Cooperation criteria C.1., relevant studies/surveys
	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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 						Work plan / work packages D.1, FA Budget , Feasibility

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 ¹ and the main outputs and results aimed for = 5 p.			Study, relevant studies/surveys

<p>Total score² : _____</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>
---	------------------

¹ 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.

² The minimum threshold for score obtained in the Quality Assessment is of 65 points.