



Quality requirements for the 2nd Call

Horst Schindler
Project Officer

20 November 2023

Lead applicant webinar

Call for proposals



Quality criteria


- are linked to the specific objectives and results of the Danube Region Programme document
- are common to all priorities
- assessment will be carried out by the MAJS

Quality criteria groups:

- **Strategic assessment criteria:** contribution to the programme's objectives and to the programme's result
- **Operational assessment criteria:** viability and feasibility, value for money in terms of resources used against delivered outputs and results

Each criteria group is assessed on basis of different criteria with each being scored from 0 to 5 + a weighting system for certain criteria.

- **Strategic** assessment is carried out **first** and independently from the operational assessment
- Only projects successfully passing the strategic assessment are assessed operationally
- The knock-out threshold is set at 60%:
 - If a proposal receives a lower score than 60% in the strategic assessment, it will not be assessed operationally and it fails the overall assessment.
 - If a proposal receives at least 60% in the strategic assessment, then it will be assessed also from an operational point of view.
 - The final score (%) of the proposal will be given by the weighted sum of the strategic and operational assessment scores (%)
 - Strategic = 70% of the total score
 - Operational = 30% of the total score

What is assessed?	Criteria	Weight
Strategic	17	70%
Threshold at 60% 		
Operational	9	30%

Strategic relevance:

Relevance for the Programme

- The project's topic is in line with the selected Programme's SO. (weight 1,4)
- The project's IL is coherent with the Programme's one.

Common shortcomings:

- Project's topic does not meet the requirements of the the selected SO.
- The project's topic would be better fitting to another SO of the Programme.
- The project touches not just 1 SO of the Programme.

Strategic relevance:

Territorial needs and challenges

- Territorial needs and challenges are clearly and coherently described and addressed (weight 2)
- Capitalisation of relevant previous projects and synergies with on-going projects **AND** bringing added value to them is demonstrated
- The durability and transferability of the project's results are concretely described and supported.

Common shortcomings:

- General needs of the entire region are presented, without any specific project related information focussing on the targeted area by the project
- There is a mismatch between the described needs/ challenges and planned activities.
- There is no (clear) information about the status quo (past initiatives, relevant results of previous projects, added value).
- There is not enough concrete information about the provisions concerning durability and transferability.

Strategic relevance:

Intervention logic

- Coherent in terms of
 - the definition of the objectives, expected outputs and results
 - the link between the objectives expected outputs and results
 - the link between the needs of the target groups and the proposed outputs and results
- Envisaged activities can realistically reach the planned outputs and results

Common shortcomings

- IL lacks internal coherence.
- Described activities cannot logically lead to the achievement of the project objective.
- Described outputs cannot logically contribute to the achievement of the envisaged results.

- Project's **main objective** is too briefly described and/or using DRP CfP wording.
- Instead of the **main objective**, project activities are described.
- Project activities are mentioned instead of project **specific objectives**.
- Project **specific objectives** are not (entirely) coherent with the project activities.

- Project outputs are presented instead of defining the **project result**.
- **Project result** does not indicate the advantage of carrying out the project or it is not coherent with planned activities/ outputs.
- **Project outputs** are not sufficiently or clearly described.
- **Project outputs** do not seem achievable as a result of the planned activities.

- Project **activities** are not clearly and comprehensively described (the context in which they are implemented or their benefits/ importance are described instead).
- **Role of individual partners** is not clear (“all partners contribute”)

Strategic relevance:

Contributions to EU strategies and policies

- Relevant EU strategies/policies (other than EUSDR) of the thematic field - addressed and contributed to
- Relevant EUSDR Priority Area(s), targets – identified, contributed to and embedded in the proposal proposal (needs and challenges, synergy/capitalisation, work plan, durability and transferability)

Common shortcomings

- Unrelated **strategies** are mentioned or project's contribution thereto does not seem realistic.
- Inappropriate **EUSDR targets** are listed or project's contribution thereto does not seem realistic.
- There are no specific actions proving the **EUSDR embedding** in the proposal.

Strategic relevance:

Partnership composition

- Right mix of countries and competences for the project topic and its geographic focus, if relevant
- Role of partners is balanced and relevant for achieving the main objective
- Non-EU countries are involved (**weight 1,4**)

Common shortcomings

- Geographical coverage is limited even though the addressed topic is relevant for a wider area.
- Partners do not have the (most) appropriate competences to implement the planned activities.
- Some relevant sectors / levels of governance are missing.
- The partnership composition favours one/ two countries.
- Benefits of the involved countries vary to a significant extent.
- Partners' involvement is not coherent with their expertise.

Strategic relevance:

Transnational cooperation

- Project's transnational dimension and impact - demonstrated through geographical coverage, planned activities and outputs **(weight 2)**
- Added value of the transnational cooperation - clearly demonstrated in comparison to a national/ cross-border approach

Common shortcomings

- Project activities are not jointly implemented or they are not harmonised.
- Project's transnational impact is limited due to a restricted geographical area covered by the partnership.
- Project outputs do not have a transnational impact (local/ national relevance).
- The added value of the transnational cooperation is not clearly demonstrated.

Strategic relevance:

Target groups/durability&transferability / horizontal principles

- Relevant target groups – clearly identified, listed and involved
- Integration and use of project outputs by the target group (weight 1,6)
- Contribution to the programme's horizontal principles – coherent with the overall territorial needs and with the programme's and project's objectives (weight 0,6)

Common shortcomings

- Inappropriate target groups are mentioned.
- It is not clear how the target groups will adopt/ use the project outputs.
- Project's contribution to the horizontal principles is not presented in the light of actual activities.

Operational relevance:

Work plan

- Timetable and spending forecast – realistic and coherent (**weight 3**)
 - Clear link between the activities/outputs
 - Achievable activities and outputs
 - Readiness to be implemented
- Activities – described in detail (how, where, when and by whom) and balanced in terms of geographical implementation (**weight 2**)

Common shortcomings

- Time plan is not realistic (act. too short/ long) or not coherent (sequence is illogical).
- Work plan is not coherent
- The project does not seem to be ready for the implementation.

Operational relevance:

Project management

- Management structure – clear, transparent, efficient and effective (**weight 2**)
- Lead Applicant's capacity (knowledge and resources) to manage EU co-financed projects demonstrated **OR** adequate measures for management support ensured

Common shortcomings

- Managing structures are not proportionate to the needs of the project or tasks are not clear.
- Effective internal communication is not apparent.
- Quality management structure is missing or procedures are not clear.
- LA is less experienced in implementing/ coordinating EU projects (esp. ETC) or lacks necessary capacities to manage the project.

Operational relevance:

Communication

- Communication objectives are clearly linked to the project specific objectives **(weight 3)**
- Communication activities and deliverables are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders. **(weight 2)**

Common shortcomings

- Communication activities (incl. strategies, communication channels) are not well tailored to project objectives, activities, outputs, type of addressed stakeholders or target groups
- Not all PPs are involved in communication activities

Operational relevance:

Project budget

- Budget allocated to each activity is justified and quantified (weight 3)
- Budget of each cost category (based on real costs) is coherent with the planned activities and involved partners (weight 2)
- Partners' budget is consistent with their involvement in the activities (weight 2)

Common shortcomings

- Budget is inappropriately distributed per PP/ Act. / SO/cost category/reporting period
- Amount allocated to External Expertise is too high - raising the question of the relevance of the respective partner in the project
- Requested amounts for equipment or infrastructure and works are not justified by planned activities.

Final scores:

- Proposals scoring overall less than 60% will be recommended by the MAJS for rejection.
- Proposals scoring overall over 60% will be subject to further discussions and a final decision will be taken by the MC.
- Final decision on financing the proposals will be taken by the MC based on the results of the technical assessment, the ranking list and the funds available.

Thank you for your attention!



Horst Schindler
Coordinator Energy &
Transport

horst.schindler@interreg-danube.eu