

Interreg

Italy – Croatia



Co-funded by
the European Union



Mediterranean
Multi-Programme
Mechanism


4th Call for Proposals

Selection Procedure

Online Infoday | 16.06.2026



PHASES OF THE SELECTION PROCEDURE



Italy – Croatia

PHASES FOLLOWING UP ON THE SELECTION PROCEDURE

RANKING LIST

approved &
financed / non-
financed or not
approved

Incl. Approved with
Conditions

CLEARING CONDITIONS PHASE

If needed / Only for
approved financed

Complaint procedure

Formal / admin. OR
Quality, capacity S.A

Contracting

Subsidy contract
& P.A.

ELIGIBILITY CHECKS




INCREASED AUTOMATIC CHECKS BLOCKING SUBMISSION

- 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)

**+ A.I. SUPPORT UNDER
HUMAN OVERSIGHT
FOR ACCURACY &
EFFICIENCY**

+ 'warning' or 'block' notifications to applicants


ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

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



ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

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





Italy – Croatia

QUALITY CRITERIA

4-EYE-PRINCIPLE

Points * Weight =
total score points

Points	Description	
0	Not evaluable	The information requested is not present or missing (either not filled in or not provided in the text).
20	Insufficient	The information requested is not relevant.
40	Poor	The information provided is relevant, however, contains considerable weaknesses.
60	Fair	The information provided is not sufficiently detailed, there are areas that could be strengthened.
80	Good	The information provided is clear and detailed although it is possible that some small improvements could be made.
100	Excellent	The information provided addresses well the criterion in its details, clearness and coherence.

QUALITY CRITERIA – STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT


No.	CRITERIA - TITLE		WEIGHT
1.1	TOTAL COOPERATION CHARACTER	<div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #0072bc; color: white; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">ADDED VALUE OF CBC</div>	19%
2.1	Common territorial challenges	<div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #0072bc; color: white; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">GENUINELY JOINT BENEFITS</div>	3%
2.2	EUSAIR		4%
2.3	MMM output	<div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #00a67a; color: white; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">MIN. 1 MMM OUTPUT</div>	7%
2.4	Environmental sustainability	<div style="border: 1px solid black; background-color: #00a67a; color: white; padding: 2px; display: inline-block;">COHERENT / EFFECTIVE</div>	3%
2.5	Horizontal		1%
2	TOTAL PROJECT RELEVANCE		18%

In every criteria mentioning outputs the selection of an MMM output (or lack thereof) is considered



QUALITY CRITERIA – STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

No.	CRITERIA - TITLE	WEIGHT
3.1	Contribution to Programme Obj.	6%
3.2	Intervention logic	4%
3.3	Target groups	2%
3.4	Sustainability of Outputs	4%
3	TOTAL CONTRIBUTION TO PROGRAMME	16%



QUALITY CRITERIA – STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT

No.	CRITERIA - TITLE		WEIGHT
4.1	Partners relevance (incl. MMM PP)	PARTNERS' CAPACITY TO TRANSFER MMM OUTPUT	9%
4.2	Partners capacities	INVOLVE OUTPUT GIVER	4%
4.3	Partner balance		4%
4	TOTAL PARTNERSHIP CRITERIA		17%
	TOTAL STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT CRITERIA		70%

Minimum threshold for strategic
criteria:
42 POINTS

QUALITY CRITERIA – OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT

No.	CRITERIA - TITLE	WEIGHT
5.1	Management arrangements	6%
6.1	Communication arrangements	6%
7.1	Work plan - activities	9%
8.1	Budget planning	5%
8.2	Budget effectiveness	4%
	TOTAL FOR OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	30%

RELEVANT LOGICAL
REALISTIC COHERENT



Minimum threshold for operational criteria
18 POINTS

CROSS-CUTTING CRITERIA AFFECTING ALL OTHER CRITERIA

How do you plan to communicate?

Need

Do you solve a real IT-HR issue & capit. on MMM output?

Do you respond to real needs of IP S.O. 4.1?

Cooperation

Is there a genuine CB cooperation?

Are partners capable?

Legacy

What happens after the end?

What are the long-lasting effects?

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE? YES, BUT...

Support
tool

research /
data

alternative
solutions

Verify

validate

own
expertise

Credibility

accurate?

credible?

Right
balance

text quality

original
critical
thinking