



**ENI
CBCMED**
Cooperating across borders
in the Mediterranean



Programme funded by the
EUROPEAN UNION



**REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA**

Call for strategic projects

Guidelines for Applicants

***Selection process and
main evaluation criteria***

Evaluation process

Consolidated features from the first call

- Submission of project proposals in **one stage**
(full project submitted on-line either in English or French within the deadline.)
- Evaluation in **two steps**
 - Step 1: Administrative check & Strategic evaluation
1st PSC meeting
 - Step 2: Operational evaluation
2nd PSC meeting
JMC approval

STEP 1

A. Administrative Check

B. Strategic Evaluation

- **RELEVANCE** (30 points) **Threshold: 18/30**
- **QUALITY OF DESIGN** (20 points) **Threshold: 12/20**

STEP 2

RELEVANCE (30 points)



Only the highest ranked proposals = total EU funds corresponding to twice the budget available will be admitted to STEP 2

- **OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY** (20 points- **12/20**)
- **EFFECTIVENESS** (20 points)
- **SUSTAINABILITY** (15 points)
- **COST EFFECTIVENESS** (15 points)

A. Operational evaluation

B. Eligibility verification – Hard Copies

TOTAL: 100 POINTS Threshold: 70/100

The evaluation process at a glance

One procedure - Two step evaluation

200/300 proposals

- Publication of the call
- Submission of Application Forms
- Administrative check
- Strategic evaluation (relevance + design)
- PSC meeting
- JMC decision

About 50 proposals

- Submission + verification of supporting documents
- Operational evaluation
- PSC meeting
- EC consultation
- JMC decision

About 23 projects
to be approved



Step
1

4 months

Step
2

5 months

JMC
award
decision

Month 9

Evaluation process

Administrative check

BEFORE SUBMITTING YOUR PROPOSAL, PLEASE CHECK THAT EACH OF THE FOLLOWING POINTS IS COMPLETED AND RESPECTS THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA FOR THE APPLICATION FORM:	To be filled in by the Applicant	
	Yes	No
ADMINISTRATIVE CHECK		
1. All requirements set out in Chapter 4 are fully met by the proposal		
2. The electronic or scanned version of the Declaration by the Applicant has been uploaded onto the online application system. It is on headed paper and/or stamped, dated and signed.		
3. All requested mandatory information is included in the Declaration by the Applicant.		
4. The electronic or scanned version of all the Partner Statements by the partners has been uploaded onto the system and they are: - on headed paper and/or stamped; - dated; - signed.		
5. All requested mandatory information is included in the Partner Statements.		
6. If an international organisations is foreseen in the proposal, the electronic or scanned version of the International Organisation Statement(s) has/have been uploaded onto the online application system: - on headed paper and/or stamped; - dated; - signed.		
7. All requested mandatory information in the International Organisation Statement(s) is included.		
8. If associated partners are foreseen in the proposal, the electronic or scanned version of the Associated Partner(s) Statement(s) has/have been uploaded onto the online application system: - on headed paper and/or stamped; - dated; - signed.		
9. All requested mandatory information in the Associated Partners Statements is included.		

Evaluation process

Administrative check

10. The following mandatory documents are filled in according to the format provided by the Programme and uploaded onto the e-Form: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Calculation of the administrative costs (for both Applicant and partners),- Financial Capacity Form (for both Applicant and partners),- State Aid Self-assessment check grid (for both Applicant and partners).		
11. Environmental screening: Section 3 of the e-Form is filled in (only for proposals under Programme Priorities 1.1; 1.2; 1.3; 4.1; 4.2; 4.3; 4.4)		



Step 1A: Administrative check of project proposal

Administrative check

LL: Under the ENPI CBC Med Programme, a relevant percentage of proposals failed in this step. The eAF is expected to reduce the number of applications rejected for administrative criteria, but you should:

R1. Devote a dedicated staff member in your team to check and collect requested documents (declarations). **DON'T WAIT UNTIL LAST MINUTE;**

R2. Read carefully the **Joint Operational Programme and the Guidelines** and share constraints with your potential partners BEFORE the final decision on the composition of the partnership: are the potential partners in the position to provide the requested information and documents?



REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA

Step 1B: Strategic evaluation (1/5)

Relevance – Max score 30 points (threshold 18/30)

1.1 Coherence with the Programme

Why and **how the project contributes to the selected thematic objective(s) and priority**. To what extent are **institutional capacity building and people-to-people cooperation** taken into account.

1.2 Common challenges

Analysis of the **problems and needs** at Mediterranean Sea Basin level to outline **how they are relevant for the territories involved**

1.3 CBC added value

The cross-border added value is clear as why cooperation is needed; what will be changed

1.4 Target groups

Needs of selected target groups and final beneficiaries are well addressed to get them fully involved

1.5 Innovation

Valuable, new and innovative solutions that go beyond the existing practices

1.6 Synergies

The **existing knowledge and results achieved** in the same sector / territories are considered to **foster synergies**

Step 1B: Strategic evaluation (2/5)

STEP 1 Relevance

LL: This award criterion is a key to success

R3. Describe the expected changes (1.3) and how the **institutional capacity building** and people-to-people cooperation will contribute to the achievement of your objectives (1.4) e.g.: *“by the end of the project, the mayors of the villages will be able to launch calls for proposals for the identification of new private houses to be part of the Community Hotel created under project X*

R4. Explain the “**Cross-Border Cooperation**” (CBC) added value (1.3): **ENI is a CBC Programme**, not a development cooperation initiative. Therefore, rather than clarifying only “why the project is needed” in a given area, **focus on cross-border approach** to achieve results.



REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA

Step 1B: Strategic evaluation (3/5)

STEP 1 Relevance

R5. Identify and quantify **target groups and final beneficiaries** (1.5), instead of including general statements (i.e. search for reliable source of information and include quantitative data).

R6. Explain how synergies and links with other initiatives in the cooperation area as well as their potentially far-reaching effects and benefits in the partners'

R7. Explain the operational synergies with other projects e.g.: *the survey carried out by project "X" will be helpful for ..., since ... instead of providing a list of project names* (1.8)

Step 1B: Strategic evaluation (4/5)

Quality of design – Max score 20 points (threshold 12/20)

2.1 Outputs, needs

Consistency of foreseen project outputs with the needs of the target groups

2.2 Result indicators

Quantification of the results indicators is realistic; results must be achievable with the planned financial resources

2.3 Partnership

Coherence of each partner's competences, experience and expertise with its planned contribution to the objectives, expected results and outputs

2.4 Outputs, results, planning

Output contribution to the achievement of the expected results and desired impact; time-frame for the delivery of the proposed outputs logically connected and realistically planned; external conditions / potential risks described

Step 1B: Strategic evaluation (5/5)

STEP 1 Quality of design

LL: Successful projects **think out-of-the-box** to design their logical frameworks. Focus on the Programme expected results and choose your innovative outputs

R9. Describe your outputs and consider that they must contribute to the Programme indicators (i.e. **at least one Programme expected result** and one output indicator)

R10. Explain the **competences** of each partner with respect to the EU and MPC scenario, and highlight complementarity within the partnership (2.3.3): The assessor of your proposal should be able to grasp: “*why this partner is necessary for the project*”

R11. Ensure **coherence** between **project outputs** and expected **results** within a realistic timeframe.



REGIONE AUTONOMA
DE SARDIGNIA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

Operational and financial capacity – Max score 20 points (threshold 12/20)

3.1 Role and tasks

Clear distribution of tasks within the partnership and **active contribution** of all partners to the achievement of the project objectives

3.2 Expertise

Complementarity of competences and expertise within the partnership

3.3 Management

Adequate management capacities (staff, requirement) of the Applicant and the partners to implement the project

3.4 Financial capacity

Adequate financial resources to ensure **cash-flows** throughout the project; consistency between the sum to be managed and actual financial capacity

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2

Operational and Financial Capacity

LL: The criterion with the lowest success rate in the previous calls

R.12. Demonstrate that **each** partner has a stable and sufficient financial capacity (FC) to ensure a positive cash-flow. Partners with insufficient financial capacity affect project evaluation; evidence of financial capacity is a self-statement to be filled in in the e-form.

R.13. Provide information on how partners complement each other (2.3.3), and what kind of working relations will be established (**who does what**)

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2

Focus on Financial Capacity

Companies

- **Dependency to grant** (the entity is financially autonomous)
- **Liquidity** (it has sufficient liquidity - is able to cover its short-term commitments)
- **Debt** (the entity is solvent - capable of covering its medium and long-term commitments).
- **Operating profit rate:** there is a positive operational profit

If Applicant: **private compaies** shall meet **3 out of the 4 criteria** above in order to be funded (proposal will be rejected on this sole basis)

If **partners** and they do not meet $\frac{3}{4}$ criteria, they will be considered at risk.



REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2

Focus on Financial Capacity

NGOs and no profit organizations

- **Dependency to grant** (the entity is financially autonomous)
- **Liquidity** (it has sufficient liquidity - is able to cover its short-term commitments)
- **Debt** (the entity is solvent - capable of covering its medium and long-term commitments).

If Applicant: **private no profit organizations** shall meet 2 out of the 3 criteria above in order to be funded; (the proposal will be rejected on this sole basis).
If **partners** and if they do not meet $\frac{3}{4}$ criteria, they will be considered at risk.

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

Effectiveness – Max score 20 points

4.1 Methodology

Clear and effective management and coordination methodology

4.2 Indicators

Realistic quantification of results indicators in relation to activities, concerned territories and target groups

4.3 Action plan

Logical (sequence), realistic and feasible action plan

4.4 Communication

Communication strategy effective (also from the financial point of view) to raise **awareness** of target groups and the general audience

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2 Effectiveness

LL: Poor project design means worse project management

R.14 Focus on **technical AND financial management** of your partners (e.g.: double entry bookkeeping system). Who is in charge for timely reporting?

Golden rule: no timely reporting = no money!

R.15 Identify the **PPs/staff in charge of ALL WPs** and able to support all reporting tasks and responsible for **procurement procedures** (i.e. draft of the intermediate/final reports), up to the end of the project implementation period (WP1). Limited attention to this task may severely delay project implementation

R.16 Describe the **internal monitoring arrangements** foreseen (5.1), who is in charge of it and how the monitoring influences the decision making system

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2 Effectiveness

LL: Poor project design means worse project management

R.17 Details the structure of the **communication strategy**, bearing in mind the new functionalities of the ENI CBC Med web site, cost effectiveness, the network of journalists you will involve, and the evaluation tools that you will apply to the communication strategy (WP2)

R.18 Explain the communication plan and **capitalization of results** in concrete terms: e.g. the launch of an association, membership to existing networks, the transfer of the management of infrastructures to local authorities, etc. (WP2)

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

Sustainability – Max score 15 points

5.1 Multiplier effects

Scale of multiplier effects (local, regional national, Mediterranean).
Effective actions to **transfer and capitalize** on the results

5.2 Sustainability

At financial, institutional, policy and environmental level

5.3 Policy impact

Impact on **policy-makers** and achieve **policy change**, policy learning or **policy innovation**

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2 Sustainability

LL: Projects tend to approach the **sustainability process** at the implementation phase rather than during the design

R.19 Describe the **multiplier effect at BOTH EU and MPC** level (6.1), rather than only on one side of the Mediterranean basin (6.2) from financial, technical and environmental aspects.

R.20 Explain the **practical arrangements** you envisage to implement, instead of making general statements without tangible evidences

R.21 Focus on **contribution** to policy development by describing:

- actions and strategies to ensure the transfer, capitalization and mainstreaming of results
- relevance of the **project to policy-makers** and potential **policy change, policy learning or policy innovation**



REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNIA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA

Step 2A: Operational evaluation (1/10)

Cost effectiveness – Max score 15 points

6.1 Work packages

Financial allocation per work package **consistent** with foreseen activities and **outputs**. Costs **realistic, necessary and justified**

6.2 Expected results

Satisfactory ratio between **expected results** and **costs**

6.3 Design of the budget

Logical distribution of budget among partners and along the project **to achieve the expected results** and ensure cash flows

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2 Cost-effectiveness

LL: Project designers tend to over-estimate project budget

R.22 Compute human resources allocation according to a “reasonable” balance with project activities and their duration. Keep in mind that under the ENI CBC Med Programme, **only ONE major amendment is allowed in project life time**

R.23 Allocate **financial resources** in relation to **outputs** and in accordance with **the contribution given by the partners**,

R.24 Keep in mind the **ratio** between **project cost** and **expected impact**

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2

Verification of eligibility

Eligibility, financial capacity, environmental and State aid checks only performed for proposals having reached the minimum quality threshold

LL: Some partners failed to fulfil the requirements declared in the previous steps, so affecting the entire partnership. The result was that some good project proposals were non-eligible due to this unfortunate last-minute short-coming

R.25 Before starting the application process, make sure that your partners are able to timely deliver the supporting documents. It is taken for granted that a dedicated professional in your team has already explained these requirements to the partners BEFORE the start of the application process



REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNIA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA

Step 2A: Operational evaluation

STEP 2

Supporting documents needed for the eligibility check

Upon request of the Managing Authority, only for short-listed project proposals:

Legal entity sheet, duly completed and signed by the Applicant

The statutes or articles of association of the **applicant** and the **partner organisations** proving their legal status

Composition of the **Management Board** or other relevant documents

The Partnership Agreement signed by the Applicant and all partners

The external audit official report on Applicant's and partners' annual accounts for the last 2 financial years *

*This does not apply to public administrations, public bodies (including bodies governed by public law) and international organisations.



**ENI
CBCMED**
Cooperating across borders
in the Mediterranean



Programme funded by the
EUROPEAN UNION



**REGIONE AUTÒNOMA
DE SARDIGNA
REGIONE AUTONOMA
DELLA SARDEGNA**

Any questions?