



**EUROPEAN TERRITORIAL COOPERATION PROGRAMME
GREECE – ITALY 2007-2013**

PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA

The following Project Selection Criteria are proposed for the Calls for proposals that will be published in the framework of the European Territorial Cooperation Programme "Greece – Italy" 2007-2013.

Potential beneficiaries prepare a proposal in cooperation with the Lead Partner who submits the proposal to the Joint Technical Secretariat (JTS). After submission, each application will be subject to a two-phase selection procedure, carried out by the Joint Technical Secretariat, based on the selection criteria described below. In order to carry out the evaluation procedure, the JTS may be assisted by external experts. The procedure, as well as the criteria for the selection of these experts will be mutually agreed by the participating countries and will be approved by the Monitoring Committee.

1st phase: Projects will be checked against their **administrative compliance** and **eligibility criteria**, in order to ensure that they fulfill the administrative and technical requirements of the Programme. This is an on-off procedure. Projects which fail to fulfill the technical requirements of the Programme will be excluded from the 2nd phase and the Lead Partner will be informed in writing.

2nd phase: Only projects that demonstrate administrative compliance and satisfy the eligibility criteria will be subject to **quality assessment**. The quality assessment is based on a scoring system and results in a ranked list of all the applications that have passed the 1st phase. It will be carried out by the JTS. The JTS may be assisted by external experts during the project evaluation.

The JTS will examine three different sets of criteria, in order to make a decision on the project's approval. Namely:

1st phase analysis

Projects will be checked against two sets of criteria, in order to ensure that they fulfill the **administrative and technical requirements** of the Programme.

- **Administrative compliance:** It confirms that a proposal has been submitted within the deadline set; the Application Form has the official form specified by the Managing Authority, is complete and meets all the requirements set in the respective Call;
- **Eligibility criteria:** These criteria examine whether the proposal fulfils the minimum requirements for being eligible for funding by the Programme. These requirements are, for instance, the structure of the cross-border partnership, the general compatibility with the Programme objectives and principles, the co-

financing requested, etc. Proposals which do not fulfill the eligibility criteria are rejected. Additional information is requested from applicants only in the case of permitted errors agreed between the two countries and approved by the Monitoring Committee.

2nd phase analysis

Quality of the project: The quality assessment will only apply to projects that have successfully gone through the 1st phase. During this phase, proposals are evaluated using **core selection criteria**. These entail evaluating the nature of the proposed operation, its relevance with and contribution to the Operational Programme's overall objectives, its timeframe, viability and results in the eligible territory, the quality of the cross-border partnership as well as the monitoring, management and evaluation methodology proposed.

The Core selection criteria are divided into:

- **Content-related criteria** (relevance of the proposal, quality of results/ sustainability, innovation) ,
- **Implementation-related criteria** (quality of the partnership, quality of management, quality of the methodological approach, budget and finance).

The different sets of criteria are presented below:

1st phase : Administrative Compliance – Eligibility

1. ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE (YES/ NO)		
a) The application was submitted in due time.	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
b) The application was submitted in the required formats	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
c) The application form used has the official form specified by the Managing Authority, is properly filled in, stamped and signed	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
d) requested documents are attached	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
i) the Partnership Declaration, signed and stamped by all partners		
ii) the Co-financing Statement- declaration of non double financing signed and stamped by each Partner	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
iii) declaration of not generating revenues	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
in case of revenue generating projects attachment of cost-benefit analysis	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Justification of budget costs	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
v) Maturity Sheet per partner	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
vi) Compatibility Check Sheet with SEA	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA (YES/ NO)		
a) The project proposal is in line with relevant EU legislation and policies	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
b) The proposed activities and the project objectives are clear and in-line with the Programme's priorities	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
c) The proposed activities of the project are of a cross-border character in accordance with article 19 of Regulation (EC)1080/2006:		
i) the project includes partners from both countries:	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
ii) the project partners cooperate in at least two of the following ways:	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Joint development	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Joint Implementation	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Joint Staffing	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Joint financing	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
d) The Lead Partner and its partners fall under the eligible categories of beneficiaries according to the call for proposals	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
e) The Lead Partner and its partners are located in the Programme area as analyzed in the Programme Manual	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
f) The project budget and costs are in line with the Call for proposals	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
g) Duration of projects are in line with the time frame set out in the call for proposals	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

2nd phase: Project Quality

A. Content-related criteria			
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Score
<i>Relevance of the proposal</i>	<p>a) Are the objectives and expected results of the project addressing specific problems, issues, opportunities of the area?</p> <p>b) Does the project take into account one or more horizontal issues of the Programme (sustainable development, positive environmental impact, equal opportunities and non discrimination, fair competition)?</p> <p>c) To which extent are there synergies or complementarities with other implemented interventions and /or policies at the European, national, regional - local level within this particular thematic area?</p>	<p>Analytical and precise analysis based on a strategic analysis (5 points) Very good reference (4 points) Good reference (3 points) Basic reference (2 points) Minimum reference (1 points)</p> <p>All four issues (4 points) 3 out of four issues (3 points) 2 out of four issues (2 points) 1 out of four issues (1 point)</p> <p>All 3 levels (2 points) At 2 out of three levels (1 points)</p>	

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Score
<i>Quality of results/ Sustainability</i>	<p>a) Are the results specific, measurable, achievable, realistic-time based?</p> <p>b) To what extent does the project capitalize previous cross-border cooperation experiences</p> <p>c) To what extent do the project results provide value added for the Programme area?</p> <p>d) Does the project have the concrete and realistic possibility to have a follow up and/ or to be sustainable after the end of the Programme contribution?</p> <p>e) Is the project's strategy for communication and dissemination of results well structured and efficient?</p>	<p>All four characteristics (4 points) 3 out of four characteristics (3 points) 2 out of four characteristics (2 points) 1 out of four characteristics (1 point) 1-4 points</p> <p>1-3 points (Capitalisation of partnerships, outputs, experiences etc.)</p> <p>1-3 points (degree of continuation-improvement of existing outputs, structures, products, transfer of outputs, knowhow experience, usability of results in other sectors, by other stakeholders etc)</p> <p>Secure funding and commitment of stakeholders (5 points) Commitment of stakeholders (4 points) Initiatives by stakeholders (3 points) Basic planning (2 points) Minimum provisions (1 point)</p> <p>Full Communication strategy existing (3 points) Well developed communication activities (2 points) Basic communication activities indicated (1 points)</p>	
<i>Innovation</i>	a) To what extent does the project clearly demonstrate innovative character?	<p>Application of innovative results of the project (3 points) Development of new innovative methods,</p>	

		products, tools (2 points) Basic innovation references (1 points) No innovative features (0 point)	
Maximum total score: 32 points			

B. Implementation-related criteria			
Criteria	Sub-criteria	Analysis	Score
<i>Quality of the partnership (appropriate synthesis and organizational arrangements)</i>	a) To what extent does the Lead Partner demonstrate the capacity to coordinate, manage, control and monitor the overall implementation of the project?	High (8 points) Very good (5 points) Adequate (3 points)	
	b) Is the professional capacity (structure and experience) of the partners sufficient to implement the project activities undertaken successfully?	High (8 points) Very good (5 points) Adequate (3 points)	
<i>Quality of management</i>	a) To what extent is an appropriate project management methodology clearly demonstrated?	Very well developed methodology connected to outputs and results (3 points) Well developed methodology (2 points) Basic Management procedures described (1 points)	
	b) To what extent are the specific roles (actions and responsibilities) clearly and appropriately distributed among the Lead Partner and the partners?	Clear and specific roles, distributed to the partners in relation to their capacity (3 points) General distribution of tasks without specific references (2 points) Not clear enough distribution of responsibilities and tasks (1 point)	
<i>Quality of the methodological</i>	a) To what extent is there coherence among the identified project objectives, expected outputs and results and the	How clear, realistic and appropriate is the work plan of activities in order to achieve the	

<i>approach concerning the content of the project</i>	<p>activities to achieve them?</p> <p>b) How mature is the project (in which stage of completion are the administrative procedures that allow the realization of the project?)</p>	<p>expected results and the objectives of the project within the specific Axis? (Minimum to maximum, 1-3 points)</p> <p>All necessary administrative procedures completed- no administrative procedures necessary (15 points) Advanced stage of realization of administrative procedures- light administrative procedures required (10 points) Medium realization of administrative procedures (5 points) Low – non realization of administrative procedures. (0 points)</p>	
<i>Budget and finance</i>	<p>a) How reasonable and realistic is the overall budget of the proposal submitted?</p> <p>b) Is the estimated expenditure of the activities justified?</p>	<p>1-4 points (Distribution of the budget secures the active participation of each partner in relation to the activities described in the Application Form and secures the successful implementation of the foreseen activities)</p> <p>Thorough and detailed analysis (4 points) Very Good justification (3 points) Justified costs (2 points) Overestimated costs (1 point)</p>	
Maximum total score: 48 points			

Scoring

The afore-mentioned criteria will be taken into account by the evaluators to assess the projects. The purpose of the **Core selection criteria** is to assess the quality of the eligible project proposals. The maximum total score a project may achieve is **80 points**. Quality criteria are closely linked to the nature and objectives of the "Greece-Italy" cross-border Programme and are common to all Priority Axes or Areas of Intervention.

The Joint Technical Secretariat carries out the evaluation of proposals, based on these selection criteria, approved by the Joint Monitoring Committee. The Managing Authority ensures that the evaluation procedure was carried out in accordance with the requirements of the call for proposals and the approved selection criteria.

Then, the MA submits to the Joint Selection Committee:

- 1) the application forms of the submitted project proposals,
- 2) a ranking list of all evaluated project proposals and
- 3) all evaluation forms.

The projects are ranked according to the results obtained and applications are divided into three categories (based on the budget available and the results of evaluation):

- Applications proposed to be accepted;
- Applications proposed to be rejected and
- Applications proposed to be further discussed at the Joint Selection Committee (acceptable under conditions).

To be financed by the Programme, a project must:

- obtain at least 50% of the total evaluation points (40 points)

The Joint Selection Committee examines all project proposals on the basis of the preliminary technical evaluation, carried out by the JTS, performing a strategic evaluation and finalizes the evaluation by filling in the final evaluation forms. Then, the MA submits to the Monitoring Committee:

- 1) the application forms of the submitted project proposals,
- 2) a ranking list of all evaluated project proposals and
- 3) the final evaluation forms.

The Monitoring Committee selects and approves the projects to be funded.

ANNEX 1

The fields of minimum criteria of joint character of the project will be interpreted as follows. Each project should satisfy at least two of the following:

Joint development

- All partners should contribute to the development of the project;
- Partners should define how the project will operate, i.e. joint development of objectives and outcomes, budget, timing and responsibilities for work packages and tasks to achieve the objectives;
- Partners should identify knowledge and experience that each one of them brings to the project, as well as what each partner expects to get from the project.

Joint implementation

- The Lead Partner should bear the overall responsibility for the project. All partners should undertake responsibilities for different parts of the implementation.
- Each project partner responsible for a work package should coordinate and ensure that planned activities are carried out, interim targets are met and unexpected challenges to implementation are dealt with.
- Several partners may contribute to each work package.

Joint staffing

- All project partners should have a defined role and allocate staff to fulfill this role.
- Staff members should coordinate their activities with others involved in the activity or work package and exchange information regularly.
- There should be no unnecessary duplication of functions in different partner organizations.

Joint financing

- The project should have a joint budget with funding allocated to partners according to the activities they are carrying out (the budget split should reflect partner responsibilities).
- The budget should include annual spending targets and spending targets per work package.
- In general, all partners should contribute with co-financing.