ANNEX III Content evaluation grid

Small Project Application ID	0
Small Project title	0
Final Recipient 1	0
Final Recipient 2	0
Final Recipient 3	0

C1 PROJECT RELEVANCE				
Evaluation question	**Subquestions for evaluation**	**Score 0 / 4/ 8**	**Evaluator's comments**	**Section in SPA**
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, C1.1., 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, with outputs and deliverables clearly linked to the Programme output indicators and targets, and a realistic contribution to the 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)			A2, C2 and D
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's specific objective is clear, realistic, and achievable; the proposed outputs and deliverables are necessary to achieve it, and their contribution to the Programme indicators is realistic and feasible given the available resources (time, financial resources, workplan, and budget) and the quantification provided.			A2, C2.1, C2, C4, D and E with budget in Excel
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.			C1.3, C2 and C4
	SCORE	**0**		
C1 Project relevance maximum score is 40 points **40% (40/100)**				

C2 PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE				
Evaluation question	**Subquestions for evaluation**	**Score 0 / 3/ 5**	**Evaluator's comments**	**Section in SPA**
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 and B1.6
	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) FRs from three (3) participating countries in the Programme area (5 points)**			B
	All partners have defined roles within the partnership - the structure of the partnership, the role of the FRs in project implementation, and their contributions to the project are well described and explained, and the Programme territory benefits from this cooperation			C1.2, C1.3, C4 and D
	The project partnership consists of complementary partners (FRs), with a clear and logical distribution of tasks among them, ensuring effective collaboration			C1.2, C1.3, C4 and D
	SCORE	**0**		
C2 Partnership relevance maximum score is 20 points **20% (20/100)**				

C3 WORK PLAN				
Evaluation question	**Subquestions for evaluation**	**Score 0 / 4 / 8**	**Evaluator's comments**	**Section in SPA**
C3.1 To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent	Proposed activities are relevant and lead to planned outputs/deliverables and result.			D

work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?	How well are the selected target groups addressed by planned outputs/deliverables and results?			C2 and D
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			C2.1 and D
		SCORE	**0**	
C3 Work plan maximum score is 24 points **24% (24/100)**				

C4 BUDGET				
Evaluation question	**Subquestions for evaluation**	**Score 0 / 4 / 8**	**Evaluator's comments**	**Section in SPA**
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. **<u>if SP consist of two (2) FRs:</u>** **- 0 points if one FR has 70 – 80 % and other FR has 20 – 30 % of the total EU contribution** **- 4 points if one FR has 60 – 70 % and other FR has 30 – 40 % of the total EU contribution** **- 8 points if both FRs are within 40 – 60 % of the total EU contribution** **<u>if SP consist of three (3) FRs:</u>** **- 0 points if one FR has more than 50 % and other FRs have 20 – 25 % of the total EU contribution** **- 4 points if one FR has 40 – 50 % and other FRs have 25 – 30 % of the total EU contribution** **- 8 points if all FRs are within 30 – 40 % of the total EU contribution**			D and E with budget in Excel
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 Excel
		SCORE	**0**	
C4 Budget maximum score is 16 points **16% (16/100)**				

HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES				
Reference	**Horizontal principles**	**Score**	**Evaluator's comments**	**Section in SPA**
C5 Sustainable development	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.			C3
C6 Equal opportunities and non-discrimination	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.			C3

C7 Gender equality	The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principal equality between men and women, gender mainstreaming and the integration of a gender perspective.			C3
		SCORE	**neutral**	
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.**				

Evaluation criteria	**Maximum score**	**Achieved score**
1 Strategic evaluation criteria	**60**	**0**
1.1 Project relevance	40	0
1.2 Partnership relevance	20	0
2 Operational criteria	**40**	**0**
2.1 Work plan	24	0
2.2 Budget	16	0
TOTAL	**100**	**0**

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: 29/09/2025

Evaluated by:

_____
(Name and Surname)

_____
(Signature)