

QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID		SPF Umbrella Project
Identification number of the Call for proposals		
Priority axis		
Specific objective		
Title of the project		
Registration number of the project		
Name of the assessor		
Signature of the assessor		
Date of assessment		

I. STRATEGIC EVALUATION			
Criterion	Max.	Score	Justification/Explanation
Project environment and coherence	18	0	
The Strategy for implementation of the Small Project Fund follows the predefined structure, it is in line with the Programme objectives, is well structured, logical and coherent. The Strategy fully satisfies the relevant performance indicators set in the Cooperation programme. The Strategy provides detailed overview of identified needs of the border region related to Programme objectives and proposes concrete activities of small projects to be supported within the SPF. It clearly demonstrates the involvement of relevant bodies in decision-making by respecting the multi-governance and partnership principle.	0-8	0	
The SPF objectives contribute to the relevant specific objective of the Priority Axis.	0-4	0	
The SPF contributes to relevant results that stakeholders seek to achieve indicated in the Cooperation Programme.	0-4	0	
The SPF contributes to the priorities of the EU Strategy for the Danube Region.	0-2	0	

Relevance	14	0	
The quality and scope of the services offered to the small projects is in line with the needs of the border region and provide for a smooth implementation of the SPF.	0-6	0	
The need for the project occurs on both sides of the border and this territorial need/challenge is coherently described.	0-4	0	
The number and type of the target group(s) is clearly identified.	0-4	0	
Cross-border cooperation	4	0	
The project has clear cross-border aspect (demonstrate the additional character of the cross-border approach compared to regional, national approaches, demonstrably draw on the results of cross-border cooperation, for example, transferring models / knowledge / technology from one country to another, combining different skill sets not available in one region, gaining a critical mass otherwise unattainable, etc.).	0-4	0	
Added value and expected results	10	0	
There is a clear link between the SPF results and the Programme result indicator and clear linkage to outcomes and programme output indicator. The planned results of the SPF are realistic and are in line with the activities and costs.	0-4	0	
The project is innovative and represents added-value (e.g. new technologies or new solutions by which the project objectives can be reached more efficiently and by which the project can create best practices in the field.)	0-2	0	
The added value of the SPF for target groups is clearly demonstrated, as well as the way the SPF serves the wider public and eligible area.	0-2	0	
The SPF results contribute to the elimination of the constraints (social, economic, cultural, and environmental) of the expansion of bilateral relations.	0-2	0	

Partnership	6	0	
The partnership is well designed. The role and added value of all Beneficiaries are presented. There is a clear division of tasks between the Lead Beneficiary and the Beneficiaries, which is in line with the competences of the partners.	0-4	0	
All project partners are fully committed to the implementation of the SPF and they have competence in achievement of objectives. They involve the target groups in the preparation and implementation of the SPF.	0-2	0	
Sustainability of project results	8	0	
The financial and institutional sustainability of the project is ensured after the implementation of the project.	0-4	0	
The SPF is foreseen to have significant achievements, results after its closure to sustain. The results of the SPF contribute to the strengthening of future bilateral relations.	0-4	0	

II. OPERATIONAL EVALUATION			
Criterion	Max.	Score	Comments/Explanation
Feasibility	12	0	
The SPF is well developed and detailed, the structure and sequence of activities have a clear and adequate logic, and the timing is well designed. The SPF project plan is feasible.	0-8	0	
The risks related to implementation are identified and analysed. A proper risk management strategy is in place for all risks.	0-4	0	
Management	6	0	
The human capacities necessary for implementation are well presented by the Strategy for implementation of the SPF with the necessary level of details. The capacities and the quality of the project staff is in line with the activities to be carried out. The role and tasks of the project staff members are clearly presented, all tasks are covered. There is an optimal ratio of internal versus external staffing.	0-4	0	
Reporting, monitoring and supervision of the project are solved within the partnership during the implementation and also in the follow-up period.	0-2	0	
Budget and finance	8	0	
The budget is well designed. All activities and costs are covered. The budget is well balanced and structured. The value for money principle is respected. The cash-flow of the project is well designed and provides a good basis for sound financial management.	0-6	0	
The project budget is well prepared without the need of further modifications	0-2	0	
Planned activities/Schedule	9	0	
Planned activities are relevant and necessary for the successful implementation of the SPF. The method of implementing the planned activities is presented in details.	0-4	0	
Planned communication activities have joint nature, suitable for dissemination of project result and provide sufficient publicity.	0-3	0	
The timing is ideal for the SPF implementation, project activities can be implemented within the planned schedule.	0-2	0	

Horizontal principles	5	0	
The SPF contributes to horizontal principles: sustainable development, equal opportunities and non-discrimination and equality between men and women.	0-3	0	
The SPF contributes to the specific horizontal measures defined for each Priority Axis.	0-2	0	

SUMMARY OF THE QUALITY ASSESSMENT			
Subtotal score for strategic evaluation	60	0	
Subtotal score for operational evaluation	40	0	
Total score:	100	0	
Overall recommendation:			
Recommended for approval:			
Recommended for approval with conditions:			
Recommended for non-approval with reasons specified:			
Conditions/Reasons:			
In case of proposed budget cuts, the exact reference to budget lines and proposed amount with justification:			