

KOLARCTIC CBC 2014-2020

EVALUATION GRID FOR THE 3RD CALL FOR PROPOSALS

To the Regional Assessment Group members and other assessors:

The MA will upload the results of the evaluation to PROMAS monitoring system during or after the RAG meeting.

This evaluation grid is made by the Managing Authority and BOs of the 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.

This evaluation grid is divided into 3 **sections**:

- relevance
- quality
- capacity

and 13 **sub-sections**. Each sub-section must be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the guidelines given in the sub-section

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. The RAG should give written comments to justify a score less than 3. Also, the assessors / RAG can give comments whenever they find it necessary to express points of view that cannot be expressed in numbers only.

The MA / BO representative can give information about the strategy of Kolarctic CBC, or projects funded in earlier programme periods (e.g. Kolarctic ENPI CBC). This would help the assessment in sub-sections 2 and 4. The MA / BO representative is nevertheless neutral in the assessment.

In sub-sections that may be a ground for rejecting the project ("Exclusive" sub-sections 1,4 and 5 and section "Relevance") the scores have to be justified in the comment boxes.

Assessment of the project:

RAG Finland ()		RAG Sweden ()		RAG Norway ()		RAG Russia ()	
Project number							
Project name							

SECTION: RELEVANCE

1. The added value of cross border cooperation on the project. Does the cross border cooperation bring real added value to the project? Does the cross border cooperation have a very good / good/ adequate / poor / very poor impact on achieving the expected results of the project?

/5 x 2

In the *Programming document for EU support to ENI Cross-Border Cooperation (2014-2020)*, the last passage in paragraph 1.2. describes the cbc impact as following:

“CBC programmes must deliver real cross-border added value, i.e. they are jointly designed for mutual benefit on both sides of the border and their results are achievable and sustainable only through joint action.”

Scores:

1. Cross border cooperation has a very poor or negative impact on achieving the expected results of the project. The project benefits one project partner or partners in one country only. The project would be better if carried out by national instruments.
2. Poor: Cross border cooperation has a poor impact on achieving the expected results of the project. The project creates structures for cross border cooperation, or networks. The project consists of preconditional actions for further cooperation. The added value of the project is low. The project benefits two or more partners, only in one country. The partners' activities do not complement each other. The project could as well be carried out by national instruments.
3. Cross border cooperation has an adequate impact on achieving the expected results of the project. A network for cross border cooperation already exists. A big part of the cross border cooperation in the project consists of competence exchange. Project partners get benefit mostly on local level, in two or more countries. Learning from each other, the project could solve problems locally in one country. The partners are dependent of each other, and they could not solve the problems as well by themselves on a national level.
4. The cross border cooperation gives a good impact on achieving the expected results of the project. The project consists of exchanging knowhow. Project partners get benefit mostly on regional level, in two or more countries. Through the learning from each other, the project could solve problems locally at least in two countries. Partners are dependent of each other and they could not solve the problems by themselves on national level.
5. The cross border cooperation gives a very good impact on achieving the expected results of the project. Cross border cooperation is a central precondition in order to achieve the expected results of the project. The project consists of mutual solving of problems. All partners and all countries will benefit from the impact of the cross border cooperation. Every partner is dependent of each other and the partners could not solve the problems separately on national level.

(This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAG:s is less than 6, the project should be rejected)

Comments:

2. To what extent can the project be regarded as “new”, not having an objective that has been pursued in a recent project in the programme area? In other words, is the project not repeating a previous project?¹

/5

Note that a project does not necessarily have to be totally about a “new” topic in order to deserve high points: one or more project(s) may have been implemented earlier in the same topic / field of activity / branch / having the same overall objective. A good project might continue building on the results of the previous activities: it continues the development further, from the point where the previous project has ended.

One thing to take into account here, is *to what extent is the project a part of the organisations’ regular duties?* If the project is about the participating organisations transferring their regular tasks, (which national legislation has given them,) to projects, it is not a development initiative and deserves no scores for innovativeness.

Scores:

1. Very poor: There have been earlier projects / organisations with attempts to achieve the same objectives, using the same activities and mostly the same actors. They have been carried out during a period of time after which the circumstances have not changed essentially.
OR:
The results and impacts of earlier projects already exist and thus there is no need for a project.
OR:
The activities are / should be part of the organisations’ regular tasks.
2. Poor: There have been earlier attempts, but this project does not clearly refer to them as “lessons learnt”, or utilize their results. In this application, the project brings in one or two new conditions, which are never done before but no further analyses of the previous development.
3. Adequate: There have been earlier attempts, which have not achieved satisfactory results because of *inappropriate actors / activities / circumstances*. This project refers to those earlier activities as “lessons learnt” and has used those experiences in doing the necessary changes in the project plan. In this application you can see a clear intervention logic in the LF and in the analyses, what is done in the previous development, and which are the further changes in this application.
4. Good: As far as the RAG:s knowledge, a similar CBC initiative in this field of activity has not been done on the programme area.
OR:
There have been earlier successful projects in the field of activity. This application is continuing the development on a new level, in a new phase.
5. Very Good: The project going to be create a new cross-sectorial improvement between the different disciplines.

Comments:

¹ Information sources about other / previous programmes and projects will be made available to the RAG members: CBCprojects.eu is one central source

3. How relevant is the proposed project in relation to regional / national / joint strategies ? /5

Does the proposed project – including its timing - complement national and regional strategies and development of the programme area?

Scores:

1. Very poor relevance: The proposed project is in inconsistency with the regional / national / joint strategies.
2. Poor relevance: The project is consistent with the national / regional / joint strategies, but does not give an essential contribution to implementing them.
3. Adequate relevance: The project is consistent with the national and joint strategies only (*e.g. International Arctic strategy, the Barents Program*), and will contribute on a very wide field, not specifically for the region.
4. Good relevance: The project is consistent with the national joint strategies, plans and / or programs, and one of the regional strategies, and will contribute on the very specific field.
5. Very good relevance: The project is consistent with both national strategies, plans and programs and regional strategies, and will contribute on the very specific field.

Comments:

4. How well does the project meet the strategy of Kolarctic CBC programme? This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAG:s is less than 9, the project should be rejected)

/5 x 3

1. The project does not contribute to the implementation of the strategy of Kolarctic CBC. The objectives and expected results of the project are not in consistency with the Programme strategy. The result indicators are missing.
2. The projects has poor contribution to the implementation of the strategy of Kolarctic CBC: the project is consistent with the programme, but does not give an essential contribution to implementing it. The objectives and expected results match poorly with the programme strategy and the specific indicators² of the programme. The result indicators³ are weak (=low target values)
3. Objectives and expected results of the project are in line with the strategy of the programme, but the results are weak in terms of the indicators (Including Common Output Indicators, Specific Output Indicators and Result Indicators) Modifications are needed in defining the results.
4. The project makes a good contribution to the implementation of the strategy of Kolarctic CBC: objectives and expected results are in line with the programme strategy. The results are realistic in terms of indicators (Common Output Indicators, Specific Output Indicators and Result Indicators⁴)
5. The project makes a very good contribution to the implementation of the strategy of Kolarctic CBC: objectives and expected results are well in line with the programme strategy in terms of indicators. The results are high and realistic in terms of indicators (Common Output Indicators, Specific Output Indicators and Result Indicators). In short, the project is very well in line with Kolarctic CBC.

Comments:

² for indicators, see last 2 pages of the document

³ *ibid.*

⁴ *ibid.*

<p>5. <u>If the project achieves its expected results</u>, how likely is it that it 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Very poor: Most likely the results of the project will leave no lasting impacts at all after the project's closure. 2. Poor: Most likely the project results lead to better networking between the partners. The effect of the project on society is narrow. 3. Adequate: Most likely, the results of the project lead to an impact on further development, and the partners have established a solid ground for further cooperation. The effect of the project on society is nevertheless limited. 4. Good: Most likely, the results of the project lead to long-term improvements in the whole sector. The project brings its results out to the society, or its results are easy to popularize. The applicability of the results are good. 5. Most likely, the results of the project lead to long-term improvements in the whole sector and cause positive side effects even outside the sector. The wide audience have very good possibilities to utilize / apply the results of the project. 	<p>/5 x 2</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

Cross-cutting issues:

6. The project's impact on the development of equality between the genders	/5
<p>1. Very poor: The project has a negative impact on the development of equality between genders. The project will make active measures towards to maintain or even to strengthen already existing gender stereotypes which are negative development for the society in the region.</p> <p>2, Poor: The project has no efforts to change gender stereotypes for the better. The project has no efforts towards demolition of gender stereotypes.</p> <p>3. Adequate: The project plan shows awareness of gender stereotypes⁵, but the approach of the project does not serve influencing gender issues – which is often the case in certain types of projects (e.g. infrastructural projects). It is possible to adjust the content of the project, for example its steering and visibility activities, so that its impact on gender stereotypes / gender equality improve.</p> <p>4. Good: The project has interest and desire – and some efforts - to make changes in gender stereotypes. Among the project activities there are some parts which promote higher understanding on the equality between genders.</p> <p>5. Very good: The project is directed towards equality issues (its specific objective is about gender issues) and has hands-on activities which will lead to structural changes in gender stereotypes in whole society. This must be showed in the application: analyses, objectives, results and specially in the work plan.</p>	
Comments:	

⁵ Gender stereotypes here refers to a situation when our prejudices about the role division between men and women, and unconscious behavior related to the roles, have lead to segregation of the labour market for the traditionally male – and female-dominated labour markets. When people think, for example, “women are weak and that’s why they can’t drive a tractor”, “men can’t take care of small children” this tends to lead to thinking that such occupations as e.g. heavy machine drivers or plumbers require characteristics that by societal stereotypes are not related to females. And, vice versa, personal services (for example nursery teachers, nurses) are mostly associated with women. The elimination of gender stereotypes is a fundamental step to achieving equality of women and men.

<p>7. The project's impact on the environment:</p> <p>1 Very poor: The project will make active measures towards substantial negative environmental impact. The activities are the type that need permits according to national legislation.</p> <p>2 Poor: The project does not do any efforts for rising environmental awareness. You can't find anything in the application which is rising environmental understanding.</p> <p>3 Adequate: The project has interest to rise environmental awareness in everyday behavior. For example, it will favour online meetings, less travelling, environmentally conscious procurement in purchases etc.</p> <p>4 Good: The project has interest to rise environmental awareness in everyday behavior. (For example it will favour online meetings, less travelling, environmental procurement in meetings and in other purchases etc.) Among the project activities there are some parts which promote higher understanding on the environment and desire to make positive environmental impacts in society.</p> <p>5 Very good: Environmental project. The project is directed towards environmental issues and has hands-on activities which will lead to positive improvements on environment. This must be showed in the application: analyses, objectives, results and specially in the work plan.</p>	<p>/5</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

<p>The RAG:s comments on the section Relevance</p>

SECTION: QUALITY

<p>8. On a scale from 1 to 5, how good is the intervention logic of the project, in other words, the logic between the project justifications, objectives and activities? Are the project's defined objectives, activities and expected results clearly defined and in logic relation with each other?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. In the project plan, the intervention logic is poor or missing. There is a lack of analyses of the needs, and /or the objectives of the project are not well defined. The links between the problem, the objectives, the activities and / or the results of the project are poor. Usually, when a project plan has the shortcomings written above, also the project objective is very wide and defined vaguely. The project results are poor, poorly described or unrealistic. 2. There is a connection between the problem analyses and the project objectives but the work plan does not match well the objectives, and it is questionable if the project is going to achieve all its expected results. 3. A logic can be seen in the project, with some missing links here and there. They are mostly repairable by giving feedback. 4. The project is well planned with some minor gaps in the intervention logic. 5. The project is planned very well. It is possible to clearly see the needs, and their connections to the (well defined) objective, activities and expected results. Through well-planned activities, the project has researchable and realistic results. 	<p>/5 x 2</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

<p>9. How good is the composition and number of project partners? Are these the right organisations to carry out the project?</p> <p>1. Very poor: The partners are not such that have the mandate or competence to carry out the project, or to achieve results. This is <i>both</i> because of the type of organisation (e.g. development of trade needs trade / commercial organisations, development of legislation requires that public organisations / legislation expertise is represented) <i>and</i> identity of organisation(s) (The organisations represented have not achieved credibility on the field of the project)</p> <p>2. Poor: The composition of partners is weak. For instance, in each country there is only one partner, (<i>which is not a problem if their nature is such that they have a de jure monopoly status – e.g. maintenance of railway network</i>). To say it in other words, the project lacks relevant partners. OR The project has too many partners, many of whom are irrelevant. Some relevant partners are missing.</p> <p>3. Adequate: The composition and number of partners is sufficient. For instance, there are a few partners in each country. Even though the project is missing some possible relevant partners, the benefit from implementing the project is still considerable high for the programme area.</p> <p>4. The composition and number of partners in the project is <u>good</u>. For instance, there is a combination of private sector, NGOs and public bodies and authorities. . The project participants have not included new partners from different branches / sectors, who would bring innovation to the project. Instead, the project is focusing on familiar partners.</p> <p>5. The project has <u>very good</u> and relevant partners, with the right qualifications for the project. There are no unnecessary partners. Cross-sectoral cooperation and public-private cooperation is included. The partnership is new in a way, which makes it possible for the project to find new cross-sectoral impacts.</p>	<p>/5</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

<p>10. 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? Is the responsibility of tasks functionally distributed between the partners, due to the project tasks.</p> <p>1. The quality of the partnership is poor, characterised by one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - According to the project plan described in the application, there seems to be no real cooperation. - There is no clear distribution of tasks. - The project activities in different countries are isolated from each other. - The roles of the partners are unclear. - Many partners have a role of being just "informed" (see RACI-matrix) - One partner is strongly involved, whereas the others partners seem to have a formal, informed role. <p>2. The distribution of tasks between partners is overall unfunctional. For instance, there is too much overlapping, or too complementary tasks. And / or the project has too many only partners whose role is only to be "informed" (See RACI-matrix)</p> <p>3. Adequate: The distribution of tasks between the project partners is, in general, functional. For instance, most partners have roles, which seem to lead to the project goals. The distribution of tasks is still far from ideal.</p> <p>4. The roles between partners and countries are mostly well described and balanced– with some confusion. For instance, most partners and countries seem to have their separate roles, which lead to the project goal.</p> <p>5. The partners' roles in the project are very functional, well described and balanced. For instance, there are clearly described complementary or supplementary responsibilities in order to achieve the project goals, between both partners and countries involved in the cooperation.</p>	<p>/5 x 2</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

<p>11. What is your estimation about the total size and the budget headlines of the project budget: is it satisfactory and in line with the project's expected results?</p> <p>1. Very poor: The total size of the project budget is irresponsible. There is no correlation between costs and estimated results. The project is extremely expensive in total, or totally underbudgeted, or totally overbudgeted by all partners</p> <p>2. Poor: The costs are poorly calculated compared to estimated results, both ways. The budget is unbalanced so that some partners' budget is over- / underestimated</p> <p>3. Adequate: The size of the budget is realistic compared to estimated results, but only approximately. Modifications are needed in specific budget lines.</p> <p>4. Good: The size of the budget is well justified compared to plans. Minor modifications are needed in specific budget lines.</p> <p>5. Very good: The presentation of project costs is very good and realistic compared to estimated results.</p>	<p>/5</p>

<p>12. Multilaterality / bilaterality TO BE FILLED IN BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITY;</p> <p>The project has participants from The project has partners from: four countries: 5 points, three countries: 3 points, two countries: 1 points</p>	<p>/5 x 4</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	

<p>The RAG:s comments concerning the Quality-section</p>

SECTION: CAPACITY

13. How good is the Lead Partner's and partners' capacity, including - experience of project management, and - experience in the relevant field	/5
Comments:	

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

Overall comments on the project

Additional information about indicators:

Priority Axis 1.: Viability of Arctic economy, nature and environment (TO 1, TO 6)

Each COI and SOI relates to the specific RI in the **Annex F** and vice-versa as follows:

Specific Output Indicators (SOI) Common Output Indicators (COI)	Programme Result Indicators (RI)
<p>SOI 1 Number of participating institutions/organizations cooperating across borders for viability of Arctic economy, nature and environment</p> <p>SOI 1.1 Number of males</p> <p>SOI 1.2 Number of females</p> <p>SOI 2 Number of participating young entrepreneurs/SMEs cooperating across borders for business cooperation and development</p> <p>COI2 Number of enterprises substantially and actively involved in projects as final beneficiaries</p> <p>SOI 3 Number of participants in cross -border activities implemented by projects enhancing the culture and/or traditional livelihoods of indigenous people</p>	<p>→ RI 1 Expert panel statement on the cooperation between economic and environment fields within common interest AND/</p> <p>→ RI 2 Number of young people employed in the Programme area</p>
<p>SOI 4 Population benefiting from cross -border activities in the field of renewable energy and energy efficiency solutions</p> <p>COI17 Number of persons actively participating in environmental actions and awareness raising activities</p>	<p>→ RI 3 Energy production capacity in MW of facilities using renewable energy and energy efficiency solutions</p>
<p>COI 16 Surface area covered by improved shared environmental monitoring capacity or joint monitoring actions</p>	<p>→ RI 4 Number of synchronized interregional practices on the example of oil spill response system</p>

Priority Axis 2.: Fluent mobility of people, goods and knowledge (TO 1, TO 6, TO 7, TO 10)

Specific Output Indicators (SOI) Common Output Indicators (COI)	Programme Result Indicators (RI)
<p>SOI 5 Number of participating institutions/organizations cooperating across borders towards fluent mobility of people, goods and knowledge</p> <p>SOI 5.1 Number of males</p> <p>SOI 5.2 Number of females</p>	<p>→ RI 6 Estimation of tourism flows in the Programme area AND/</p> <p>→ RI 5 Expert panel statement on the East West Transport Corridor and communication services</p>
<p>COI 27 Total length of reconstructed or upgraded roads</p>	<p>→ RI 7 Estimated average speed on the reconstructed or upgraded roads</p>
<p>SOI 6 Population covered by developed transport and communication networks as the direct consequence of the Programme support</p> <p>COI 29 Number of additional ICT based tools developed supporting cross-border cooperation</p>	<p>→ RI 8 Qualitative survey regarding quality of ICT services/infrastructure, conducted among a sample of population in the Programme area</p>
<p>SOI 7 Number of participants in cross-border activities implemented by projects improving the border management and border security, mobility and migration management</p>	<p>→ RI 9 Annual number of private cars crossing the border as a ration to number of customs personnel directly</p>

<p>COI 35 Number of border crossing points with increased throughput capacity</p> <p>COI 36 Increased throughput capacity of private cars on land border crossing points</p> <p>COI 38 Increased throughput capacity of persons on land border crossing points</p>	<p>employed at the border crossing points</p>
---	---