

## **ASSESSMENT OF PROJECT PROPOSALS**

The financing under the current Call for Proposals shall be made available to potential beneficiaries through a competitive process. All projects will be assessed and selected according to the evaluation criteria previously approved by JMC.

Assessment Working Group (AWG) consisting of Chairperson, Secretary and voting members, all from the Managing Authority, the National Authority and the Joint Secretariat shall perform the assessment of the project proposals.

The evaluation process will be carried out in two steps:

- **First step** - administrative compliance and eligibility check carried out by AWG;
- **Second step** - technical and quality assessment carried out by external assessors contracted by the MA/NA.

### **🔔 IMPORTANT**

**In order to be proposed for financing, a project must fulfil all the administrative and eligibility criteria and receive at least 65 points at the technical and quality assessment.**

**An applicant can be excluded at any stage of the evaluation, selection and pre-contracting process whenever it is obvious that the latter does not meet the eligibility criteria.**

### **STEP 1: ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE AND ELIGIBILITY CHECK**

The **administrative compliance and eligibility check** will be carried out by AWG. The check is performed under the supervision of the Chairperson. Each proposal will be examined by 2 persons (representative of each country), with each person filling in a "Yes", "No" or "N/A" answer in the separate administrative compliance and eligibility check grid, as published below.

If any project proposal has received "No" on a specific criterion/a, the AWG could request clarification or justification of information/documents submitted with the project proposal through the system for online application.

## NOTE

**Clarifications will only be requested to conclude the administrative compliance and eligibility check and not to improve the content of the application. The Assessment Working Group could only request clarification or justification of information/documents already submitted with the project proposal. Re-submission of corrected documents or other required documents, not included in the original proposal, shall not be allowed.**

The AWG will ensure equal treatment of the applicants, i.e. all applicants with the same type of problem shall be requested to clarify the respective issue in the same manner. All requests for clarification shall be made through the system for online application, which shall be used as the only official communication channel with the Applicant during the entire assessment process, and will contain clear instruction concerning the deadline for submission of the information. The deadline for submission of the information by the Applicants will be defined, depending on the type of the requested information/clarification/supporting document/s but shall be not less than 5 working days.

The Managing Authority shall bear NO responsibility in cases when the Applicant does not respond to a clarification request within the set deadline. Furthermore, any requests for clarifications and notifications shall be deemed to have been received on the date upon which the Managing Authority has sent them to the Lead partner through the system for online application.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE and ELIGIBILITY CHECK**

<b><u>ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE and ELIGIBILITY CHECK GRID</u></b> (to be filled by Assessment Working Group)				
Project Registration No				
Project title				
Type of project				
Lead Partner				
Project partner/s				
No	CRITERIA FOR ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE	YES	NO	N/A Comment
1	<b><i>The project proposal has been submitted within the deadline</i></b>			
2	<b><i>The Application Form (AF) is duly completed in compliance with the <u>template of the current call for proposals</u></i></b>			
3	<b><i>Project summary in 3 (three) languages <b>English, Bulgarian and Macedonian</b> is provided (part of the AF)</i></b>			

4	<b>Project Partnership agreement</b> is provided – scanned, signed and stamped by all partners (Annex A2)			
5	<b>Declaration of eligibility and commitment</b> is provided - scanned, signed and stamped by each project partner ( <b>part of the AF</b> )			
6	<b>Partnership and co-financing statements is provided</b> - scanned, signed, stamped and dated by each partner ( <b>part one the AF</b> )			
7	<b>Authorization document</b> from the legal representatives of partners (if applicable) in case the application form and declarations are not signed by the legal representatives of the Lead Partner/partners – in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
<b>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR ALL PROJECTS</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A Comment</b>
8	Documentary and other evidence on the <b>most recent legal status</b> of all partners (issued not later than 6 months prior to the submission deadline of the current call) – in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
9	<b>Decision of Applicant's governing body</b> (Annex B1) Local Council/Board of Directors or any similar body) regarding project development and implementation - in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned  In case of participation of Bulgarian partner that is second-level budget administrators, a Letter of Support for implementation of the project issued by the respective first level administrator – in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
10	<b>Justification of lump sum costs</b> – provided by each partner with planned lump sums under Budget Line 4, sub-line "Consultancy, studies, designs, website development, etc.", - in original language and English translation signed by the legal representative or the authorized person and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
<b>SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS FOR PROJECTS WITH INVESTMENT ACTIVITIES</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
11	<b>In case investment activities will be performed on municipal or state-owned property</b>			

11.1	<p><b>Ownership act or certificate or legal document for municipal or state ownership</b> of the tangible assets, which will be subject of works activities together with recent outline/design of the property – in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned</p> <p>In the case the project envisages the purchase of supplies which need to be permanently installed - an ownership act on municipal or state-owned property - in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned</p>			
11.2	<p><b>Consent of the owner</b> (Decision of the Council/ Board, etc.), issued in the original language and translated into English, clearly stating that the assets are given for free right of use for the purpose of the project <b>at least for 5 years after the end of the project</b> – in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned</p> <p>Consent of the owner for use of municipal or state-owned property for permanent installation of equipment – in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned</p>			
<b>12</b>	<b>In case of investment activities required passing through private territories</b>			
12.1	<b>Consent of the owners</b> , issued in in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
12.2	<b>Ownership act</b> , issued in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
<b>13</b>	<b>In case of investment activities within territories/objects with special status (National parks, environmental and architectural reserves, cultural monuments, protected areas, areas included in Nature 2000 etc.)</b>			
13.1.	<b>Relevant documentation</b> (permits, approvals, certificates, statements, etc.) required by the respective national applicable law - in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
<b>14</b>	<b>FOR ALL CASES WITH WORKS COMPONENT</b>			
14.1	Positive Environmental Impact Assessment (positive opinion from the relevant body), required by the national legislation and issued in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner – scanned <b>Letter issued by the relevant body clearly stated that</b>			

	<b>Environmental Impact Assessment is not necessary</b> , issued in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner – scanned			
14.2	<b>Approved detailed works design</b> <b>Explanatory note</b> – both in the original language and translation into English - (signed and stamped by the respective partner) - scanned and <b>Detailed Bill of Quantities</b> (in Euro) – both in the original language and translation into English (signed and stamped by the respective partner) – scanned			
14.3.	In case of construction works, for which the relevant legislation does not require approval of a detailed investment projects for construction, the required documents according relevant national legislation is presented - scanned			
14.4.	<b>Latest photos</b> of the site with filled name of applicant, date and the exact location of the object on the back			
	<b>IN CASE OF SUPPLY OF EQUIPMENT</b>			
15	<b>Technical specifications for supplies</b> (in English) – description of the envisaged supplies, including exact quantities - in original language and English translation signed and stamped by the respective partner - scanned			
<b>COMMENTS:</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	
<b>ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>N/A Comment</b>
At least one partner from <b>each side of the eligible cross border region</b> is involved				
Applicant participate in <b>one (1) project as Lead Partner</b> and in <b>one (1) project as Partner</b> or in <b>two(2) projects as Partner</b>				
<b>Lead partner</b> is registered <b>at least 12 months before the deadline for submission</b> of project proposals under current Call for Proposals				
All partners meet <b>eligible criteria</b> defined in the Guidelines for Applicants, section 2.1.1				
<b>The implementation period</b> does not exceed the maximum project duration per specific objective and type of project defined in the Guidelines section 2.1.2.				
The project proposal covers <b>only one specific objective</b> and is in line with <b>indicative activities</b> stipulated in the Guidelines for Applicants defines in the Guidelines section 2.1.2.				
The budget of activities to be carried out outside the programme area (if the case) is within <b>20% limit</b> as set in the Guidelines for Applicants				
The project proposal respects at least <b>mandatory both criteria:</b>				

<i>joint development and joint implementation, and additionally, one of the other two cooperation criteria: joint staffing or joint financing</i>			
<i>The value of the financial support requested is in line with the limit indicated for the specific objective in the Guidelines for Applicants defined in the Guidelines section 2.1.2.</i>			
<i>For investment projects – The <b>minimum rate of more than 50 % for investment (works and/or supply)</b> in Budget line 5 is observed.</i> <i>For soft projects – The <b>maximum rate of 50 % for investment (works and/or supply)</b> in Budget line 5 is observed.</i>			
<i>The maximum rate for Staff costs in <b>Budget line 1</b> for each partner is observed</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For soft project – <b>maximum 15 % of direct costs</b></li> <li>• For investment project – <b>maximum 10% of direct costs</b></li> </ul>			
<i>The maximum rate for Office and administrative costs in <b>Budget line 2</b> for each partner is observed – maximum 15 % of staff costs</i>			
<i>The maximum rate for Project preparation costs is observed – maximum 3 % of direct project costs (BL 3+BL4+BL5) , as well as the maximum rate for preparation of the Application package - maximum 3000 Euro</i>			
<i>Project proposal satisfies all criteria for eligibility compliance</i>	YES	NO	
<b>GENERAL COMMENT:</b>			

#### **IMPORTANT**

**Only proposals that satisfy all the administrative and eligibility criteria mentioned in the above checklist, applicable to the respective project, will be subject to technical and quality assessment.**

### **STEP 2: TECHNICAL AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT**

All project proposals which have successfully passed the administrative compliance and eligibility check will be subject to a technical and quality assessment. This assessment allows the quality of the project proposals to be evaluated in relation to the set objectives and priorities, and ensures that the selected operations comply with the Programme specific objectives and guarantee the visibility of the Community funding.

Technical/quality assessment of the project proposals is carried out taking into account the submitted project proposals, annexes and supporting documents, and the clarifications received during the previous stages of assessment.



The technical and quality assessment will be performed on the basis of specific selection criteria, grouped in four general sections in the technical and quality assessment grid, as published below:

- **Capacity of the partnership** (maximum 15 points) – the assessment should check the ability of the project partners to perform functions effectively, efficiently and sustainably. The project partners should be capable of ensuring quality of the final product or service, and efficient, transparent allocation of resources;
- **Project's context and consistency with the Programme and other strategies** (maximum 35 points) – the assessment should check whether the project has clearly chosen one single priority and specific objective, and whether the content of the proposal properly fits the selected priority and specific objective or not; if not fitting, this would lead to a lower score under section 2. The assessment should also verify the coherence of the project with other programmes and/or strategies and its value added, providing coherence with the following horizontal themes: sustainable development, equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women;
- **Methodology** (maximum 40 points) – the proposed project activities should be assessed according their logic consistency objective-activity-result. The assessment should verify if the activities are realistic, well defined and justified, if the output indicators are quantified and relevant. The assessment should also check the cross-border impact of the project, the level of involvement of project partners in activities, action plan and potential multiplier effect of the project. If there is no logic consistency, activities are not realistic, action plan is not clear or level of involvement of partners in activities is not balanced then this would lead to lower score under section 3;
- **Budget** (maximum 10 points) – assessment of the eligibility of costs and compliance of the expenditures with the market rates within the target region. The assessment should make a clear recommendation regarding the decreasing of the requested grant according to the identified ineligible or over-estimated costs.

The maximum overall score of a project proposal is **100 points**.

The assessment will be performed by equal number of Bulgarian and Macedonian assessors. Each proposal shall be assessed by two different assessors (one from each participating country) working separately and providing their own independent assessment grid with respective scores for each question, in accordance with the provided scale and guidelines in the grid.

The assessors will also make final conclusions/recommendations on each application, which will consist of a short analysis of the proposal, followed by a list of the main strong and weak points for each section of the evaluation grid.

In case of significant divergences in the scores attributed by the two external assessors for particular project proposal, additional assessment (arbitration) of the project must be performed. The additional assessment is carried out by two voting members of the AWG, appointed by the Chairperson, who fill in new evaluation grids for the proposal concerned. Arbitration is required when:

- The total scores given by the two external assessors diverge by more than 10 points;
- One external assessor's final score is above the threshold for overall admissibility of the proposal and the other external assessor's final score is below the threshold, independently of the discrepancy between the two scores.

When arbitration is done, the final score given to the proposal will be calculated as arithmetical average of the total scores given by the four evaluators.

Based on the performed assessment, lists of the proposals ranked by score (average of the two scores given by the assessors), shall be prepared for each Output Indicator, following the provisions stated in Attachment 2 - Fulfilment of Programme Indicators and Ranking of Project Proposals to the Guidelines for Applicants. Whereas a project contributes towards the achievement of more than one Output Indicator, the proposal shall be included in each of the ranking list for the respective Output Indicators.

In certain cases a situation may occur where a number of proposals receive the same overall score and at the same time they cannot be all proposed for financing (e.g. the proposals are close to the threshold for available funding under certain Output Indicators and funds are unavailable for financing all of them). In such cases, priority shall be given to those proposals that have received higher average scores on section 2 – Project's context and consistency with the Programme and other strategies. If the scores on section 2 are also identical, the step must be repeated using the average scores on section 3 (then section 1 and 4, if necessary), until ranking of the proposals is achieved

#### **⚠ WARNING**

In case a project proposal receives an **average of 0 points** (both external assessors give a score of 0) on any one of the **questions No 1, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16 and 17** from the technical and quality assessment grid below, the **proposal shall be proposed for rejection**.

TECHNICAL AND QUALITY ASSESSMENT GRID			
(to be filled by the Assessor)			
Project registration No:			
Lead Partner:			
Type of project:			
Partner/s:			
Project title:			
SECTION I: CAPACITY OF THE PARTNERSHIP			
No	Selection criteria	Max. score	Reference
1	<b>Project partners have authority to implement the project activities</b>	2	....
	<i>All project partners have authority to implement the project activities envisaged for each of them</i>	2 points	0 - rejected



	<i>Not all project partners have authority to implement the project activities, but the respective activities could still be implemented by the partnership</i>	<i>1 point</i>		
	<i>None of project partners has authority to implement the project activities</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
<b>2.</b>	<b>Composition of partnership is relevant to the proposed project</b>		<b>5</b>	<b>Part I p. 1.2</b>
	<i>All project partners have the necessary expertise to implement the project and complement each other</i>	<i>5 points</i>		
	<i>The partnership is relevant to the proposed project and partners complement each other although not all of them have the necessary expertise to implement the project</i>	<i>4 points</i>		
	<i>The partnership is relevant to the proposed project, but not all partners have necessary expertise to implement the project.</i>	<i>2 points</i>		
	<i>One of the partners is not relevant to the proposed project in view of its profile (it is artificially added to the partnership/its role is not clear)</i>	<i>1 point</i>		
	<i>The partnership is not relevant to the proposed project and none of the project partners has the necessary expertise to implement the project</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
<b>3.</b>	<b>The partners are experienced in project management of public funded projects, especially in the field addressed by this project</b>		<b>6</b>	<b>Part I p.1.3</b>
	<i>All project partners are experienced in project management of public funded projects, especially in the field addressed by this project</i>	<i>6 points</i>		
	<i>All project partners are experienced in project management of public funded projects, but not all of them in the field addressed by this project</i>	<i>5 points</i>		
	<i>All project partners are experienced in project management of public funded projects, but none in the field addressed by this project</i>	<i>4 points</i>		
	<i>Not all of the partners are experienced in project management of public funded projects</i>	<i>2 point</i>		
	<i>None of the partners is experienced in project management of public funded projects</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
<b>4.</b>	<b>Staff and financial stability of the project partners</b>		<b>2</b>	<b>Part I p.2.2</b>
	<i>All partners have permanent staff and financial stability</i>	<i>2 points</i>		
	<i>Some partners have permanent staff and financial stability</i>	<i>1 points</i>		

	None of the project partners has permanent staff and financial stability	0 points		
	SUBTOTAL SECTION I		15	
SECTION II: PROJECT'S CONTEXT AND CONSISTENCY WITH THE PROGRAMME AND OTHER STRATEGIES				
No	Selection criteria		Max. score	Reference
5.	The project is relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the border region		8	Part II p.1.3 p.3.1 p.3.2
	The envisaged activities in terms of needs of the border region are very well described and well justified: they are timely and appropriate	8 points		
	The envisaged activities are timely and appropriate, relevant to the particular need and constraints of the border region, but are not described in details	6 points		
	The envisaged activities in terms of needs of the border region are very well described and well justified, but they are not timely	4 points		
	The project activities are well described and justified, but the connection with the particular need and constraints of the border region is not clear	2 points		
	The project activities are not well described and justified, and the connection with the particular need and constraints of the border region is not clear	0 points		
6.	Cross-border impact of the project		8	Part II p.1.3  0 - rejected
	The project will have positive effect on the partners organizations, target groups and beneficiaries, and will bring a clear cross-border impact.	8 points		
	The project will have positive effect on the partners organizations, target groups and beneficiaries, but the envisaged activities do not complement each other and will not be implemented jointly	5 points		
	The project will have positive effect on the partners organizations, but the effect on the target groups and beneficiaries on both sides of the border area is not clear	3 points		
	The project will have positive effect on the partners organizations, target groups and beneficiaries, but the justification for the cross-border impact is	1 point		

	<i>unsufficient</i>			
	<i>The project will not have positive effect on the partners organizations, target groups and beneficiaries, and there will be no cross-border impact</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
<b>7.</b>	<b>The project contributes to the achievement of the Programme's output indicators</b>		<b>8</b>	<i>Part II p.3.2 p. 5.1</i>
	<i>The project contributes to the achievement of more than one Programme output indicator and there is clear evidence that the pointed quantities are reasonable</i>	<i>8 points</i>		
	<i>The project contributes to the achievement of one Programme output indicator and there is clear evidence that the pointed quantities are reasonable</i>	<i>6 points</i>		<i>0 - reject ed</i>
	<i>The project contributes to the achievement of one Programme output indicator and the pointed quantities are well justified</i>	<i>5 points</i>		
	<i>The project contributes to the achievement of one Programme output indicator, but there is no clear evidence that the pointed quantities are reasonable</i>	<i>3 points</i>		
	<i>Selected output indicators are not relevant to the project idea and proposed activities</i>	<i>0 point</i>		
<b>8.</b>	<b>Coherence of the project with European Union strategies concerning territorial cooperation and other programmes/ initiatives/ strategies at national/ regional level</b>		<b>2</b>	<i>Part II p.6.1</i>
	<i>The project demonstrates clear coherence with both European Union strategies concerning territorial cooperation and with other national/ regional strategy(ies)</i>	<i>2 points</i>		
	<i>The project demonstrates coherence with only European Union strategies concerning territorial cooperation, or programmes/ initiatives/ strategies at national/ regional level only.</i>	<i>1 points</i>		
	<i>The project does not demonstrate coherence with European Union strategies concerning territorial cooperation and with other programmes/ initiatives/ strategies at national/ regional level.</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
<b>9.</b>	<b>The target groups, direct and final beneficiaries are relevant to the project activities, clearly defined and quantified</b>		<b>5</b>	<i>Part II p.3.4</i>
	<i>Relevant, clearly defined and realistically quantified target groups, direct and final beneficiaries</i>	<i>5 points</i>		

	Relevant and clearly defined, but not realistically quantified target groups, direct and final beneficiaries	2 points		
	Partially relevant, not clearly defined and/or not realistically quantified target groups, direct and final beneficiaries	1 point		
	Undefined target groups, direct and final beneficiaries (lack of relevant description and lack of quantification)	0 points		
10.	<b>Multiplier effect of the project</b>		2	Part II p.5.2
	The project has clear and justified potential for further development.	2 points		
	The project has potential for further development, but the respective measures are not clearly defined.	1 point		
	The project does not possess potential for further development.	0 points		
11.	<b>The project makes positive contribution to the Programme horizontal principles: sustainable development, equal opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women</b>		2	Part II p. 6.3
	The project demonstrates clear coherence with at least 1 horizontal principle, and its contribution is evident from the planned activities and outputs.	2 points		
	The project demonstrates coherence with at least 1 horizontal principle, but it is not clearly integrated in the planned activities and outputs.	1 point		
	No coherence with the horizontal principles	0 points		
<b>SUBTOTAL SECTION II</b>			<b>35</b>	
<b>SECTION III: METHODOLOGY</b>				
No	Selection criteria		Max. score	Reference
12.	<b>Project activities are well defined, realistic, achievable and necessary for achievement of the set objectives</b>		8	Part II p.3.5.
	All project activities are necessary for achievement of the set objectives, clearly defined, described in details, realistic and achievable	8 points		
	The project activities are necessary for achievement of the set objectives, realistic and achievable, but are not described in enough details	6 points		0 - rejected
	The project activities are necessary for	4 points		

	<i>achievement of the set objectives, well defined, but the methods for achievement and are quite vague.</i>			
	<i>The project activities are described in details, but the link between the activities and expected results is not clear</i>	2 points		
	<i>The project activities are not well defined, poorly described and their achievement is unrealistic.</i>	0 points		
13.	<b>The intervention logic "project objective – activity – result/output" is kept</b>		8	Part II p.3.5. 0 - reject ed
	<i>The project is well-thought and structured in way that shows clear consistency between the project objectives, activities and expected results/outputs.</i>	8 points		
	<i>There is an overall consistency between the project objective, activities and expected results/outputs, but some project activities including expected results/outputs do not correspond to the project objectives</i>	5 points		
	<i>The connection between the activities and result/outputs is well defined, but the justification for achievement of the overall project objective is insufficient</i>	2 points		
	<i>The project shows lack of clear-thought structure and there is no consistency between the project objectives, activities and expected results/ outputs</i>	0 points		
14.	<b>Sustainability of the project's main results/ outputs</b>		8	Part II p. 3.5 p.5.3
	<i>Clear evidence for the institutional and/or financial sustainability of project's main results/ outputs and their long-term contribution to all targeted beneficiaries is presented</i>	8 points		
	<i>The institutional and/or financial sustainability of project's main results/ outputs is ensured for the short-term without any long-term strategy.</i>	4 points		
	<i>The project's main results/ outputs will be sustainable, but will be used only by the project partners</i>	2 points		
	<i>There is no evidence for the sustainability of the project's main results/ outputs</i>	0 point		
15.	<b>Communication and visibility activities</b>		4	Part II p.3.5 p.3.5. 1  0 –
	<i>The project envisages communication and visibility activities to wide audience (regional and national level)</i>	4 points		
	<i>The project envisages communication and visibility activities, but to restricted audience (local</i>	2 points		

	<i>community)</i>			<i>reject ed</i>
	<i>The project does not envisage communication and visibility activities</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
16.	<b>Action plan in accordance with the project activities</b>		4	<i>Part II p.3.6 0 - reject ed</i>
	<i>The action plan is realistic – the sequence and duration of activities is clear</i>	<i>4 points</i>		
	<i>The sequence and duration of activities is not well defined, but they could still be implemented within the timeframe of the project</i>	<i>2 points</i>		
	<i>The action plan is unachievable with neither the sequence, nor the duration of the activities realistic</i>	<i>0 points</i>		
17.	<b>Level of involvement and participation of project partners in activities</b>		8	<i>Part II p.3.5 p. 3.5.1</i>
	<i>All project partners are involved in implementation of the project activities, including participation in joint actions</i>	<i>8 points</i>		
	<i>All project partners are involved in implementation of the project activities, but not all of them participate in joint activities</i>	<i>6 points</i>		
	<i>All project partners are involved in implementation of the project activities, but participation in joint actions is not foreseen</i>	<i>4 points</i>		
	<i>Unbalanced distribution of activities and responsibilities between all project partners</i>	<i>2 points</i>		
	<i>Some of the project partners are not responsible for implementation of any project activities</i>	<i>0 point</i>		
<b>SUBTOTAL SECTION III</b>			<b>40</b>	
<b>SECTION IV: BUDGET</b>				
No	Selection criteria		Max. score	Reference
18.	<b>Estimated expenditures are necessary for the implementation of the project and the prices are realistic and market based</b>		5	Part III Table 2
	<i>All estimated costs fully correspond to the proposed activities and are necessary for the implementation of the project. All prices are realistic and market based. No budget reduction/revisions are needed.</i>	<i>5 points</i>		
	<i>Planned expenses correspond to the proposed activities and are necessary for the implementation of the project, but partial reductions (up to 10 % of</i>	<i>4 points</i>		



	the total project budget) of budget items and/or item prices is needed to optimize cost effectiveness.			
	Planned expenses correspond to the proposed activities and are necessary for the implementation of the project, but serious reduction of budget items and/or item prices (from 10 to 25 % of the total project budget) is necessary for optimizing the expenditure performance.	3 points		
	Project expenses highly exceed the expected benefits for the target area and the target groups. Some costs are not relevant to the activities proposed. A significant reduction of budget items and/or item prices (more than 25 % of the total project budget) is necessary.	2 points		
	Costs envisaged are totally inconsistent with project activities. Most prices are not realistic and not market based. The budget needs full re-design in this aspect.	0 points		
19.	<b>The specific rules for each budget line (as described in point 2.5.1 "Eligibility of expenditures" of the Guidelines for Applicants) are respected</b>		2	Part III Table 2
	The specific rules for each budget line are respected	2 points		
	Not all specific rules for each budget line are respected	1 point		
	None of the specific rules for each budget line are respected	0 points		
20.	<b>Budget breakdown between partners</b>		3	Part III Table 4
	Even budget breakdown between partners (in case one partner's budget exceeds the budget of another partner with up to 25%)	3 points		
	Balanced budget breakdown between partners (in case one partner's budget exceeds the budget of another partner from 25% to 50 %)	2 points		
	Unbalanced budget breakdown between partners (in case one partner's budget exceeds the budget of another partner from 50% to 80 %)	1 points		
	Unfair budget breakdown between partners (in case one partner's budget exceeds the budget of another partner by more than 80 %)	0 point		
	<b>SUBTOTAL SECTION IV</b>		<b>10</b>	
	<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>		<b>100</b>	

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

*Recommendation*

*Assessor's name:*

*Assessor's signature:*

*Date of evaluation:*

**👉 IMPORTANT**

Only projects with **total final score of 65 and above** at the technical and quality evaluation stage can be **proposed for financing**.