

Second call for standard projects:

Concept Note's evaluation criteria

Severino Ostorero – JTS Financial Officer

Selection procedure: actors involved



The following actors are involved in the evaluation procedure:

- **JTS - JMA staff as internal assessors** perform the opening and administrative check (both stages), the quality check of the external evaluation (PSC chairperson) and the verification of the eligibility;
- **External Assessors** perform the qualitative evaluation (both stages);
- **Projects Selection Committee** (all countries represented) supervises and approves each step of the evaluation;
- **Joint Monitoring Committee** defines the application pack and the evaluation criteria and approves the evaluation report at each stage.

Administrative check (1)



PART 1 (ADMINISTRATIVE)

1. The Concept Note published for this call for proposals has been used and it has been submitted within the set deadline.
2. The Declaration by the Applicant for Concept Note in original has been filled in, stamped, dated, on headed paper and hand written signed and refers to the submitted project. The Declaration by the Applicant for Concept Note is enclosed.
3. The Concept Note is fully typed in English or French.
4. One (1) original and one (1) copy are included.
5. An electronic version of the Concept Note (CD-Rom, USB) is enclosed and is identical to the submitted paper version.
6. The Applicant organisation does not participate as applicant in any other project proposal within the same Priority.

Administrative check (2)



PART 2 (TECHNICAL)

7. The project will be implemented in eligible territories (eligible and adjoining regions).
8. The duration of the project is between 18 and 24 months.
9. The requested contribution is indicated and is not higher than 90% of the estimated total eligible budget costs.
10. The total eligible budget is in line with the provisions of the Guidelines for Applicants (minimum € 500.000 and maximum € 2.000.000 with the exception of Priority 4 for which a minimum total eligible budget of € 200.000 is allowed).
11. The partnership includes at least three (3) participating countries including at least one (1) partner from a Mediterranean Partner Country and one (1) partner from a EU Mediterranean Country.
12. The Applicant is established in an eligible region (Applicants from adjoining regions are not eligible) or is a Ministry or national public administration based in one eligible Country or an International organisation.
13. The partners are established in eligible or adjoining regions or they are Ministries or national public administrations based in one eligible Country or International organisations.
14. The Concept Note is specifically targeting only one (1) Priority and one (1) Measure.

Qualitative evaluation criteria (1)



Minimum threshold for the Concept Note: 30 / 50

Relevance (5 criteria, max. subscore 30 points)

- How relevant is the proposal at **Mediterranean Sea Basin** and in particular to the Priority and Measure under which it has been submitted? Does the proposal have a real cross border impact?
- How relevant at cross border level is the proposal to the particular needs and constraints of the **target country(ies) or region(s)**? *
- How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (**final beneficiaries and target groups**)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?

* Score multiplied by 2 in accordance with its importance

Qualitative evaluation criteria (2)



Relevance

- How relevant is the **partnership** in relation to the proposed project, and in particular, to its objectives and expected results?
- How clearly defined are **synergies** with other major initiatives and, in particular, EU, ENPI CBC MED and national funded projects addressing the same problem at national and regional level both in EUMC and MPC? Do the main expected results contain any specific added value elements, in particular innovative approaches, best practices, pilot actions, new services?

Qualitative evaluation criteria (3)



Design (2 criteria, max. subscore 20 points)

- How coherent is the overall design of the project? In particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and relevant stakeholders?*
- Is the project **feasible and consistent** in relation to the specific objective and expected results?*

* Scores multiplied by 2 in accordance with their importance



Thank you for your attention

www.enpicbcmed.eu