



HELLENIC REPUBLIC
MINISTRY OF ECONOMY, DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM

Strategic Project Selection Criteria

Interreg IPA II CBC Programme
Greece – Albania 2014-2020

Interreg - IPA CBC 
Greece - Albania

Table of Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Selection Procedure of Operations	5
2	EVALUATION PROCEDURE	6
2.1	1 st phase.....	6
2.2	2 nd phase.....	6
3	SETS OF CRITERIA	7
4	SCORING	28
4.1.1	Confidentiality and independence	30
5	ANNEX 1.....	32
6	ANNEX 2.....	34
6.1	Measure 1.1.....	34
6.2	Measure 2.1.....	38

1 INTRODUCTION

The present guide describes the Project Selection Procedure (including the Criteria) for the 1st Call for Strategic Project Proposals in the framework of the Interreg IPA II Cross-border Cooperation Programme “Greece-Albania 2014-2020” and illustrates clearly and transparently the project selection procedure. This procedure is made public in order to make all stakeholders and project potential beneficiaries aware of the selection procedure and criteria before preparing their applications.

1.1 Selection Procedure of Operations

Potential beneficiaries prepare a proposal in cooperation with the Lead Beneficiary, who submits the proposal to the Joint Secretariat (JS).

After submission, each project proposal will be evaluated based on specific selection criteria and will be subjected to a **two-phase** selection procedure, carried out by the Joint Secretariat (JS) with the support of Albanian Operating Structure (OS) and, if necessary, external experts, as referred in the Interreg IPA II Cross-border Cooperation Programme “Greece-Albania 2014-2020” (*Section: Submission of Proposals and Selection of Operations*). The procedure and the criteria for the selection of these experts will be mutually agreed by the participating countries and will be approved by the Joint Monitoring Committee (JMC). The cost for the engagement of those experts will be covered by the Technical Assistance Budget of the Programme.

The MA/JS will get information from Albanian Operating Structure (OS) about the eligibility of the Albanian beneficiaries participating in the respective Call for Proposals.

The JS and external experts (assessors), nominated by the Programme Management Bodies, will examine three different sets of criteria (administrative compliance, eligibility criteria and quality assessment), in two phases in order to make a decision on the projects’ approval.

2 EVALUATION PROCEDURE

2.1 1st phase

The first phase consists of the **administrative and eligibility criteria** in order to ensure that they fulfil the administrative and technical requirements of the Call for Proposals.

Projects will be checked for their compliance with the **administrative criteria**, in order to confirm that a proposal has arrived within the set deadline and that the Application package is complete and conforms to the requirements. Administrative criteria can be answered with a “Yes”, “No”, or “NA”. This check will be carried out by the JS.

Additionally, projects will be checked for their compliance with the **eligibility criteria**, in order to confirm that the minimum requirements are met. These criteria examine whether the proposal fulfils the minimum requirements on e.g. the structure of the cross-border partnership, the general compatibility with the Programme objectives and principles, the funds requested etc. Eligibility criteria can be answered with a “Yes” or “No”. This phase will be carried out by the JS and assisted by the Albanian Operating Structure (OS).

Project proposals that do not meet the administrative and eligibility criteria are rejected.

2.2 2nd phase

The second phase consists of the **quality criteria**, an in-depth assessment of the project, namely the **quality assessment**. Only projects that demonstrate administrative compliance and satisfy the eligibility criteria will be subjected to quality assessment. This phase will be carried out by the JS. External expertise can be acquired as and if required. These criteria form the basis for an assessment of the application with the aim of bringing the projects into a certain ranking for selection based on a scoring system. Quality criteria are supplementary grouped into two categories: 1) **Content-related criteria** and 2) **Implementation-related criteria**.

Furthermore, all project proposals will be examined for their compatibility with the strategic environmental assessment of the cross-border cooperation programme (Annex 2).

All applicants will be informed about the result of the assessment only after the Joint Monitoring Committee’s decision.

The quality selection criteria are divided into:

- **Content-related criteria** (relevance and strategy of the proposal, quality of outcomes and results, added value, sustainability, innovation, cross border cooperation, capitalization and communication) and

- **Implementation-related criteria** (quality of the partnership, quality of management, quality of the methodological approach, budget and finance).

3 SETS OF CRITERIA

The different sets of criteria are presented below:

Phase 1: Administrative and Eligibility Criteria

Project Identification	
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	INTERREG IPA II CBC PROGRAMME "GREECE – ALBANIA 2014 – 2020"
PRIORITY AXIS	
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	
CALL CODE	
LEAD BENEFICIARY	
PROJECT TITLE	
PROJECT ACRONYM	
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER	

A.1 Administrative Criteria					
Nr	Criteria	Compliance			Comments
A.1.1	The Application Package was delivered with the correct indication on the envelope, by the set deadline;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.1.2	The Application Package was submitted in the required formats:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'Application Form' and all obligatory Application Documents in one (1) original paper version and one (1) paper copy; 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two 'CD/DVD-ROMs'; 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	The Application Package was delivered in the correct format, in English and fully completed:				
A.1.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 'Application Form' in the <i>MS Excel format</i>; 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CD/DVD-Rom includes the 'Application Form' and the 'Specification of Budget' in the <i>MS Excel format</i> required and all other obligatory Application Documents in scanned format or pdf format; 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.1.4	The Application Package is compiled in English language (apart from the supporting documents (a) for the eligibility of project beneficiaries, (b) the maturity of project activities and (c) the decision of the designated body stating its agreement for submitting the particular project proposal, which shall be in the national language);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.1.5	The Application Package (the 'Application Form' and all obligatory Application Documents) (a) is signed by the authorised signatory, (b) is submitted in full, (c) is correctly filled in (no automatic errors or missing/ wrong information) and (d) administrative and formal data is consistent (e.g. co-				

financing amounts, beneficiary names, etc.):				
• The ‘Application Form’ (standard excel form provided), originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Beneficiary;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• The ‘Concept Note on the Strategic Scope of the Project and Sustainability, originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Beneficiary;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• The ‘Partnership Declaration’ (standard form provided), originally signed and stamped by the legal representatives of the participating beneficiaries;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• The ‘Co-financing – Non Double Financing Statement’ per beneficiary (standard form provided), originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of each beneficiary separately;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• The ‘Declaration of not generating Revenues’ (standard form provided), completed, originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Beneficiary; (in case of revenue generating projects a cost-benefit analysis should be attached);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• The ‘Declaration of non-distribution of profits’ (standard form provided), completed, originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Beneficiary; (in case of private organizations)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	
• The ‘Specification of budget costs’ completed, in the requested format, expressed in euro, originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Beneficiary;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• The ‘Maturity Sheet’ per beneficiary (for equipment, small-scale infrastructure and services per beneficiary) completed, originally signed and stamped by the legal representative of each beneficiary separately;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
• Authorisation document from the legal representatives of LB (if applicable) in case the Application Form and declarations are not signed by the legal representatives of the Lead Beneficiary – original or	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	

notary certified copy;				
• The ‘Documentation for small-scale Infrastructure Projects’ (if applicable)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	
• The ‘Documentation for the eligibility of Project Beneficiaries for:				
– <i>Bodies governed by public law</i> (if applicable);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	
– <i>Bodies governed by private law</i> (if applicable);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	
– <i>Proving the existence of a branch within the Programme area or the participating countries (if applicable)</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	NA <input type="checkbox"/>	
• The Documentation for IPA Beneficiaries:				
– <i>The “Legal Entity” Form – for IPA Public, Private, Governed by Public Law</i>	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		

A.2		Eligibility criteria			
Nr	Criteria	Compliance		Comments	
A.2.1	The Project Proposal is in line with the relevant EU legislation and policies;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.2	The Project Proposal is assigned to programme priority and its specific objectives;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.3	The project objectives and the proposed activities are clear and in-line with the Programme priorities;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.4	The project partnership is in line with the limits set:				
	• Project beneficiaries from both participating countries;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	• Includes at least one beneficiary from the Programme area of each country;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.5	• At least four (4) project beneficiaries with a maximum of eight (8);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	All beneficiaries shall co-operate in:				
	• the development of operation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	• the implementation of operation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	In addition, they shall cooperate in at least one of the following ways:				
• staffing of operation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>			

	• financing of operation	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.6	The Lead Beneficiary is eligible organisation (Ministries, Central Level Bodies governed by public law (only for beneficiaries from Albania), Decentralised Administrations, or Regional Authorities);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.7	All project Beneficiaries including Lead Beneficiary, are officially registered at least 24 months before the publication of the Call for Project Proposals	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.8	All project Beneficiaries are eligible organisations (legal status, territorial eligibility - area, correctly attributed to NUTS3);	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.9	The project budget, size and costs are in line with the limits set in the Call for Proposals;				
	• The project's budget limit is in accordance with the restrictions set in the call for proposals per specific objective.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	• The minimum budget per project beneficiary is 100.000,00€.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	The requested EU/National Contributions are in line with the limits set in the Call for Proposals	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.10	The time limits (start and end dates, project duration) are in line with the time frame set in the Call for Proposals;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.11	The limitation in the number of Project Proposals that each applicant as Lead Beneficiary can participate is set to a maximum of one (1) project proposal per specific objective;	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.12	All beneficiaries are entitled to implement the project activities.	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
A.2.13	The project activities are not physically completed or fully implemented before the application for	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		

	funding is submitted.				
A.2.14	Does the project contribute to the Programme’s horizontal principles:				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promotion of equal opportunities and non- discrimination (including provision of accessibility for persons with disabilities); 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promotion of sustainable development; 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promotion of equality between men and women; 	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>		

Assessor 1	Name	
	Signature	
Assessor 2	Name	
	Signature	
Date		

Phase 2: Quality Assessment

Project Identification	
COOPERATION PROGRAMME	INTERREG IPA II CBC PROGRAMME "GREECE – ALBANIA 2014 – 2020"
PRIORITY AXIS	
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	
CALL CODE	
LEAD BENEFICIARY	
PROJECT TITLE	
PROJECT ACRONYM	
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER	

B.1		Content-related Criteria				
Nr	Criteria	Sub-criteria - Assessment Questions	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Numerical Assessment	Comments - Justification
B.1.1	Relevance & Strategy - How well is a need for the project justified? (max 10 points)	To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of Programme's specific objectives: 1.1 Increase the capacity of CB infrastructure in transport, water & waste management and 2.1 Preserve cultural and natural resources as a prerequisite for tourism development of the cross border area? What evidence is there that the project addresses specific problems, issues and opportunities of the Programme area?	Extensively (5 points) Satisfactorily (3 points) Partially (2 points) None (0 points)	Annex, B.1.2		
		To what extent will the project contribute to a wider strategy on one or more policy levels [EU (incl. macro-regional)/ national/ regional/ local]; in particular, those concerning the project or Programme area?	At all four levels (5 points) At 3 out of four levels (3 points) At 2 out of four levels (2 points) At 1 out of four levels (1 point)	Annex, B.8.2		
B.1.2	Outcomes - To what extent	Do the results and main outputs of the project contribute to the needs of the selected target groups?	Extensively (4 points) Satisfactorily (2 points) Barely (1 point)	B.1		

<p>will the project deliver useful outcomes contributing to the Programme's objectives?</p> <p>(max 46 points)</p>		No contribution (0 points)			
	<p>Are the results specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, time-based?</p> <p>(Relevant question: Are the outputs and results foreseen in line with the defined objectives and outlined methodology?)</p>	<p>All five characteristics (5 points)</p> <p>4 out of five characteristics (4 points)</p> <p>3 out of five characteristics (3 points)</p> <p>2 out of five characteristics (2 points)</p> <p>1 out of five characteristics (1 points)</p> <p>The results do not comply with the above characteristics (0 point)</p>	B.1.4		
	<p>- Does the project have the concrete and realistic possibility to have a follow up and/ or to be sustainable/ durable after the end of the Programme contribution?</p>	<p>Secure funding and commitment of stakeholders (10 points)</p> <p>Commitment of stakeholders (8 points)</p> <p>Initiatives by stakeholders (6 points)</p> <p>Basic planning (4 points)</p> <p>Minimum previsions (2 point)</p> <p>No guarantees for the project's sustainability (0 points)</p>	Annex, B.6		

		<p>Are the main outputs of the project applicable and replicable by other organisations/ regions/ countries outside of the current partnership and be further used and promoted by other projects/ programmes after the end of the project?</p>	<p>All (8 points) Some (4 point) None (0 points)</p>	<p>Annex B.6</p>		
		<p>- To what extent does the project contribute to the achievement of the Programme indicators? - Do the project outputs and results contribute/ link to the Programme indicators?</p>	<p>Clear explanation for the contribution/ link (3 points) Adequately explanation for the contribution/ link (2 points) Basic explanation for the contribution/ link (1 point) None explanation for the contribution/ link (0 points)</p>	<p>B.1.3 B.1.4 F</p>		
		<p>Does the project include studies, licenses, approval of feasibility study, construction permits, preliminary designs, priced bill of quantities, technical specifications, environmental impact assessment, infrastructure and exchanges of experiences which are performed for the purpose of support or guidance towards concrete results (could be pilot project or demonstrative actions)?</p>	<p>All plans will produce concrete results within the duration of the project (10 points) Most of the plans will produce concrete results within the duration of the project (6 points) Some plans will be implemented within the duration of the project (4 point) No implementation of plans is foreseen within the duration of</p>	<p>B.1.3 F</p>		

			the project (0 point)			
		Does the project pave the way for future major investments which will produce tangible and visible results?	<p>The project will be a catalyst for investment in the area (6 points)</p> <p>Investment is expected to result from the project actions (4 points)</p> <p>Stimulation and preparation for investment is a concrete objective of the project (2 point)</p> <p>No future investment is foreseen (0 points)</p>	Annex B.1.4 B.2.3		
B.1.3	Added Value - What is the added value of the project? (max 20 points)	In terms of socio-economic effect: - How significant is the impact of the results and to what extent do the project results provide added value for the Programme area? - To what extent does the project produce long-term changes and improvements?	1-5 points (degree of continuation-improvement of existing outputs, structures, products, transfer of outputs, know-how, experience, usability of results in other sectors, by other stakeholders etc)	Annex B.1 B.7.1		
		In terms of innovation: - To what extent does the project clearly demonstrate innovative character that goes beyond the existing practice in the sector/ Programme area/ participating	Application of innovative results of the project (4 points) Development of new innovative methods, products, tools (3 points)	B.1		

		countries?	Use of new methods, products, tools for the implementation of the project (2 points) Basic /minimum innovation references (1 point)			
		In terms of cooperation - To what extent is the cross-border cooperation needed to achieve the project's objectives and results?	1-3 (degree of cooperation)	B.1.2 B.1.4 B.7.1		
		In terms of cooperation - To what extent does the project capitalize previous and present cooperation experiences, especially in the Programme area?	1-4 points (Capitalization of partnerships, outputs, projects, experiences etc.)	B.7.3		
		Is this proposal distinguished by its cross-border character?	All actions of the project have a strong cross-border character (4 points) All actions of the project have cross-border character, not in all cases strong (3 points) Some actions of the project do not have a cross-border character (1 or 2 points) No cross-border character (0 points)	B.7.1		

B.1.4	<p>Communication</p> <p>-</p> <p>How will the project be effectively communicated? (max 4 points)</p>	<p>To what extent are communication activities appropriate, efficient and well-structured to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p>	<p>Full Communication strategy existing (4 points)</p> <p>Well developed communication activities (3 points)</p> <p>Basic communication activities indicated (2 point)</p> <p>Poor communication activities indicated (1 point)</p>	B.4.1		
	<p>Maximum total score: 80 points</p>					
	<p>Minimum total score: 45 points</p>					

B.2		Implementation-related Criteria				
	Criteria	Assessment Questions	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Numerical Assessment	Comments - Justification
B.2.1	Partnership - To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project? (max 20 points)	- To what extent does the partnership composition involve the relevant actors needed to address the territorial challenge and the objectives specified in the proposed project?	A broad outreach of key actors and stakeholders, exceeding the targeted area is planned (4 points) A broad mobilization and open involvement of key actors and stakeholders of the targeted area is foreseen (3 points) Several actors and stakeholders are involved in the implementation (2 points) Some involvement of actors and stakeholders is foreseen (1 point) No cooperation apart from the least required is foreseen (0 points)	B.3.1		
		- To what extent is the geographical coverage wide and balanced? Does the project involve beneficiaries from different regions of the Programme area?	All of the area (4 points) Most of Programme area (3 points)	B.2.3 B.3.1		

			<p>Several areas (2 points)</p> <p>Covers only particular areas (1 point)</p> <p>Limited to specific location (0 points)</p>			
		<p>- To what extent is the project partnership balanced with respect to the sectors? Does the partnership consist of beneficiaries that complement each other?</p>	<p>High (3 points)</p> <p>Very Good (2 points)</p> <p>Adequate (1 points)</p> <p>Basic (0 points)</p>	B.3.1		
		<p>- To what extent does the Lead Beneficiary demonstrate the capacity to manage EU co-financed projects and to coordinate, control and monitor the overall implementation of the project (financial, human resources, premises, etc.)?</p>	<p>High (6 points)</p> <p>Very Good (4 points)</p> <p>Adequate (2 points)</p> <p>Basic (0 points)</p>	B.3.1		
		<p>- To what extent beneficiaries' organisations have the experience and competence in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to successfully implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?</p>	<p>High (3 points)</p> <p>Very Good (2 points)</p> <p>Adequate (1 points)</p> <p>Basic (0 points)</p>	B.3.1		

B.2.2	Management (max 7 points)	- To what extent is an appropriate project management methodology clearly demonstrated? To what extent are management structures in line with the project size, duration and needs; and management procedures clear, transparent, efficient and effective?	Very well developed methodology connected to outputs and results (4 points)	B.2.1 B.3.2		
			Well developed methodology connected to outputs and results(3 points)			
			Basic Management procedures described connected to outputs and results (2 points)			
			Minimum references connected to outputs and results (1 point)			
		- To what extent are the specific roles of project beneficiaries (actions and responsibilities) clearly defined and appropriately distributed in the partnership among the Lead Beneficiary and the Project Beneficiaries?	Clear and specific roles, distributed to the beneficiaries in relation to their capacity (3 points)	B.2.1		
			General distribution of tasks without specific references (2 points)			
			Not clear enough distribution of responsibilities and tasks (1 point)			

B.2.3	Methodology - Will the chosen methodology enable successful implementation of the project? (max 16 points)	- To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent in terms of distribution of tasks among beneficiaries, time plan and identified project objectives, expected outputs, results and deliverables?	High (6 points) Very Good (4 points) Adequate (2 points) Basic (1 points)	B.2.1		
		- To what extent is the project mature, allowing the realization of the project (i.e. stage of completion of the administrative procedures, etc.)?	All necessary administrative procedures completed- no administrative procedures necessary (10 points) Advanced stage of realization of administrative procedures- light administrative procedures required (6 points) Medium realization of administrative procedures (4 points) Low – non realization of administrative procedures (1 points)			

B.2.4	Budget & Finance - Is the budget requested in reasonable relation with proposed outcomes? (max 17 points)	- To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money? Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?	High value for money (4 points) Good value/money (3 points) Reasonable value for money/Justified costs (2 point) Low value for money/Overestimated costs (1 point)	B.1.4 Section D SoBC		
		- To what extent is the budget of the proposed activities well-justified and explained?	Well justified/explained budget (6 points) Basically justified/explained budget (4 points) Insufficiently justified/explained budget (1 point)	B.2.2 Section D SoBC		
		- Is the budget logically planned and distributed among the beneficiaries and in accordance with the activities and their real involvement? Are the limits of the budget respected? (Distribution of the budget secures the active participation of each beneficiary in relation to the activities described in the Application Form and secures the successful implementation of the foreseen activities – <u>Budget limitations</u> : Preparation costs up to 20.000,00€, Management costs up to 10% of the beneficiary’s budget,	Very balanced and reasonable allocation (7 points) Few imbalances in the distribution of budget (5 points) Important imbalances in the distribution of budget (2 points) Unreasonable distribution of budget (0 points)	B.2.1 B.2.2 Section D SoBC		

	Office and administration up to 4% of the beneficiary’s budget and Staff costs up to 50% of the beneficiary’s budget)			
[Maximum total score: 60 points] [Minimum total score: 32 points]				0
Total Score [maximum total score: 140 points] [minimum total score: 77 points]				0

Assessor 1	Name :	
	Signature:	
	Date:	
JS Co-ordinator	Name :	
	Signature:	
	Date:	

4 SCORING

The afore-mentioned criteria will be taken into account by the evaluators to assess the projects. The purpose of the **quality criteria** is to assess the quality of the eligible project proposals. Quality criteria are closely linked to the nature and objectives of the INTERREG IPA II Cross-border Cooperation Programme "Greece–Albania 2014-2020" and are common to all Priority Axes or Specific Objectives.

The quality assessment is based on a scoring system. Each criteria group ("Content-related" and "Implementation-related") is assessed on a basis of eight assessment categories, based on a numerical assessment.

The assessment criteria are defined using a set of assessment questions for the evaluator to answer. An overall assessment score is set for the project proposal. The maximum total score a project may achieve for the content related criteria and the implementation related criteria is **140 points**.

The Joint Secretariat carries out the evaluation of proposals, based on these quality criteria, approved by the Joint Monitoring Committee.

Only projects that demonstrate administrative compliance and satisfy the eligibility criteria will be subjected to quality assessment. These project proposals will be evaluated by two assessors. The final score of the proposals will be defined in the following way:

- For evaluations with a difference equal or up to 15 points in the score of the 2 assessors, the average score will be calculated and will define the final score obtained.
- For evaluations with a difference higher than 15 points, a third evaluation will take place. This will be executed by a member of JS and the average score of the three assessments will be calculated and will define the final score obtained.

Additionally, a third evaluation by a member of JS will take place in the following cases:

- the total score given by one assessor on the section "Project quality section (Content related criteria)" is below the defined threshold, while the second assessor has given a score above the defined threshold **and** the average score given by both assessors on the section "Project quality section (Content related criteria)" is below the defined threshold (e.g. 45 points);
- the total score given by the one assessor on the section "Implementation-related criteria section" is below the defined threshold, while the second assessor has given a score above the defined threshold **and** the average score given by both assessors

on the section "Implementation-related criteria section" is below the defined threshold (e.g. 32 points);

The final score given to the project, which may fall under the two cases mentioned above, will be the average score of the scores given by the three assessors.

At the end of the evaluation process, the Joint Secretariat draws up a shortlist ranking the proposals per priority axis (from the highest score downward), which will serve as a basis for considering the project decision by the Joint Steering Committee.

The Managing Authority ensures that the evaluation procedure is carried out in accordance to the requirements of the Call for strategic projects and the approved selection criteria. Then, the JS, with the consent of the Managing Authority, submits to the Joint Steering Committee:

1. The fiches of the submitted project proposals, summarizing the most important information about the project proposals
2. The ranking list per priority axis of all evaluated project proposals
3. All the evaluation forms of the 1st and 2nd phase checks

The project proposals are ranked according to the results obtained in the evaluation procedure. They are divided into three categories (based on the budget available and the results of evaluation):

- Project proposals proposed to be accepted;
- Project proposals proposed to be rejected;
- Project proposals proposed to be discussed for approval under conditions (such as budget surplus, provision of further necessary documents, licenses, permits, etc) at the Joint Steering Committee.

In case of equal scoring of two or more project proposals, while the available budget is not enough to fund all of them, the JS will present the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal to the members of the JSC.

A reserve list of projects may also be drawn up following the same criteria to be used if funds are available. The selection of a project from the reserve list will be made on the basis of its ranking. The Joint Steering Committee may decide to finance projects from the reserve list.

The Joint Steering Committee conducts the procedure for the selection of the operations to be funded, and reports to the Joint Monitoring Committee that has the ultimate responsibility for the selection of operations.

Overall, a project proposal in order to be financed by the Programme must:

- i. obtain a total rating score equal or higher than the minimum score allowing a project to be financed (77 points),
- ii. be evaluated with a score higher than 0 at any sub criterion of the project quality section (Content related criteria)
- iii. be evaluated with a score equal or higher than the threshold of 45 points set in the project quality section (Content related criteria),
- iv. be evaluated with a score equal or higher than the threshold of 32 points set in the Project quality section (Implementation related criteria),
- v. be in line with all the requirements of the budget available for each specific objective as stated in the Call for proposals,
- vi. be placed into a ranking list that takes into account the score and the budget available for each specific objective as stated in the Call for proposals.

In case where the indicative amount foreseen for the specific Priority Axis cannot be used due to the insufficient quality or the low number of proposals received, the Joint Monitoring Committee reserves the right to reallocate the remaining funds to another Priority Axis, with the conditions of Programme amendment (if applicable).

All the Lead beneficiaries of the submitted project proposals will be informed in writing on the results obtained on the performance of the 1st and 2nd phase checks, after the completion of the decision procedure of the Joint Monitoring Committee.

The Lead beneficiaries of the rejected projects will be informed about the reasons for the rejection upon request.

Approved projects are expected to be ready-to-start after the approval. In case of approval of a project under conditions, the revised Application Form is a prerequisite for the signing of the Subsidy Contract and its annex (Partnership Agreement). The Managing Authority (MA), with the support of the Joint Secretariat (JS), verifies that the conditions have been met (a new approval by the Joint Monitoring Committee is not necessary).

4.1.1 Confidentiality and independence

Project proposals and Application Forms submitted by project applicants will be kept confidential. The content of project proposals and application forms should not be published or forwarded to persons or institutions, which are not directly engaged in the

applications assessment procedure or decision making. The project idea itself, as well as the description and concept of the project and the structures of the applications remain the property of the project applicants.

All actors included (JMC members, JSC members, MA/JS, assessors and external experts) participating in the assessment procedure have to guarantee that the privacy and confidentiality of all applications submitted in the framework of the call for proposals will be kept and that all national privacy laws and EU Directive related to the protection of personal data (95/46/EC) will be respected.

It is not allowed to forward applications and assessment documents to actors outside the regular assessment procedure, particular not to project applicants or the wider public.

Furthermore the JMC members, JSC members, MA/JS, assessors and external experts will declare that they do not have a conflict of interest and/or political influence. All actors involved in assessment, evaluation and selection must sign a declaration of Confidentiality.

5 ANNEX 1

The fields of minimum criteria of joint character of the project will be interpreted as follows.

All beneficiaries shall co-operate in:

a) Development of operations

- All beneficiaries should contribute to the development of the project;
- Beneficiaries should define how the project will operate, i.e. joint development of objectives and outcomes, budget, timing and responsibilities for work packages and tasks to achieve the objectives;
- Beneficiaries should identify knowledge and experience that each one of them brings to the project, as well as what each beneficiary expects to get from the project.

b) Implementation of operations

- The Lead beneficiary should bear the overall responsibility for the project. All beneficiaries should undertake responsibilities for different parts of the implementation;
- Each project beneficiary responsible for a work package should coordinate and ensure that planned activities are carried out, interim targets are met and unexpected challenges to implementation are dealt with;
- Several beneficiaries may contribute to each work package.

In addition, they shall cooperate in at least **one** of the following ways:

c) Staffing of operations

- All project beneficiaries should have a defined role and allocate staff to fulfill this role;
- Staff members should coordinate their activities with others involved in the activity or work package and exchange information regularly;
- There should be no unnecessary duplication of functions in different beneficiary organizations.

d) Financing of operations

- The project should have a joint budget with funding allocated to beneficiaries according to the activities they are carrying out (the budget split should reflect beneficiary responsibilities);

- The budget should include annual spending targets and spending targets per work package;
- In general, all beneficiaries should contribute with National counterpart.

6 ANNEX 2

6.1 Measure 1.1

	
COMPATIBILITY CHECK SHEET OF THE PROJECT WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT	
OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	INTERREG IPA II CROSS BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMME "GREECE-ALBANIA 2014-2020"
PRIORITY AXIS	1. Promotion of the environment, sustainable transport and public infrastructure
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	1.1 Increase the capacity of CB infrastructure in transport, water & waste management
CALL CODE	A1
LEAD BENEFICIARY	
PROJECT ACRONYM	
PROJECT TITLE	

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS (Directive 2001/42/EK determines the environmental factors (components) for which the environmental consequences have to be appraised)		EXPECTED CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO THE S.E.A. OF THE INTERREG IPA II CROSS BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMME "GREECE-ALBANIA 2014-2020"	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACT	COMMENTS
BIODIVERSITY - FLORA - FAUNA	Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status(*)	POSITIVE		
POPULATION - HUMAN HEALTH - TANGIBLE ASSETS	Decrease of annual primary energy consumption of public buildings(*)	POSITIVE		
SOIL	Additional solid waste management capacity created(*)	POSITIVE		
WATER	Additional population served by improved water supply(*)	POSITIVE		
AIR	Area damaged by forest fires (5-yr rolling annual average in hectares)(*)	POSITIVE		

CLIMATIC FACTORS	Population benefiting from forest fire protection measures(*)	POSITIVE		
CULTURAL HERITAGE (including architectural and archaeological heritage)	Increase in expected number of visits to supported sites of cultural and natural heritage and attractions	POSITIVE		
LANDSCAPE	% of cross-border vertical axes to Egnatia motorway either constructed or with sufficient maturity to be constructed(*)	POSITIVE		
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE ABOVE FACTORS	People participating in awareness actions	POSITIVE		
Conclusions				
Remarks				
Conditions that have to be met if the proposal is financed.				

(*): Indicators assigned to the environmental components derive from the Programme Document and not from the respective specific objective

INSTRUCTIONS	
↑	expected increase in the value indicator
↔	no substantial change in the value indicator
↓	expected decrease in the value indicator
0	action is not related to the specific indicator
😊	positive change
😞	negative change

6.2 Measure 2.1

Interreg - IPA CBC Greece - Albania



EUROPEAN UNION

COMPATIBILITY CHECK SHEET OF THE PROJECT WITH THE STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME	INTERREG IPA II CROSS BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMME "GREECE-ALBANIA 2014-2020"
PRIORITY AXIS	2. Boosting the local economy
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	2.1 Preserve cultural and natural resources as a prerequisite for tourism development of the cross border area
CALL CODE	A1
LEAD BENEFICIARY	
PROJECT ACRONYM	
PROJECT TITLE	

ENVIRONMENTAL COMPONENTS (Directive 2001/42/EK determines the environmental factors (components) for which the environmental consequences have to be appraised)		EXPECTED CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO THE S.E.A. OF THE INTERREG IPA II CROSS BORDER COOPERATION PROGRAMME "GREECE-ALBANIA 2014-2020"	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED ACT	COMMENTS
BIODIVERSITY - FLORA - FAUNA	Surface area of habitats supported in order to attain a better conservation status(*)	POSITIVE		
POPULATION - HUMAN HEALTH - TANGIBLE ASSETS	Decrease of annual primary energy consumption of public buildings(*)	POSITIVE		
SOIL	Additional solid waste management capacity created(*)	NO IMPACT		
WATER	Additional population served by improved water supply(*)	NO IMPACT		
AIR	Area damaged by forest fires (5-yr rolling annual average in hectares)(*)	NO IMPACT		
CLIMATIC FACTORS	Population benefiting from forest fire protection measures(*)	NO IMPACT		

CULTURAL HERITAGE (including architectural and archaeological heritage)	Increase in expected number of visits to supported sites of cultural and natural heritage and attractions	POSITIVE		
LANDSCAPE	% of cross-border vertical axes to Egnatia motorway either constructed or with sufficient maturity to be constructed(*)	POSITIVE		
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THE ABOVE FACTORS	People participating in awareness actions	POSITIVE		
Conclusions				
Remarks				
Conditions that have to be met if the proposal is financed.				

(*): Indicators assigned to the environmental components derive from the Programme Document and not from the respective specific objective

INSTRUCTIONS	
↑	expected increase in the value indicator
↔	no substantial change in the value indicator
↓	expected decrease in the value indicator
0	action is not related to the specific indicator
😊	positive change
😞	negative change