

The Kolarctic CBC 2014-2020 programme

EVALUATION GRID

approved in the JMC meeting on 27th October, 2016

Basic information about the project:

RAG Finland () RAG Sweden () RAG Norway () RAG Russia ()	
Project title:	
Project no:	
Project type: (integrated / symmetrical / single country)	

To the Regional Assessment Group members and other assessors:

This evaluation grid is made by the Managing Authority of Kolarctic CBC and approved by the Joint Monitoring Committee of the programme. It is intended to help and control the evaluation of the project proposals in relation to the objectives and priorities set for the Kolarctic CBC programme. It also collects assessments of the project proposals’ relation to different national and regional aims, known by the RAG members.

Each RAG assesses all applications - regardless whether a Lead Partner/ Partner from the country in question will participate in the implementation of the project or not.

Assessments of / by the RAG’s and other assessors

Scoring guidelines

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **subsections**. Each subsection must be given a score between **1** and **5** in accordance with the following guidelines:

Score	Meaning
1	very poor
2	poor
3	adequate
4	good
5	very good

Each **section** contains a box for comments. These comments should address the issues covered by that section. If an evaluator gives a score of 1 (very poor), 2 (poor) or 5 (very good) to a subsection, it should be somehow justified in the comment box. Extra space may be used for comments if required.

The following sections / subsections will be exclusive: numbers 1, 4, and 5; and section Relevance.

Section: Relevance

<p>1. To what extent does the proposed project have a cross border cooperation impact, and does the cbc bring added value to the project? (This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAG:s is less than 6, the project should be rejected)</p>	/5 x 2
Comments:	
<p>2. To what extent can the project be regarded as “new”, not having an objective that has been pursued in a recent project? In other words, is the project NOT repeating a previous project? (This is to be assessed both by the MA and the assessors)</p>	/5
Comments:	
<p>3. How relevant is the proposed project in relation to regional / national / joint strategies ? Does the proposed project – including its timing - complement national and regional strategies and development of the programme area?</p>	/5
Comments:	
<p>4. How important is the project for the implementation of Kolarctic CBC programme’s strategy? (This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAG:s is less than 9, the project should be rejected)</p>	/5 x 3
Comments:	
<p>5. How likely is it that the project will have a long-term impact? (This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAG:s is less than 6, the project should be rejected)</p>	/5 x 2
Comments:	

Expected results towards the programme-specific indicators:

<p>6. How well does the project contribute to reaching the programme result indicators?</p>	/5 x 2
Comments:	

Exclusive condition: If the average score for Relevance from the RAG:s is less than 25, the project should be rejected.

Cross-cutting issues:

<p>7. The project's impact on the development of equality between the genders</p> <p>The project will improve the equality between the genres (an equality project) = 5 The project has a positive impact on the development of equality between genders = 4 The project has a neutral impact on the development of equality between genders = 3 The project has a negative impact on the development of equality between genders = 0</p>	/5
Comments:	

<p>8. The project's impact on the environment is...</p> <p>Very positive = 5 Positive impact on the environment = 4 Neutral impact on the environment = 3 The project has a negative impact on the environment = 0 NOTE: Projects with a negative impact on the environment should not be financed.</p>	/5
Comments:	

The RAG:s comments on the section Relevance

Section: Quality

<p>9. On a scale from 1 to 5, how good is the intervention logic of the project ? The logic between the project justifications, objectives and activities? For example, do the planned objectives, activities and expected results match each other? Are the project's defined objectives, activities and expected results clearly defined and in logic relation with each other?</p>	/5 x 2
Comments:	

<p>10. Quality of the partnership: How good is the composition and number of project partners? Are these the right organisations to carry out the project? <i>This evaluation is taken into account also in section Capacity.</i></p>	/5
Comments:	

<p>11. Quality of the partnership: To what extent is this <i>real cooperation</i>? Take into account e.g.: does the project description and budget distribution give an understanding that project activities will be implemented in co-operation between the project partners and that the responsibility of the implementation of the different activities will be sufficiently equal to the partners?</p>	/5
Comments:	

<p>12. To what extent – how widely - can the project results be utilized? taking into notice the project's - dissemination of information - potential for replication and extension of the outcome</p>	/5 x 2
Comments:	

<p>13. What is your estimation about the total size of the project budget: is it satisfactory and in line with the project's expected results?</p>	/5
Comments:	

<p>14. Multilaterality / bilaterality</p> <p>The project has participants from (Suggestion from the working group is points 1-5 multiplied by 4 in the calculation) The project has partners from: four countries: 5 points, three countries: 3 points, two countries: 1 points</p>	/5 x 4
Comments:	

The RAG:s comments concerning the Quality-section

Section: Capacity

<p>15. How good is the Lead Partner's and partners' experience of project management?</p>	/5
Comments:	

<p>16. Are the Lead Partner's sources of finance sufficient, and is its financial situation stable? Are the <u>resources of the project's Lead partner sufficient</u> for the whole project period so that all the planned project activities can be implemented and financed also in situations when the EU-financing and national co-financing will be paid after the reporting? Does it have sufficient <u>ability to handle the budget</u> for the project?</p>	/5 x 2
--	--------



Comments:	

The RAG:s overall comments on the Capacity of the actors

Scores:

Relevance	
Quality	
Capacity	

Overall comments:

Recommendation:

Signatures:

Time and date
