# ANNEX III

**CONTENT EVALUATION GRID**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Small Project title:** |  |
| Final Recipient 1: |  |
| Final Recipient 2: |  |
| Final Recipient 3: |  |
| Final Recipient 4: |  |

*Table 1: Strategic evaluation criteria/****project relevance***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Evaluation question** | **Sub-questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Section in SPA form** |
| **C1** | **Project relevance** |  | **0 / 3 / 5** |  |
| C1.1 | How well is the need for the small project justified? | The project addresses common challenge of the Programme or a joint asset of the Programme area – there is a real need for the project (well justified, reasonable, well explained). There is a clear benefit for selected target group/s. New/existing solutions developed/adopted/ implemented during the project and FRs approach is well described, reasonable and well explained.  |  | A2, C2 and D |
| C1.2 | To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of Programme’s objectives and indicators? | The project’s overall objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the Programme priority specific objective. |  | A2 and C2 |
| The project’s outputs/deliverables clearly link to Programme output indicators and their contribution to Programme targets is sufficient. |  | A2, C2 and D |
| Project’s contribution to Programme result indicators (RCR 03 – SMEs introducing product or process innovation, RCR 104 - Solutions taken up or up-scaled by organizations, RCO 84 Pilot actions developed jointly and implemented in projects and RCO 116 Jointly developed solutions) is realistic. |  | C2 |
| C1.3 | To what extent will project outputs/deliverables have an impact beyond the project’s lifetime? | The project’s outputs/deliverables have potential to become durable (in the sense that they bring people together and create favorable cooperation conditions) – if not, it is justified.* the SPA is expected to provide a significant and durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted
 |  | C2.2 |
| C1.4 | To what extent is the project intervention logic plausible? | The project specific objective is specific, realistic and achievable. |  | C2.1 |
| Proposed project outputs/deliverables are neededto achieve project specific objective. |  | A2, C2 and D  |
| Project outputs/deliverables and results that contribute to the Programme indicators are realistic (it is possible to achieve them with given resources– i.e., time, FRs, workplan, budget – and they are realistic based on the quantification provided). |  | C2.1, C4, D and E with budget in Excell |
| C1.5 | What added value does the cooperation bring? | The importance of cooperation beyond borders for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated* the results cannot/can only to some extent be achieved without cooperation
* there is a clear benefit from cooperating for the FRs/target groups/project area/Programme area.
 |  | C1.4 and C2 |
| SCORE |  |  |

Maximum score is 45 points, 45%

*Table 2: Strategic evaluation criteria/****partnership relevance***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Evaluation question** | **Sub-questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Section in SPA form** |
| **C2** | **Partnership relevance** |  | **0 / 3 / 5** |  |
| C2.1 | To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project? | The small project involves the relevant actors needed to address the common challenge/joint asset and the objectives specified. |  | A2  |
| The project partnership:* **if SP consist of two (2) or more FRs from two (2) participating countries in the Programme area (0 points)**
* **if SP consist of three (3) or more FRs from three (3) participating countries in the Programme area (5 points)**
 |  | B1.3, C2 and C4 |
| All partners play a defined role in the partnership and the Programme territory benefits from this cooperation. |  | C1.2, C1.3 and C4 |
| The project partnership consists of partners (FRs) that complement each other. |  | C1.2, C1.3 and C4 |
| Distribution of tasks among FRs is appropriate (e.g., sharing of tasks is clear, logical, etc.). |  | C1.3, C4 and D |
| The structure of partnership, FRs’ role in project implementation and contribution to the project is well described and explained. |  | C4 |
| SCORE |  |  |

Maximum score is 30 points, 30%

*Table 3: Operational evaluation criteria/****work plan***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Evaluation question** | **Sub-questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Section in SPA form** |
| **C3** | **Work plan** |  | **0 / 3 / 5** |  |
| C3.1 | To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent? | Proposed activities are relevant and lead to planned outputs/deliverables and result. |  | D 1 and D 2 |
| How well are the selected target groups addressed by planned outputs/deliverables and results? |  | D 1 and C2 |
| C3.2 | To what extent are communication activities appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders? | Communication activities are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders:* communication objective is relevant and is expected to contribute to small project specific objective
 |  | D 1 and C 2.1  |
| SCORE |  |  |

Maximum score is 15 points, 15%

*Table 4: Operational evaluation criteria/****budget***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **Evaluation question** | **Sub-questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Section in SPA form** |
| **C4** | **Budget** |  | **0 / 3 / 5** |  |
| C4.1 | To what extent is the small project budget proportionate to the project activities and results? | The project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan, project outputs/deliverables and project's contribution to Programme indicators. |  | D and E with budget in Excell |
| C4.2 | To what extent is the small project budget balanced between FRs? | Final Recipients have balanced budget between themselves in well elaborated cooperation activities based on joint cooperation of Final Recipients. |  | D and E with budget in Excell |
| SCORE |  |  |

Maximum score is 10 points, 10%

*Table 5: Horizontal principles*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reference** | **Nr.**  | **Horizontal principles** | **Section in SPA form: C.3** |
| Sustainable development | C5 | The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principle sustainable development as set out in Article 11 TFEU, taking into account the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement. | POSITIVE or NEUTRAL or NEGATIVE |
| Equal opportunities and non-discrimination | C6 | The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principle equal opportunities and non-discrimination based on gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. | POSITIVE or NEUTRAL or NEGATIVE |
| Gender equality | C7 | The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principal equality between men and women, gender mainstreaming and the integrationof a gender perspective. | POSITIVE or NEUTRAL or NEGATIVE |

Fulfillment of required minimum in horizontal principles has a neutral contribution in entire evaluation process. Negative assessment in one of the horizontal principles will lead to rejection of the Small Project.

It is expected from the evaluators to formulate the necessary conditions/budget cuts which are needed to guarantee the keeping of the eligibility rules of the Call and ensure proper preparedness of the Small Projects for implementation (e.g. indicators are complete and covering the outputs of the Small Project; necessity, proportionality and reality of budgeted costs items are properly underpinned and can be clearly derived from the planned activities).

**Selection criteria:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **Maximum score** | **Achieved score** |
| **Strategic evaluation criteria** | **75** |  |
| Project relevance | 45 |  |
| Partnership relevance | 30 |  |
| **Operational criteria** | **25** |  |
| Work plan | 15 |  |
| Budget | 10 |  |
| **TOTAL (operational + strategic)** | **100** |  |

**For evaluation of Small Project Applications,** **a total of 100 points can be achieved.**

**Small Project Application is ineligible for granting if total score of Small Project Application is under 60 points.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Date:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Evaluated by: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (Name and Surname) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (Signature) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |