



**POLAND - RUSSIA**  
CROSS-BORDER  
COOPERATION PROGRAMME  
2014-2020



PROGRAMME  
IS CO-FINANCED  
BY THE EUROPEAN UNION

Approved  
by the Joint Monitoring Committee  
of the ENI Cross-border Cooperation Programme Poland-Russia 2014-2020  
on April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2017

# Application Form administrative and eligibility check and quality assessment criteria

## Administrative and eligibility criteria

I.1	Meeting the AF submission requirements:	Reference point
1.	The AF was submitted on-line before the application deadline	submission date
2.	The unique identification number has been attributed to the AF by the Programme e-application)	AF
3.	The AF is in English	AF
4.	All applicable sections of the AF are filled in	
5.	All required supporting documents (Annexes A1-A15) are included. Supporting documents are valid and in compliance with Polish / Russian legal system (if relevant)	PM / annexes
6.	The Declaration by the lead beneficiary has been signed by the head of the organisation or another authorised person(s) (in this case the authorisation is enclosed) and has been attached as a scan	Declaration by the lead beneficiary / Annex 4 A1(A)
7.	The separate Partnership statement has been filled in and signed by the head of each beneficiary organization (except for the lead beneficiary) or another authorised person(s) (in this case the authorisation is enclosed) and attached as a scan	Annex 4 A1(B) (Partnership statements)
II.1	Compatibility with Programme TOs and priorities:	
1.	The project is covered by the Programme TO/priority open in the CfPs (the project can only be attributed to a single TO/priority)	AF (pp. 1.1, 1.2)/ PM
2.	The overall/specific objectives of the project correspond to the TO and priority selected by the lead beneficiary	AF (p. 2.3)/ PM
3.	The overall/specific objectives of the project will contribute to the achievement of at least one Programme result indicator	AF (p. 3.1, 3.4.2)/ JOP (p. 2.3)
4.	The project will add to the achievement of at least one of the output indicators from the list defined in the PM	AF (p. 3.4.1)/ PM
II.2	Partnership eligibility	

5.	The partnership composition is eligible - the project will be implemented by at least one beneficiary from Poland and one from Russian Federation)	AF (p. 9 and 10)/ PM
6.	It is declared that at least three out of four cooperation criteria has been met by the project proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ joint project preparation (obligatory)</li> <li>▪ joint project implementation (obligatory)</li> <li>▪ joint project staff (optional)</li> <li>▪ joint project financing (optional)</li> </ul>	AF (p. 7.3 and 7.4)
7.	One beneficiary out of project partners plays the role of the lead beneficiary and meets the criteria required in this regard.	AF (p. 9, 11)/ PM
<b>II.3</b>	<b>Eligibility of beneficiaries</b>	
8.	The lead beneficiary and all beneficiaries meet the eligibility criteria listed in point 2.2 of the PM.	AF (p. 9, 10), A2, A6 of each beneficiary/ PM
<b>II.4</b>	<b>Eligibility of the project and costs</b>	
9.	The project is eligible under criterion of its location (in the Programme area or partially outside the Programme area).	PM / AF (pp. 1.11, 3.3, budget)
10.	The duration of the project is equal to or lower than 24 months and all project activities will be completed by the end of 2022	AF (p. 1.8)
11.	The requested Programme contribution is within the range of 100 000 – 2 500 000 EUR	AF (p. 1.9, budget)
12.	Amount allocated to acquisition of infrastructure is lower than 2 500 000 EUR	AF (budget)
13.	The project has been correctly classified in both categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ soft, investment or infrastructure</li> <li>▪ integrated, symmetrical or single-country</li> </ul>	PM / AF (p. 1.10)
14.	The requested Programme contribution is equal to or lower than 90% of the total eligible costs. The lead beneficiary's (and beneficiaries', if applicable) financial contribution is equal to or higher than 10% of the total eligible costs (minimum percentage required)	AF (p. 1.9, budget) / A4
15.	The revenue to be generated by the project is properly calculated and does not exceed 10% of total eligible project costs	AF (p. 4.4, budget)
16.	The costs are not regarded as ineligible according to chapter 6 of the PM. The costs are properly calculated.	PM / AF (budget)
17.	The administrative costs do not exceed 7% of the total direct eligible costs excluding costs incurred in relation to the provision of infrastructure.	AF (budget)
18.	Based on the description of the activities and the lead beneficiary's declaration it is not likely that the project constitutes state aid <sup>1</sup>	AF (p. 3.3, 4.3)
19.	Lack of overlapping or duplication with other programmes/other donors financing (e.g. EU programmes, EEA Financial Mechanism and Norwegian Financial Mechanism, Swiss-Polish Cooperation Programme)	AF (p. 4.2)
20.	The project ensures equal treatment of persons with disabilities (i.e. ensures the accessibility to information about the project and participation in the project events)	AF (p. 2.5)

<sup>1</sup> If it cannot be defined by the JTS that the project does not constitute state aid the AF shall be examined by a state aid expert.

FINAL ASSESSMENT:	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
COMMENTS		

## Quality assessment criteria

### Strategic assessment criteria

Assessment questions	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project...	Reference point	Numerical assessment
1. Project's context (relevance and strategy)	a) The problems and needs that justify the necessity of project implementation are precisely defined and described	AF (p. 2.1)	/5
<i>How well is a need for the project justified?</i>	b) The project proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>is relevant to the particular identified problems/needs</li> <li>is relevant to particular constraints of the target regions</li> <li>is likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups</li> </ul>	AF (pp. 2.1, 2.4, 3.3)	/3+3+3 (9)
	c) The project demonstrates added value to implementation of the Programme strategy and relevant national/regional strategies.	AF (p. 2.2)	/5
	d) The project is relevant to the <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>particular TO (including also specific added value elements, such as promotion of gender equality, human rights, democracy, environmental sustainability, struggle against HIV/AIDS, where relevant) (5 point)</li> </ul>	AF (pp. 2.3, 2.5, 3.3)	/ 5
2. Cooperation character	The project contributes to the strengthening of cross-border cooperation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the results benefits both sides of the border</li> <li>there is a clear benefit from cooperating in the proposed project partnership (results cannot be fully achieved without cooperation in proposed partnership)</li> <li>the project creates the basis to develop cross-border cooperation</li> <li>partners share their experience, methods, models, data, ideas, know-how, knowledge etc.</li> </ul>	AF (pp. 2.4, 3.3)	/4+4+4+4 (16)
3. Project's contribution to Programme's expected results and outputs	a) The project's implementation will contribute to the achievement of Programme output and result indicators b) The project indicators have been properly chosen and are adequate to the project activities and goals	AF (pp. 3.3, 3.4, A8)	/10
<i>To what extent will the project contribute to the achievement of Programme's objectives?</i>	<b>Note:</b> a score of 10 (very good) may only be allocated if the project includes at least one output indicator presented in the JOP.		
4. Partnership relevance	a) The project involves the relevant partners needed to implement the project	AF (pp. 7.1 and 7.2), budget	/4

<i>To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project?</i>	b) All partners play a defined role in the partnership and get a real benefit from it	AF (pp. 7.1 and 7.2), budget	/3
	c) The roles have been assigned to specific partners according to the organizations' competences	AF (pp. 7.1 and 7.2), budget	/3
<b>Total score</b>			<b>/60</b>

## Operational assessment criteria

Assessment questions	Guiding principles for the assessment → To what extent does the project...	Reference point	Numerical assessment
1. Management  <i>To what extent are management structures and procedures in line with the project size, duration and needs?</i>	a) The lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries have sufficient experience of project management	AF (pp. 9.2 and 10.2, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries)	/2
	b) The lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries demonstrate sufficient technical expertise and management capacity, including staff, equipment, knowledge and ability to handle the budget of the project	AF (pp. 9.2, 9.3, 10.2 and 10.3, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries), A1 and A3	/3
	c) How satisfactory is the level of involvement and activities of the cross-border beneficiaries, whether the project: was jointly prepared/will be jointly implemented/will have shared staff/will be jointly financed.	AF (p. 7.3, section 3.)	/3
2. Communication  <i>To what extent are communication activities appropriate and forceful to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</i>	The project information and communication plan is appropriate to achieve project communication goals	AF (p. 5.2), A8	/4
3. Work plan  <i>To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent?</i>	a) The overall design of the project is coherent, it clearly presents the proposed activities, results and objectives. The intervention logic and project plan are clear and feasible. b) If applicable: to what extent is the brief feasibility study realistic and consistent and coherent with the project activities?	AF (section 3), A8	/4
	b) Proposed activities and deliverables are appropriate, practical and consistent with the	AF (section 3), A8	/3

	objectives and expected results c) Activities outside the Programme area clearly benefit the Programme area (if applicable)		
	d) The time schedule is realistic	AF (section 3), A8	/3
4. Budget	a) Sufficient and reasonable resources are planned to ensure project implementation (both the lead beneficiary and other beneficiaries who financially contribute do the project have stable and sufficient sources of financing)	AF (pp. 5.1, 9, 10, if needed also relevant sections for all beneficiaries), A3, budget	/3
<i>To what extent does the project budget demonstrate value for money?</i>	b) Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and the main outputs and results aimed for (the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results is satisfactory)	AF (section 3, p. 7.4), budget, A8	/2
<i>To what extent is the budget coherent and proportionate?</i>	c) Total partner budgets reflect partners' actual involvement in the project (are balanced and realistic)? Does the planned project financing (financial flows) ensure its stable implementation? Does it refer to the payment options that may be used by the project?	AF (section 3, p. 7.4), budget, A8	/2
	d) The budget is transparent and adequately related to the planned activities. The costs foreseen within the budget are eligible and in line with the Programme rules.	AF (section 3, p. 7.4), budget, A8	/3
5. Durability	a) Project is likely to have a long-lasting impact on its target groups. The project main outputs will be further used once the project has ended.	AF (p. 3.3, section 6)	/4
	b) Project is likely to have multiplier effects (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the project and dissemination of information)		
	c) The expected results of the proposed project are durable in relation to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>financial durability (there are sources of revenue for covering all future operating and maintenance costs during the period of project results durability, for financing of follow-up activities etc.)</li> <li>institutional level (there are structures that would allow the results of the project to be continued after the end of the action - local "ownership" of project results</li> <li>environmental sustainability (there are conditions put in place to avoid negative effects on natural resources on which the project depends and on the broader natural environment).</li> </ul>	AF (p. 3.3, section 6)	/4
Total score			/40

	Strategic assessment	Operational assessment
Score	/60	/40
Total score	/100	
FINAL ASSEMENT:	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<b>COMMENTS:</b>	
------------------	--

The maximum score the application can obtain is 100 points.

The minimum score the application has to achieve in order to be taken into consideration for possible financing is 70 points. In addition, each project to be taken into consideration for possible financing `has to achieve at least 60% from each of the parts of the quality assessment, i.e. at least 36 points from the strategic assessment ) and at least 24 points from the operational assessment.