KOLARCTIC CBC 2014-2020

EVALUATION GRID FOR THE 4TH 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 the 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' in 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 11 **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 must give written comments to justify a score less than three (3) or when the application receives maximum score five (5). Written comments are highly recommended in every score; 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 chosen by project Priority axis 1 or Priority axis 2 and relevant Thematic Objective 1 and Thematic Objective 6 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, 3) 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? (This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAGs is less than 6, the project should be rejected).	/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.

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]
 	
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. This application does not clearly refer to them as "lessons learnt", or utilize their results
       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.
 	
  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.
 	
  5   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.
       OR:
       The project is going to create new cross-sectoral improvements.
	/5

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 well does the project fit, to chosen Priority axis 1 or Priority axis 2 and relevant Thematic Objective 1 and Thematic Objective 6 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)
 	
Scores:
   1   Very Poor: The project does not fit to chosen Priority axis 1/2 and TO 1/TO6
 	
   3   Adequate: The projects has a connection with chosen Priority axis 1/2 and TO1/TO6 of Kolarctic CBC.
 	
   5   Good: The project is in line with chosen Priority axis 1/2 and TO 1/TO6 of the programme.
	/5 x 3

Comments:	

4. How likely will the project outputs be utilised further?
 	
Scores:
   1   Very Poor: The project outputs will not be utilized further after the projects closure.
 	
   3   Adequate: Most likely, the project outputs will be utilized further after the project´s closure, but still not clear how AND by whom.
 	
   5   Good: The projects outputs will be utilized further after the project´s closure.
	/5

Comments:	

5. The project's impact on the development of equality between the genders	/5

Scores:
 	
    1 Poor: The project has no efforts to change gender stereotypes for the better. The project has no efforts towards demolition of gender stereotypes.
 	
    3 Adequate: The project plan shows awareness of gender stereotypes2, but the approach of the project does not serve influencing gender. 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.
 	
    5 Good: The project has interest and desire – and some efforts - to make change in gender stereotypes. Among the project activities there are some parts, which promote higher understanding on the equality between genders.	

Comments:	

---

[2] Gender stereotypes here refers to a situation when our prejudices about the role division between men and women, and unconscious behaviour related to the roles, have led 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.

6. The project's impact on the environment:	**/5**

Scores:

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.

2   Poor: The project does not do any efforts for rising environmental awareness. You cannot find anything in the application, which is rising environmental understanding.

3   Adequate: The project has interest to rise environmental awareness in everyday behavior. For example, it will favor online meetings, less travelling, environmentally conscious procurement in purchases etc.

4   Good: The project has interest to rise environmental awareness in everyday behavior. (For example, it will favor 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.

5   Very good: Environmental project. The project is directed towards environmental issues.

Comments:

SECTION: QUALITY

7. Are the project's specific objectives, activities and expected results clearly defined and in logic relation with each other?	/5 x 2
Scores: 1 Very Poor: In the Project Work 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 project results are poor, poorly described or unrealistic. 2 Poor: 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 Adequate: A logic can be seen in the project, with some missing links here and there. They are mostly repairable by giving feedback. 4 Good: The project is well planned with some minor gaps. 5 Very Good: 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.	
Comments:	

8. How good is the composition and number of project partners: Are these the right organisations to carry out the project and to what extent is this *real cooperation*?	/5
Scores: 1 Very poor: The partners do not have the mandate or the competence to carry out the project to achieve results / the composition of partners is weak / the project has too many partners taking into account that this is a micro-project. 3 Adequate: The composition and number of partners is sufficient. 5 Very Good: The project has good and relevant partners, with the right qualifications for the project. There are no unnecessary partners.	

9. Are the outputs / expected results of the project in line with the costs?	/5
Scores: 1 Very poor: There is no correlation between costs and expected results. 5 Very good: The outputs of the project and the results that the project probably will have, match the costs in a realistic way.	

10. Multilaterality / bilaterality TO BE FILLED IN BY THE MANAGING AUTHORITY;
 	
The project has participants from:
        four countries: 5 points
        three countries: 3 points
        two countries: 1 points
	/5

Comments:	

SECTION: CAPACITY

11. **How good is the Lead Partner's and partners' capacity, including** **- experience of project management, and** **- experience in the relevant field** (This is an exclusive sub-section: If the average score of the RAG:s is less than 3, the project should be rejected).	/5
Comments:	

Overall comments on the project