

Interreg

Italy – Croatia



Co-funded by
the European Union



Mediterranean
Multi-Programme
Mechanism

INTERREG ITALY-CROATIA PROGRAMME 2021 - 2027

Annex 1 to Project Selection Procedure

4th Call for Proposals

(Version 1.0 - 11 June 2026)

***CATCHING THE WAVES
OF COOPERATION***

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, i.e. it blocks any application submission if these are not fulfilled, 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;
- the minimum number of partners per country is respected;
- the maximum number of Associated partners is respected;
- the total financial dimension of the project proposal is in line with the Call Announcement;
- the minimum PP ERDF contribution is respected;
- the project commits to apply joint development, joint implementation and at least one of the following cooperation criteria: joint staffing or joint financing;
- the project commits to not adversely impact the horizontal principles (equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women and sustainable development).

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

The following table specifies the criteria applied to this stage of the Project Selection process:

N.	DESCRIPTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE (A) AND ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA (E) - Knock-out criteria
A1	The proposal is the only submitted for the given project?
A2	The proposal is complete and filled out in all its parts in English language?
A3	The LP organization is involved as LP in max 2 proposal within the Call
A4	The minimum and maximum number of partners is respected
E1	The Lead Partner is an eligible applicant according to the Call requirements
E2	Financial capacity of the private LP is demonstrated
E3	The Lead Partner Declaration is signed by LP legal representative /Delegated person
E4	Project Partners are eligible applicants according to the Call requirements



N.	DESCRIPTION OF SUPPLEMENTARY (S) AND INVESTMENT CRITERIA (I)
S1	The Project Partner Declaration is signed by PP legal representative /Delegated person
S2	The Associated Partner declaration is signed by the Legal representative / Delegated person indicated in AF
I1	INVESTMENTS - All mandatory supporting documents are listed in the project proposal (e.g. the authorizations, permits, etc) and uploaded on Jems. Alternatively, it is indicated when the mandatory documentation will be available
I2	INVESTMENTS - DNSH declaration is signed and uploaded on JEMS together with its annexes



2. Quality Assessment

2.1 Strategic assessment criteria

1	Cooperation character	Reference in the AF ¹	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
1.1	<p>What added value does the cooperation bring?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of cooperation beyond borders for the capitalisation on the output/s selected is clearly demonstrated and it cannot be capitalised on (or only to some extent) without cooperation Benefit for all PPs and for both side of the border are clearly demonstrated 	C.2.3 C.4 B.n.6 ² C.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	19%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR COOPERATION CHARACTER				19%	
2	Project relevance and strategy	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
2.1	<p>What are the common territorial challenges that will be tackled by the output/s selected for capitalisation, which is aligned with the IP 2021-2027 (is a real need for the project in respect to the identified challenges demonstrated)?</p>	C.1 C.2.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
2.2	<p>Is the project clearly and consistently contributing to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> specified EUSAIR macro-regional strategy pillar objectives and flagships? other EU/National/Regional strategies? 	C.2.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
2.3	<p>Has the project selected at least one output from another MMM programme, to be capitalised on with coherent and effective activities?</p>	C.1 C.2.7 C.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	7%	(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

2.4	<p>The proposal shows to coherently contribute to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The environmental sustainability objectives of the cooperation area as specified in the Strategic Environmental Assessment? • Use of “sustainable development practices” (e.g. Green Public Procurement; Nature-based solutions; Lifecycle costing criteria; Standards going beyond regulatory requirements, circular economy practices)? • circular economy approaches and digitalization included? 	C.4 C.7.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	3%	(points x weight)
2.5	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)	1%	(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	<p>To what extent will the project contribute to the Programme’s objectives and indicators?:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project’s capitalisation objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the SO 4.1 • The capitalisation outputs clearly link to the Programme output indicators and their contribution to Programme targets is effective • The project’s contribution to the Programme result indicators is realistic and sufficient 	A.2 C.1 C.4 C.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	6%	(points x weight)
3.2	<p>To what extent is the project intervention logic plausible?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project specific objectives are specific, realistic and achievable and linked to capitalisation • Proposed project outputs are needed to achieve project specific objectives and the capitalisation on the output selected 	B.n. C.4 C.5	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 (including young people with suitable activities as an explicit TG) clearly identified and addressed by the proposal deliverables/outputs and results?	C.2.4	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	2%	(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:</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 equipment 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 (in case of investment)? 	C.4 C.8.1	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	4%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR CONTRIBUTION TO PROGRAMME’S OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED RESULTS AND OUTPUTS				16%	
4	Partnership relevance	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
4.1	Does the project involve relevant project partners with proven experience and competence in the thematic field to capitalise on the selected output(s), implement the project and reach the target groups, and does it ensure adequate transfer of knowledge and expertise related to the selected MMM output(s), possibly including the involvement	B.n.6 C.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	9%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	of the partner(s) that originally developed the selected output(s), either as full partners where eligible, or as associated partners, in line with the Programme’s eligibility rules?				
4.2	Does the LP and all the PPs have the necessary operational capacity to implement the project: financial, human resources, etc.? (Multiple participation of a partner in project proposals might weigh negatively)	B.n.6 C.3	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	4%	(points x weight)
4.3	To what extent is the partnership balanced and optimal? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● overall size of partnership (including associated partners if present) ● country representation ● thematic fields covered ● governance levels ● quadruple helix 	B.n.6 C.3	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	4%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE				17%	
TOTAL SCORE FOR STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA				70%	
Minimum strategic threshold					42

2.2 Operational assessment criteria

		Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
5	Management				
5.1	Are the quality management and risk mitigation procedures, governance structures and internal coordination mechanisms clearly defined, sufficiently detailed and effective? Furthermore, does the Lead Partner demonstrate adequate capacity to coordinate, manage and monitor project implementation, including	C.7.1 C.7.4	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	6%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	responsibilities related to financial management and quality assurance procedures?				
	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? Are feedback mechanisms and evaluation measures envisaged for the communication activities? Are the proposed communication approach and activities relevant and sufficient to reach the target groups and stakeholders?	C.4 C.2.4 C.7.3	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	6%	(points x weight)
	TOTAL SCORE FOR COMMUNICATION			6%	
7	Work plan /Activity plan	Reference in the AF	SCORE	Weight	Weighted score
7.1	Are the proposed activities and deliverables: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● relevant and lead to planned outputs and results ● well described, specific and measurable ● defined in a logical and realistic time-sequence ● based on a coherent distribution of tasks among partners (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners’ role in the project, etc.) 	C.4 C.5 C.6	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	9%	(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 planned and used efficiently and effectively, ensuring that the financial allocation per cost category and per period is coherent with the work plan, proportionate to the proposed activities, outputs and Programme indicators, and transparently justified? In particular, is the budget distribution over time and among partners reasonable and consistent with their respective roles and tasks,	B.n. D E	(0-20-40-60-80-100)	5%	(points x weight)



Italy – Croatia

	and are resources foreseen for investments and equipment (where applicable) sufficient, realistic and aligned with project needs?				
8.2	To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principle of economy, i.e. the budget allocated to staff and external expertise (if applicable) is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic, reasonable resources, flat rates use is necessary, preparation and closure costs included	B.n. D E	(0-20- 40-60- 80- 100)	4%	(points x weight)
TOTAL SCORE FOR BUDGET				9%	
TOTAL SCORE FOR OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT				30%	
Minimum operational threshold					18

