

Annex  
B2

| EVALUATION GRID - Technical & financial evaluation |  |            |
|--|--|------------|
| No.  | Criteria   | Max. score |
| <b>I. Strategic assessment criteria</b>            |  |            |
| <b>1. Project relevance</b>                        |  |            |
| <b>A.</b>  | <b>How well is the need for the project justified?</b>   | <b>8</b>   |
| <b>1</b>   | The project addresses common territorial challenges of the programme or a joint asset of the programme area - there is a real need for the project and it is proven that the cross-border approach is the best way of tackling it (well justified, reasonable, well explained). – AF C.2.1 and C.2.2 | <b>5</b>   |
| <b>2</b>   | The project clearly contributes to wider strategies at one or more policy levels (EU/ national/ regional) – AF C.2.5 <i>(2 points for each strategy)</i>   | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>B.</b>  | <b>To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of programme's objectives and indicators?</b>   | <b>6</b>   |
| <b>1</b>   | The project outputs are clearly linked to the programme output indicators and their contribution to programme targets is sufficient. – AF C.4 Output tables in work packages   | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>2</b>   | Project's contribution to the programme result indicators is realistic and sufficient. – AF C.5  | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>C.</b>  | <b>How does the project build on existing practices?</b>   | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>1</b>   | The project makes use of available knowledge and builds on existing results and practices. – AF C.2.7  | <b>2</b>   |
| <b>2</b>   | The project demonstrates new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/programme area/participating countries or adapts and implements already developed solutions. – AF C.2.2  | <b>1</b>   |
| <b>2. Cooperation character</b>                    |  |            |
| <b>D.</b>  | <b>What added-value does the cooperation bring?</b>  | <b>8</b>   |
| <b>1</b>   | The importance of cross-border cooperation for the topic addressed is clearly demonstrated. – AF C.2.3   | <b>2</b>   |
| <b>2</b>   | The results cannot/only to some extent be achieved without cross-border cooperation. – AF C.2.3  | <b>2</b>   |

|                                      |   |           |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------|
| 3                                    | There is a clear benefit from cooperating for the project partners / target groups / project area / programme area. – AF C.2.3  | 2         |
| 4                                    | Are the project partners accomplishing the cooperation criteria (mandatory joint development, joint implementation and joint financing + (optional) joint staffing)?  | 2         |
| <b>3. Project intervention logic</b> |   |           |
| <b>E.</b>                            | <b>To what extent is project intervention logic plausible?</b>  | <b>9</b>  |
| 1                                    | Project specific objective is realistic and achievable. – AF C.4 Specific objectives in work packages   | 3         |
| 2                                    | Proposed project outputs are needed to achieve project specific objectives. – AF C.4 Output tables in work packages   | 3         |
| 3                                    | Project outputs and results that contribute to programme indicators are realistic (it is possible to achieve them with given resources – i.e., time, partners, budget - and they are realistic based on the quantification provided). – AF C.4, C.5, C.6, D | 3         |
| <b>F.</b>                            | <b>To what extent will project outputs have an impact beyond project lifetime?</b>  | <b>6</b>  |
| 1                                    | Project outputs are durable (the proposal is expected to provide a significant and durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted) – if not, it is justified. – AF C.8.2   | 3         |
| 2                                    | Project main outputs are applicable and replicable by other organisations/regions/countries outside of the current partnership (transferability) – if not, it is justified. – AF C.8.3  | 3         |
| <b>4. Partnership relevance</b>      |   |           |
| <b>G.</b>                            | <b>To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?</b>   | <b>10</b> |
| 1                                    | The project involves the relevant actors needed to address the territorial challenge/joint asset and the objectives specified. – AF C.3   | 3         |
| 2                                    | With respect to the project’s objective, the project partnership: – AF C.3:<br>o is balanced with respect to the levels, sectors, territory<br>o consists of partners that complement each other.   | 2         |
| 3                                    | Partner organisations have proven experience and competence in the thematic field concerned, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.) – AF B.1.6   | 2         |
| 4                                    | The partnerships involve partners that have not previously benefited from financing through previous Romania-Serbia CBC programmes (for the 2007-2013 and 2014-2020 programming periods)  | 2         |

|  |  |           |
|--|--|-----------|
| 5  | All partners play a defined role in the partnership and the territory benefits from this cooperation. – AF C.3   | 1         |
| <b>II. Operational assessment criteria</b> |  |           |
| <b>5. Work plan</b>                        |  |           |
| <b>H.</b>                                  | <b>To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?</b>   | <b>10</b> |
| 1  | Proposed activities and deliverables are relevant and lead to planned outputs and results. – AF C.4, C.5   | 2         |
| 2  | Distribution of tasks among partners is appropriate (e.g., sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the project, etc.). – AF C.4<br>Activities in work packages  | 2         |
| 3  | Time plan is realistic. – AF C.6   | 1         |
| 4  | Activities, deliverables and outputs are in a logical time-sequence. – AF C.6  | 1         |
| 5  | The importance of investments and their cross-border relevance is demonstrated to reach project objective – AF C.4 Investments   | 4         |
| <b>6. Communication</b>                    |  |           |
| <b>I.</b>                                  | <b>To what extent are communication activities appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</b>   | <b>2</b>  |
| 1  | The communication objective is relevant and is expected to contribute to project specific objective. – AF C.4 Objectives in work packages  | 1         |
| 2  | Communication activities (and deliverables) are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders. – AF C.4 Activities and deliverables in work packages  | 1         |
| <b>7. Budget</b>                           |  |           |
| <b>J.</b>                                  | <b>To what extent is the project budget used in accordance with the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness?</b>   | <b>28</b> |
| 1  | Is the proposed project budget directly connected and reflected in the project activities? – AF D.2 & E.3  | 8         |
| 2  | Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation. – AF D.2   | 4         |
| 3  | The expenditure is realistic and cost-effective for the proposed activities. – AF E.3  | 2         |
| 4  | Financial allocation per cost category is in line with the work plan. – AF D.2   | 4         |
| 5  | The distribution of the budget per period is in line with the work plan. – AF D.4  | 2         |
| 6  | The available information in the budget is transparent and sufficient. On that basis, the project budget appears proportionate to the proposed work plan, project outputs and project's contribution to programme indicators aimed for. – AF D.2 | 4         |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 7        | Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned for investments and equipment purchases and their costs are realistic. – AF D.2   | 4         |
| <b>K</b> | <b>Horizontal principles</b>  | <b>10</b> |
| 1        | The project makes a positive contribution (including raising public awareness) to programme horizontal principle equal opportunities and non-discrimination based on gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. – AF C.7.6 | 2         |
| 2        | The project makes a positive contribution (including raising public awareness) to programme horizontal principle equality between men and women, gender mainstreaming and the integration of a gender perspective. – AF C.7.6   | 2         |
| 3        | The project makes a positive contribution (including raising public awareness) to programme horizontal principle sustainable development and the "Do No Significant Harm" principle. – AF C.7.6   | 2         |
| 4        | The "infrastructure and works" takes into consideration the potential impacts of climate change (climate proofing in the sense of climate adaptation & resilience*) (only for infrastructure investments with an expected lifespan of at least 5 years)                     | 4         |
|          |   |           |
|          | The expenditure is in line with the list of eligible expenditure annexed to the Applicant's Guide.<br><b>! If the project is not in line with the list of eligible expenditure annexed to the Applicant's Guide it will be rejected.</b>                                    |           |

\*Technical guidance on the climate proofing of infrastructure in the period 2021-2027 C(2021) 5430 final