Assessment grid – LIP Full application form

1. **General information about the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Reference number |  |
| 2. Project title |  |
| 3. Lead Partner/country |  |
| 4. Project Partners |  |
| 4.1 Project Partner 1/country |  |
| 4.2 Project Partner 2[[1]](#footnote-2)/country |  |
| 5. Priority / specific objective (SO) under which funding is requested |  |
| 6. Application form assessed by  (name, surname, position, institution) |  |
| 7. Date of the MC approval |  |

1. **Formal assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Administrative criteria** | | **Reference point** | ***YES*** | ***NO*** | ***Comments*** |
| 1. | The FAF was submitted in the electronic system WOD2021 (CST2021) before the application deadline |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 2. | All obligatory fields were filled in |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 3. | All required supporting documents are submitted in the electronic system. Supporting documents are signed by right persons and consistent with the project and valid and in compliance with Polish / Ukrainian laws (if relevant) |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 4. | The scan of signed Declaration by the Lead Partner is submitted | Declaration by the Lead Partner | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 5. | The scan of separate Partnership statement has been submitted, filled in and signed by each Partner (except for the Lead Partner) | Partnership statement(s) | *YES* | *NO* |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Eligibility Check** | | | **Reference point** | ***YES*** | ***NO*** | ***Comments*** |
| 1. | FAF is in line with the LIP Project summary approved by the MC (incl. EU financing) | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 2. | The overall/specific objectives of the project correspond to the Programme Priority/specific objective selected and potential actions specified therein | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 3. | The project will contribute to the achievement of at least one Programme result indicator and at least one of the output indicators from the Full list of indicators defined in the Annex 3 to the Programme Manual | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 4. | The partnership composition is eligible – the project will be implemented by at least one Partner from Poland and one from Ukraine.  Partners are eligible institutions. | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 5. | It is declared and convincingly proved that at least three out of four cooperation criteria have been met by the project proposal:   * joint project development (obligatory) * joint project implementation (obligatory) * joint project staff (optional) * joint project financing (optional) | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 6. | The project is eligible under criterion of its location | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 7. | The duration of the project is equal to or lower than 30 months | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 8. | All planned costs are eligible, in line with the Programme Manual | |  |  |  |  |
| 9. | The budget share of a total cost of at least EUR 2 500 000 is allocated to the acquisition, construction or modernisation of infrastructure | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 10. | The requested EU contribution is equal to or lower than 90% of the total eligible costs. The Lead Partner’s (and Project Partners’, if applicable) financial contribution is equal to or higher than 10% of the total eligible costs (minimum percentage required) | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 11. | At least 20% of the EU financing is spent on cross-border partner's activities and majority of that contributes to infrastructural component | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 12. | Project is in line with the state aid rules.  In case of project requesting state aid/de minimis – the costs are adequately indicated. | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| 13. | Activities planned are not funded from other sources | |  | *YES* | *NO* |  |
| **FINAL ASSESSMENT:** | | POSITIVE | NEGATIVE | | | |
|  |  | | | |
| **COMMENTS:** | |  | | | | |

1. **Quality assessment criteria**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Strategic assessment criteria** | | | |
| **Assessment questions** | **Guiding principles for the assessment** | **Reference point** | **Comments** |
| 1. Project’s context (relevance and strategy)  *How well is a need for the project justified?* | a) The problems and needs that justify the necessity of project implementation are precisely defined and described |  |  |
| b) The project:   * is relevant to the particular identified problems/needs * is relevant to particular constraints of the target regions * is likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups |  |  |
| c) The project will have significant contribution to achievement of the selected Programme specific objective |  |  |
| d) The project is complementary to other initiatives in the field – it adds to the so far achievements and builds on them.  The results of other initiatives are used in the project.  Synergies with other initiatives are ensured in a practical way. |  |  |
|  | e) The project brings the added value to initiatives in the same field (innovative character of whole project or its elements) |  |  |
| 2. Cross-border cooperation potential and partnership  *What added value does the cross-border cooperation and that partnership bring?* | a) The project contributes to the strengthening of cross-border cooperation:   * it has objectives of common interest important for both sides of the border * the results shall benefit both sides of the border * the cross-border cooperation generates synergy effect * the project creates the basis to develop cross-border cooperation |  |  |
| b) The partnership proposed is adequate to the addressed problem:   * It is proven that Partners have sufficient experience, expertise and competences in the field; * It is proven that Partners have sufficient capabilities (financial, personnel, etc.) * There is a clear benefit from cooperating in the proposed project partnership. The results cannot be fully achieved without it; * Each partner plays an important and well defined role in the project, the division of tasks between the cross-border partners is balanced; * Partners share their experience, methods, models, data, ideas, know-how, knowledge etc. |  |  |
| 3. Project’s contribution to the Programme’s expected results and outputs  *To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of the Programme’s objectives?* | The project’s contribution to the achievement of the Programme output and result indicators is significant, realistic and well proven in the description. |  |  |
| 4. Horizontal principles | a) What is the project contribution to horizontal principles:   * equal chances and non-discrimination (including accessibility), * gender equality, * environmental sustainability |  |  |
| b) Project is in line with 'do not sigificant harm' (DNSH) rule |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Operational assessment criteria** | | | |
| **Assessment questions** | **Guiding principles for the assessment** | **Reference point** | **Comments** |
| 1. Overall logic of the project | a) The overall design of the project is coherent, there is a clear link between problem addressed and proposed activities, results and objectives. The intervention logic and project plan are clear and feasible. |  |  |
| b) Foreseen products will lead to achievement of the results. |  |  |
| c) The project’s indicators have been properly chosen, they are coherent with the addressed problem and expected project impact.  Product and result indicators cover all main parts of the project and they are properly calculated. |  |  |
| d) Activities outside the Programme area are duly justified and clearly benefit the Programme area (if applicable) |  |  |
| 2. Action plan and project organization | a) Proposed activities ensure achievement of the expected deliverables and results. They are practical and consistent with the project’s objectives and expected results. |  |  |
| b) Schedule of activities is planned effectively and will enable their implementation on time, in consistence with the whole project.  Adequate time is foreseen for each activity’s implementation. |  |  |
| c) The project implementation arrangements are clearly described in the application, and they are adequate for implementation of the project, taking into account its size and complexity |  |  |
| d) A detailed description of the infrastructure investment(s) and its (their) location is/are included in the application. |  |  |
| 3. Budget | a) The financial plan and the project budget are in line with the principles of sound financial management, the budget presents well ratio between costs and expected effects. |  |  |
| b) all costs are necessary and clearly linked to the activities planned |  |  |
| c) The costs are properly calculated and included in appropriate categories, SCOs are applied in line with the rules |  |  |
| 4. Readiness | The project is ready for implementation.  Documents necessary to start implementation are in the possession of the Partners. |  |  |
| 5. Durability | a) The obligations specified in art. 65 of the CPR will be fulfilled |  |  |
| b) Project is likely to have a long-lasting impact on its target groups. The project main outputs will be further used once the project has ended. |  |  |
| c) Project is likely to have multiplier effects (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the project and dissemination of information). |  |  |
| d) The expected results of the proposed project are durable:   * financially – there are sources of revenue for covering all future operating and maintenance costs during the period of project results durability, for financing of follow-up activities etc. * institutionally – there are structures that would allow the results of the project to be continued after the end of the action – local “ownership” of project results |  |  |
| 6. Sustainable development principle | Is the project in line with:   * environmental protection requirements arising from applicable EU and national law? * the principle of sustainable development? Does, and if yes how, the project take into account the principle of sustainable development at the stages of its preparation and implementation, and the stage of use of the project's products following the completion of its implementation? |  |  |
| Is the project in line with the *Rules for implementing actions in projects with infrastructure elements to ensure their compliance with the "do no significant harm" principle*? (we suggest preparing and applying that document in accordance with the EC recommendation contained in the Explanatory Note of September 2021) |  |  |
| Has the project been subject to an environmental impact assessment (if it is mandatory for a given type of investment) as required under applicable EU and national law, and has the assessment of alternative solutions been taken in due account? Is the result positive (it must be such for the project to receive co-financing)? |  |  |
| For investments in infrastructure with an expected lifespan of at least five years – has an assessment of expected impacts of climate change been carried out? How have the risks associated with climate change, considerations regarding climate change adaptation and mitigation, and natural disaster resilience been taken into account?[[2]](#footnote-3) |  |  |
| 7. Communication | a) Communication plan and goals are consistent with the scope of the project and its objectives. |  |  |
| b) Target groups for the communication activities are properly specified and they are linked with the project. |  |  |
| c) Communication activities are feasible and effective in achieving the communication goals. Communication tools and target values are adequately defined. |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Justification for the selection of the project in direct award procedure |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **FINAL ASSEMENT:** | POSITIVE | NEGATIVE |
|  |  |
| **COMMENTS:** |  | |

1. Add as many rows as needed. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. "Technical guidance on the climate proofing of infrastructure in the period 2021-2027" (2021/C 373/01). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)