



HELLENIC REPUBLIC
MINISTRY OF ECONOMY, DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM

Project Selection Criteria

Cooperation Programme

Interreg (V-A)

Greece-Italy 2014-2020



Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	3
1.1	Selection Procedure of Operations	3
2	Evaluation Procedure	4
2.1	1st phase: Administrative and eligibility requirements	4
2.2	2nd phase: Quality assessment of the projects	4
2.3	Scoring	5
2.4	Resolution of complaints.....	7
2.5	Confidentiality and independence	7
3	Sets of criteria.....	9



Edited by the Programme 's Managing Authority
Thessaloniki, Greece. The Programme 's Managing Authority is
hosted by Managing Authority of European Territorial Programmes
which is an integral part of the Greek Ministry of Economy,
Development and Tourism

Electronic document, available for download at www.interreg.gr

1 Introduction

The present guide describes the Project Selection Procedure (including the Criteria) for the 1st Call for ordinary Project Proposals in the framework of the Cooperation Programme Interreg (V-A) EL-IT - Greece-Italy 2014-2020 and illustrates clearly and transparently the project selection procedure. This procedure is made public in order to make all stakeholders and project potential beneficiaries aware of the selection procedure and criteria before preparing their applications.

1.1 Selection Procedure of Operations

Potential beneficiaries prepare a proposal in cooperation with the Lead Beneficiary, who submits the proposal to the Joint Secretariat (JS).

After submission, each project proposal will be evaluated based on selection criteria and will be subject to a two-phase selection procedure, carried out by the Joint Secretariat (JS):

- 1) Administrative and eligibility requirements
- 2) Quality assessment

In case specific, scientific and/or technical expertise is required the JS Coordinator, with the consent of MA and the approval of the MC, may ask for the assistance of external experts during the quality assessment of the proposals, as referred to in the Cooperation Programme Interreg (V-A) EL-IT - Greece-Italy 2014-2020 (see sections: “Guiding principles for the selection of operations” and “Development and Selection of operations”). External experts don’t substitute the JS assessors and their role is purely advisory and consultative. The procedure and the criteria for the selection of these experts will be mutually agreed by the participating countries and will be approved by the Monitoring Committee (MC). The cost for the engagement of those experts will be covered by the Technical Assistance Budget of the Programme. Furthermore, it should be ensured that they have the demanded experience and the scientific qualifications and that they don’t have any conflict of interest. The JS officers, will examine three different sets of criteria (administrative compliance, eligibility criteria and quality assessment), in two phases in order to make a decision on the projects’ approval. The evaluation of each project shall be carried out by two assessors according to the “four-eye” principle.

2 Evaluation Procedure

2.1 1st phase: Administrative and eligibility requirements

Projects will be checked for their **administrative compliance** and **eligibility criteria**, in order to ensure that they fulfil the administrative and eligibility requirements of the Programme. This is an on-off procedure. Projects, which fail to fulfil the above requirements of the Programme, will be excluded from the 2nd phase check.

- **Administrative compliance:** It confirms that a proposal has been submitted by the deadline set through the MIS; the Application Form has been submitted through the format specified in the Call, is complete and meets all the requirements set in the respective Call; all the required documents have been submitted through the MIS.
- **Eligibility criteria:** This set of criteria examines whether the proposal fulfils the requirements for being eligible for funding by the Programme. These requirements are, for instance, the eligible structure of the cross-border partnership, the general compatibility with the Programme objectives and principles, the co-financing requested, the duration of the project etc. Proposals that do not fulfil the eligibility criteria will be rejected.

2.2 2nd phase: Quality assessment of the projects

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 concludes with a ranking list of all the project proposals that have passed successfully the 1st phase. During this phase, proposals are evaluated using **core selection criteria**. These entail evaluating the nature of the proposed project, its relevance with and contribution to the achievement of the specific objectives of the Programme, its viability, sustainability and results in the eligible territory, the cross border cooperation and capitalization, the quality of the cross-border partnership, as well as the monitoring and management methodology proposed, information and communication actions and planning of the budget.

The Core selection criteria are divided into:

- **Project Quality (Content related criteria)** (relevance of the proposal, quality of the results, impact and sustainability, innovation, cross border cooperation and capitalization) and

- **Implementation related criteria** (quality of the partnership, quality of the methodological approach, budget and finance).

The different sets of criteria are presented below:

2.3 Scoring

The below 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 obtain is **100 points**. Quality criteria are closely linked to the nature and objectives of the INTERREG V-A Greece-Italy 2014-2020 Cooperation Programme and are common to all Priority Axes.

The Joint Secretariat carries out the evaluation of proposals in the basis of these selection criteria, as approved by the Monitoring Committee.

The submitted project proposals will be evaluated by **two JS assessors**. The final score of the proposals will be defined in the following way:

- for evaluations with a difference equal or up to 10 points in the score of the 2 JS assessors, the average score will be calculated and will define the final score obtained.
- for evaluations with a difference higher than 10 points, a third evaluation will take place. This will be executed by the JS Coordinator and the average score given by the three assessors (2 JS assessors and the JS Coordinator) will be calculated and will define the final score obtained.

The Managing Authority will ensure that the evaluation procedure is carried out in accordance to the requirements of the Call for projects and the approved selection criteria. Then the JS, with the consent of the Managing Authority, submits the following documentation to the Monitoring Committee:

- 1) The fiches of the submitted project proposals, summarizing the most important information about the project proposals
- 2) The ranking list of all evaluated project proposals
- 3) All the evaluation forms of the 1st and 2nd phase checks

The project proposals are ranked according to the results obtained in the evaluation procedure. They are divided into two categories (based on the budget available and the results of the evaluation):

- 1) Project proposals to be rejected during the 1st phase
- 2) Project proposal that were evaluated during the 2nd phase. For these project proposals a ranking list will be prepared indicating the score of each project. The Managing Authority on the basis of the ranking list and taking into account the budget allocated to the call will propose to the MC the projects for approval.

To be proposed for financing by the Programme, a project must meet all the below mentioned requirements:

- i. obtain a total rating score equal or higher than the minimum score allowing a project to be financed (**60 points**),
- ii. be in line with all the requirements of the budget available for each thematic objective as stated in the Call for proposals,

After drawing up a list with the proposed projects per Specific Objective, where at least one project has to be financed per Specific Objective with the highest value score. After ensuring the financing of one proposal per S.O a ranking list will be created per priority axis.

A reserve list of alternate projects can be drawn up per Priority Axis. The remaining available budget per Priority Axis of the Programme can be used to finance the proposed alternate projects. The alternate projects could be financed by the Programme in case of budget savings either due to approved projects' de-commitment/withdrawal, or due to the non contracting of projects under future calls (including non-publication of future calls), etc. The selection of a project from the reserve list of alternate projects will be made on the basis of its ranking and the marking it received under the specific Priority Axis.

In case of equal scoring of two or more project proposals, while the available budget is not enough to fund all of them, the JS/MA will present the advantages and disadvantages of each proposal to the members of the MC, taking into consideration the remaining budget and the contribution to the Programme indicators.

The Monitoring Committee selects the projects to be funded. All the Lead beneficiaries of the submitted project proposals will be informed in writing on the results obtained on the performance of the 1st and 2nd phase checks after the completion of the decision procedure of the Monitoring Committee.

If a proposal is accepted under conditions, the Managing Authority will have to check that these conditions are taken into account before Subsidy Contracts are signed with the competent Authorities.

2.4 Resolution of complaints

Project Lead Applicants will have the possibility to submit to MA complaints related to decisions of project assessment and selection.

A procedure will be set up in the relevant programme documents and will be communicated to applicants and beneficiaries. All complaints are submitted to MA.

Complaints regarding the selection of operations:

The two Member States shall set up a joint, separate an independent from the Monitoring Committee, committee for the review of any complaint addressed to the Managing Authority regarding the selection of operations made by the Monitoring Committee under the given call for proposals.

This Joint Complaint Committee will be formed by two participants of the Managing Authority and two representatives of the JS. It will evaluate the relevant complaints and give an opinion to the Monitoring Committee that will take the final decision.

The Managing Authority will send this decision to the interested parties and inform the applicants about their judicial rights under Greek law. All relevant procedures will be covered by Greek law since Greece hosts the Managing Authority of the Programme and any case will fall under the jurisdiction of the Greek Courts.

2.5 Confidentiality and independence

Project proposals and Application Forms submitted by project applicants will be kept confidential. The content of project proposals and application forms should not be published or forwarded to persons or institutions, which are not directly engaged in the applications assessment procedure or decision making. The project idea itself, as well as the description and concept of the project and the structures of the applications remain the property of the project applicants.

All actors included (MC members, MA/JS, assessors and external experts) participating in the assessment procedure have to guarantee that the privacy and confidentiality of all applications submitted in the framework of the call for proposals will be kept and that all national privacy laws and EU Directive related to the protection of personal data (95/46/EC) will be respected.

It is not allowed to forward applications and assessment documents to actors outside the regular assessment procedure, particular not to project applicants or the wider public.

Furthermore the MC members, JSC members, MA/JS, assessors and external experts will declare that they do not have a conflict of interest and/or political influence. All actors involved in assessment, evaluation and selection must sign a declaration of Confidentiality.

3 Sets of criteria

The different sets of criteria are presented below:

PHASE A : ADMINISTRATIVE COMPLIANCE

Project Identification	
CBC PROGRAMME	INTERREG V-A "GREECE-ITALY 2014-2020"
PRIORITY AXIS	
THEMATIC OBJECTIVE	
INVESTMENT PRIORITY	
SPECIFIC OBJECTIVE	
CALL CODE	
LEAD BENEFICIARY	
PROJECT TITLE	
PROJECT ACRONYM	
PROJECT REFERENCE NUMBER	

1. ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA (YES/NO)				
Nr	Criteria	Compliance		Comments
		YES	NO	
A1.1	The Application Package has been uploaded / submitted, by the set deadline, according to the Call.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.2	The Application Form has been submitted via MIS in the official format, properly filled in, using the official language of the programme (English).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

A1.3	The Justification of Budget in the required MS excel format has been uploaded, as well as all other obligatory Application Documents in scanned/pdf format.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4	All obligatory Application Documents have been uploaded / submitted in digital version using the Call templates and the required language (i.e –in English, except the supporting documents concerning a) the eligibility of beneficiaries and b) readiness of project activities, which can be submitted in the national languages of the two participating countries).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4.1	The Partnership Declaration correctly filled in and duly signed and stamped by the legal representative of the participating beneficiaries.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4.2	The Co-financing Statement and declaration of non double financing correctly filled in and duly signed and stamped by the legal representative of each Beneficiary.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4.3	The declaration of not generating revenues, correctly filled in and duly signed and stamped by the legal representative of the Lead Beneficiary; or in case of revenue generating projects a cost-benefit analysis is attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4.4	The project readiness sheet correctly filled in and duly signed and stamped by the legal representative of Lead Beneficiary.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4.5	Beneficiaries' documents for bodies governed by public law and private organizations as stated in the call text.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A1.4.6	The documentation of proving the existence of branch within the programme area (if applicable)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA (YES/NO)				
Nr	Criteria	Compliance		Comments
		YES	NO	
A2.1	The proposed activities and the project objectives are in-line with the Programme's Thematic objectives, Investment Priorities and their Specific Objectives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.2	The project beneficiaries cooperate ¹ in the:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	1. Development of the operation (mandatory)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	2. Implementation of the operation (mandatory)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	3. Staffing of the operation and /or	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	4. Financing of the operation (the fulfillment of one of the conditions 3 or 4 should be also mandatory)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.3	The Lead Beneficiary and its beneficiaries fall under the eligible categories of beneficiaries according to the call for proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.4	The project budget, size and costs are in line with the Call for proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.5	The duration of the project is in line with the limits set in the call for proposals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.6	The project proposal fulfils minimum and maximum requirements for partnership (i.e. number of beneficiaries and countries involved)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.7	The Lead Beneficiary does not participate, as Lead Beneficiary in more than one (1) project proposal under the same Specific Objective.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.8	Does the project contribute to the Programme's horizontal principles:			

¹ According to Regulation (EU) No 1299/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 17 December 2013 on specific provisions for the support from the European Regional Development Fund to the European territorial cooperation goal, Article 12, paragraph 4: "Beneficiaries shall cooperate in the development and implementation of operations. In addition, they shall cooperate in the staffing or the financing of operations, or in both."

	promotion of equal opportunities and non- discrimination (including provision of accessibility for persons with disabilities);	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	promotion of sustainable development;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	promotion of equality between men and women;	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
A2.9	The project activities are not physically completed or fully implemented before the application for funding is submitted (Reg. 1303/2013, article 65, par. 6).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Assessor 1	Name	
	Signature	
	Date	
Assessor 2	Name	
	Signature	
	Date	

PHASE B: PROJECT QUALITY

B.1 Content - related Criteria	Number of criteria	Max points
B.1.1 Relevance of the proposal	4	20
B.1.2. Cross Border Co-operation and Capitalization	2	8
B.1.3. Quality of Results-Efficiency and effectiveness	2	15
B.1.4. Sustainability	1	8
B.1.5. Innovation	1	3
<u>Total</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>54</u>

B.2 Implementation – related Criteria	Number of criteria	Max points
B.2.1.Quality of the Partnership	3	12
B.2.2 Managerial Quality	2	7
B.2.3. Quality of Methodological Approach	3	16
B.2.4. Budget and Funding	2	11
<u>Total</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>46</u>

PHASE B: PROJECT QUALITY					
B.1 Content - related Criteria					
Criteria	Sub-Criteria	Analysis	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
B.1.1 Relevance of the proposal	B.1.1.1 Does the proposal contribute significantly to the achievement of the specific objectives of the investment priorities and the corresponding thematic objectives?	0=None	B. 1.2		
		1=Partially - general description of project's objectives with partial documentation			
		3=Satisfactorily- fairly substantiated the feasibility of the project and its contribution to the achievement of the specific objectives of the investment priorities and the corresponding thematic objectives.			
		5=extensively - clearly substantiated the feasibility of the project and its contribution to the achievement of the specific objectives of the investment priorities and the corresponding thematic objectives.			
	B.1.1.2. Is the project consistent with one or more cross-cutting themes (investing in education skills and lifelong learning, strengthening institutional capacity and efficiency of public administration) of the Programme?)	0=None	B. 8.1		
		3= Barely (one)			
		4= Fairly (one and barely two)			
		6= Fully (two)			
	B.1.1.3. Does the proposal promote synergies with the EU/ Regional/National/Local strategies	0=None	B.8.2		
		1=Barely (One)			
		2= Fairly (One-Two and other Programmes)			
		4=Fully at all levels			

	B.1.1.4. Does the proposal contribute to the macro- regional strategy of EUSAIR?	0=None	B.8.3		
		1= Bare contribution			
		3= Partial contribution			
		5= Strong contribution			
	Total (Max. 20)				

B.1.2. Cross Border Co- operation and Capitalization	B.1.2.1. Does the project demonstrate clearly the need for cross border approach to the addressed topic? (Is there a real demand for the project? Does it address common cross border challenges and opportunities in the Programme area?). Does it demonstrate a benefit for both sides of the border?	0=None	B.1.1, B.7.1, B.7.2		
		1=Barely			
		2= Partially			
		3= Satisfactorily			
		6=Extensively			
	B.1.2.2. To what extent does the project capitalize previous cooperation and experience, especially in the Programme area?	0=None	B.7.3		
		1= Small or Medium			
		2=High			
	Total (Max. 8)				

B.1.3. Quality of Results-Efficiency and effectiveness	B.1.3.1.Are the project results specific, measurable, achievable, realistic and time-bound?	0=None	B.1.3 , B.1.4 and section F		
		1=Barely (1 characteristic)			
		2= Partially (2 characteristics)			
		4=Satisfactorily (3 characteristics)			
		8=extensively (4 or 5 characteristics)			
	B.1.3.2.Do the project results create real added value within the areas of intervention? Do they link to the economic, social and environmental indicators?	0=None	B.1.1, B.7.1		
		1=Barely (added value and no reference to indicators)			
		2= Partially (added value and vague reference to some indicators)			
		4=Satisfactorily (added value and concrete reference to some indicators)			
		7=extensively (It is well documented with reference to specific indicators -economic indicators, unemployment, social indicators, educational indicators etc- that the project creates an added value to the area of intervention)			
	Total (Max .15)				

B.1.4. Sustainability	B.1.4.1 Is there a realistic possibility for the sustainability in order the project to continue to be sustainable after the end of the eligible period?	0= None (No prospect)	B.1.3 and B.1.4		
		2=Low prospect of sustainability			
		5=Medium prospect of sustainability			
		8= Strong prospect of sustainability			
	Total (Max. 8)				

B.1.5. Innovation	B.1.5.1 Does the project proposal contain innovative features (new ideas, more effective devices or processes: new solutions, new technologies, and new products)?	0=None	B.1		
		1= Partially (limited reference)			
		2= Satisfactorily (not adequate documentation)			
		3=Extensively (clear reference)			
	Total (Max. 3)				
TOTAL For Category “Content Related Criteria” (Max. 54)					

B.2 Implementation – related Criteria					
Criteria	Description	Analysis/comments	Reference to the AF	Score	Comments
B.2.1.Quality of the Partnership	B.2.1.1. Does the proposed partnership exhibit wide and balanced geographic coverage?	0=No	B.2.1, B.2.4 ,B 2 5		
		1= Partially			
		2= Satisfactorily			
		4=Extensively			
	B.2.1.2. Does the partnership contain suitable beneficiaries subject to the roles they will be involved for the successful implementation of the project?	0=No	B.2.1, B2.4 B3.1		
		1= Partially			
		2= Satisfactorily			
		4=Extensively			
	B.2.1.3. To what extent are the specific roles (actions and responsibilities) clearly and appropriately distributed among the Lead Beneficiary and the other beneficiaries?	0=No	B.2		
		1= unclear roles and improper distribution			
		2=clear roles improper distribution or vice versa			
		4=Clear roles and clear distribution in relation to capacity			
Total (Max. 12)					

B.2.2 Managerial Quality	B.2.2.1. Does the Lead Beneficiary demonstrate the capacity (managerial, steering, administrative, etc) to coordinate, manage control and monitor the overall project implementation (previous experience completed projects)?	0=None	B.3.1, B.3.2		
		1=Low (almost all project activities assigned to external experts and no prior experience)			
		2=Adequate (partly own staff and mainly external experts and some prior experience)			
		5=High (mainly own staff and only specialized needs to external experts)			
	B.2.2.2 To what extent is appropriate project management clearly demonstrated?	0=None	B.3.2		
		1=Low (Basic management procedures)			
		2=High (Very well developed management connected to outputs and results)			
Total (Max. 7)					

B.2.3. Quality of Methodological Approach	B.2.3.1. Is the structure and methodology of the proposal clear and coherent enough to lead to tangible and visible results? Is there consistency between the project activities and the anticipated project objectives, the expected outputs and attainment of results?	0= No Coherence	B.1, B.2		
		3= Generally described interconnection between project activities and the anticipated project objectives, the expected outputs and attainment of results.			
		6=Clearly described interconnection between project activities and the anticipated project objectives, the expected outputs and attainment of results.			
	B. 2.3.2. How ready is the project (in which stage of completion are the administrative procedures that allow the implementation of the project (licenses, designs, permits,	0= No readiness	B.5		
		1=Basic implementation of required procedures	Documentation for Infrastruct		

	land acquisition etc.)		ure Projects		
		3= Advanced stage of implementation of required procedures			
		5= All necessary required procedures completed –all approvals obtained			
	B.2.3.3. To what extent are the communication activities appropriate efficient and well-structured to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?	0= No communication Strategy	B.4		
		1= General description of communication strategy not clearly related to project outputs and results nor oriented to target groups			
		3= Good description of communication strategy related to project outputs and results but not oriented to target groups			
		5=Clear and concise description of communication strategy towards specific target groups and related to outputs and results			
	Total (Max. 16)				

B.2.4. Budget and Funding	B.2.4.1. To what extent is the proposed budget well justified and explained?	3= Insufficiently justified/explained budget	B.1.4, Section D, Justification of Budget		
		4= Basically justified/explained budget			
		6=well justified/explained budget			
	B.2.4.2. Is the budget logically planned and distributed among the beneficiaries and the activities?	2= Partially balanced budget	B.2.1, B.2.2, Section D, Justification of Budget		
		5= Fully balanced budget			
	Total (Max. 11)				
TOTAL For Category “Implementation Related Criteria” (Max. 46					

Evaluation Summary	Overview graph
Project Content Quality:	
Project Implementation Quality:	

Assessor 1	Name	
	Signature	
	Date	
Assessor 2	Name	
	Signature	
	Date	
JS Coordinator	Name	
	Signature	
	Date	