

Interreg



Co-funded by
the European Union

Italy – Croatia

INTERREG ITALY-CROATIA PROGRAMME 2021 – 2027

Annex 1 to the Project Selection Procedure “Assessment criteria”

2nd Call for Proposals

(Version 1.0 – 17th of September 2024)

1. Administrative Compliance and Eligibility check

After the submission in Jems, the JS will perform the assessment of the project proposals.

The following criteria are part of the Jems set-up and for this reason they are not included in the administrative compliance and eligibility check:

- submission by the deadline set for a Call;
- the total ERDF co-financing is not exceeding 80% of the total project budget;
- The project duration is in line with the time limit set in the Call Announcement.

In addition, Jems will manage certain checks with reference to specific criteria, issuing 'warning' or 'block' notifications to the applicants, as detailed below.

The following table specifies the criteria to be used for this stage of the Project Selection process:

	Criteria	Eligible	Jems
A	Submission and completeness of the AF		
A.1	The proposal is the only one submitted for the given project?	YES/NO	
A.2	The proposal is complete and filled out in all its parts in English language?	YES/NO	
A.3	The proposal is duly signed by LP's legal representative/delegated person?	YES/NO	
B	General Call requirements		
B.1	The minimum number of partners is respected	YES/NO	Management by Jems
B.2	The minimum number of partners per Country is respected	YES/NO	
B.3	The total financial dimension of the project proposal is in line with the Call Announcement	YES/NO	Management by Jems
C	Eligibility of Lead Partner		
C.1	The Lead partner is an eligible applicant according to the Call requirements	YES/NO	Partial management by Jems
C.2	The LP organization is involved as LP in only 1 proposals within the Call	YES/NO	
D	Eligibility of Project Partners		
D.1	Project partners are eligible applicants according to the Call requirements	YES/NO	



Italy – Croatia

D.2	Minimum PP ERDF contribution (300.000€) is respected	YES/NO	Management by Jems
D.3	The PP organization is involved as LP or PP in maximum 2 proposals within the Call	YES/NO	
E	Annexes		
E.1	The Lead Partner Declaration is complete and correct	YES/NO	
E.2	The Project Partner declarations are complete and correct	YES/NO	
E.3	Information presented in the project proposal and in annexes is consistent	YES/NO	
E.4	For INVESTMENTS: All mandatory supporting documents are listed in the project proposal (e.g. the authorizations, permits, assessment of expected impacts of climate change, etc.) and uploaded on Jems. Alternatively, it is indicated when the mandatory documentation will be available.	YES/NO/NOT APPLICABLE	
E.5	For INVESTMENTS: DNSH declaration is signed and uploaded on Jems together with its annexes.	YES/NO/NOT APPLICABLE	
F	Cooperation criteria		
F.1	The project commits to apply joint development, joint implementation and at least one of the following cooperation criteria: joint staffing or joint financing	YES/NO	
G	Horizontal principles		
G.1	The project commits to not adversely impact the horizontal principles (equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women and sustainable development)	YES/NO	



2. Quality Assessment

2.1 Strategic assessment criteria

1	Cooperation character	Reference in the AF ¹	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
1.1	What added value does the cooperation bring? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of cooperation beyond borders for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated; The results cannot (or only to some extent) be achieved without cooperation. • Effective CB activities (and investment if any) are clearly demonstrated (no mirroring). • Benefit for all PPs and for both side of the border are clearly demonstrated. 	C.2.3 C.4 C.7.5 B.n.6 ²	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	14	(points x weight)
1.2	To what extent does the project demonstrate new cross-border solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/Programme area/participating countries?	C.2.2 C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR COOPERATION CHARACTER				19%	
2	Project relevance and strategy	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
2.1	What are the common territorial challenges that will be tackled by the proposal on the basis of IP 2021-2027 (is a real need for the project in respect to the identified challenges demonstrated)?	C.2.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.2	Is the project clearly contributing to a wider strategy on one or more policy levels (EU/national /regional), especially as specified in the ANNEX 1 - Thematic Descriptive Sheets?	C.2.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.3	Is the project clearly and consistently contributing to specified EUSAIR macro-regional strategy pillar objectives and flagships, as specified in the ANNEX 1 - Thematic Descriptive Sheets?	C.2.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
2.4	Are complementarities and synergies between the project proposal and projects supported by	C.2.6	(0-20-40-60-	2%	(points x weight)

¹ In addition to the mentioned chapters, also other parts of the AF can be used during assessment.

² The letter „n“ refers to the Jems section of each LP/PP in the proposal.



Italy – Croatia

	other programmes and initiatives clearly demonstrated?		80-100)		
2.5	To what extent the project makes use of available knowledge and builds on existing results and practices?	C.2.7	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
2.6	Do the actions proposed aim to effectively achieve the environmental sustainability objectives of the cooperation area as specified in Strategic Environmental Assessment?	C.7.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.7	How effective and measurable is the contribution to Horizontal principles from Art. 9 CPR and art. 22(2) Interreg Regulation?	C.7.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
2.8	Is the proposal foreseeing the efficient use of “sustainable development practices” (e.g. Green Public Procurement; Nature-based solutions; Lifecycle costing criteria; Standards going beyond regulatory requirements, circular economy practices)?	C.7.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR PROJECT RELEVANCE AND STRATEGY				18%	
3	Contribution to programme’s objectives, expected results and outputs	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
3.1	To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme’s objectives and indicators, as specified in the ANNEX 1 - Thematic Descriptive Sheets: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project contributes to the achievement of the programme’s objectives The project’s overall objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the OSI objectives selected The project’s outputs clearly link to the OSI output indicators and their contribution to programme targets is effective The project’s contribution to the OSI result indicators is realistic and sufficient 	C.1 C.4 C.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
3.2	To what extent is the project intervention logic plausible and also complying with the ANNEX 1 - Thematic Descriptive Sheets?	A.4 C.4 C.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project specific objectives are specific, realistic and achievable Proposed project outputs are needed to achieve project specific objectives Project outputs and results are effective and realistic (it is possible to achieve them with given resources; i.e., time, partners, budget - and they are realistically based on the quantification provided) 				
3.3	Are the needs of the selected target groups clearly identified and addressed by the proposal deliverables/outputs and results?	C.2.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
3.4	<p>To what extent will project outputs/results have an impact beyond project lifetime coherently to the achievement of programme’s objectives and indicators, as specified in the ANNEX 1 -Thematic Descriptive Sheets:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the outputs durable? Are the outputs applicable by and replicable to the other organizations/ regions/ Countries outside of the current partnership? If applicable: in case of investment in infrastructure or productive investment, has the involved partner the necessary financial resources and mechanisms to cover operation and maintenance costs, so as to ensure its durability and financial sustainability? Is the DNSH principle respected? 	C.4 C.8.1 C.8.2 C.8.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
3.5	Is digitalization valorised in the proposal?	C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTRIBUTION TO PROGRAMME’S OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED RESULTS AND OUTPUTS				15%	
4	Partnership relevance	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
4.1	Is the LP demonstrating to possess the necessary competence and experience according to the Call Announcement?	B.1.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

4.2	Does the project involve the relevant project partners with proven experience and competence in the thematic field to address the territorial challenges, implement the project and reach the target groups?	B.n.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
4.3	Does the LP and all the PPs have the necessary operational capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?	B.n.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
4.4	To what extent is the partnership appropriate according to the overall size of partnership including associated partners if present, thematic fields covered, governance levels, Country representation?	B.n.6 C.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE				18%	
TOTAL SCORE FOR STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA				70%	



Italy – Croatia

2.2 Operational assessment criteria

		Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
5	Management				
5.1	Are the management procedures, structures and internal coordination defined, sufficiently elaborated and effective?	C.7.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
5.2	Does the lead partner demonstrate the capacity to coordinate, manage and monitor project implementation, including financial management?	C.7.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
5.3	In what extent is ensured the quality of the project management (e.g. project management risks have been identified and mitigation measures foreseen, project evaluation is planned, etc)	C.7.2 C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR MANAGEMENT				6%	
6	Communication	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
6.1	Are the communication objectives clearly linked to the project specific objectives and coherently integrated in the overall project strategy?	C.4 C.7.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
6.2	Are the proposed communication approach and activities relevant and sufficient to reach the target groups and stakeholders?	C.7.3 C.4 C.2.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
6.3	Are feedback mechanisms and evaluation measures envisaged for the communication activities?	C.7.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
6.4	Are the requirements for OSI Communication respected and sufficient details provided? Does the project's communication ensure greater visibility of EU support, particularly the Union's basic values and the horizontal principles of Cohesion policy?	C.4 C.7.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR COMMUNICATION				8%	
7	Work plan /Activity plan	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
7.1	Are the proposed activities and deliverables: • relevant and lead to planned outputs and results;	C.4 C.5 C.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • well described, specific and measurable; • defined in a logical and realistic time-sequence. 				
7.2	Is the distribution of tasks among partners coherent? (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the project, etc.)	B.n.6 C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR WORK PLAN /ACTIVITY PLAN				9%	
8	Budget	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
8.1	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of efficiency: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial allocation per cost category is in line with the work plan • Distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan 	B.n.budget	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
8.2	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of effectiveness: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The available information on the budget is transparent and sufficient, and on that basis, the project budget appears proportionate to the proposed workplan, project outputs and project's contribution to programme indicators aimed for; • Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned for investments and equipment purchases (if applicable) and their costs are realistic • The distribution of budget between PPs is reasonable and coherent with their respective role in project activities 	B.n.budget C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
8.3	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of economy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The budget allocated to staff and external expertise (if applicable) is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic. • Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation. 	B.n.budget	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR BUDGET				7%	
TOTAL SCORE FOR OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT				30%	

