

## Second call for proposals Operational Evaluation GRID

Grid completed by	External Evaluator X + External Evaluator Y
Third evaluation if needed	External Evaluator Z

Date: \_\_/\_\_/2025

Date of the third evaluation: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/2025

### I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Reference Number:	
Acronym:	
Lead Applicant:	
Lead Applicant's Country:	
Countries involved	
Amount requested (and % of total eligible costs):	< EUR > _____ ( ____% )
Duration:	____ months
Type of Project	(Eco-Youth; Green Transformation)

Operational evaluation check grid

## II. SCORING GUIDELINES

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **subsections**. Each subsection must be given a score between 1 and 4 in accordance with the following guidelines:

Score	Meaning	Detail
1	poor	The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination. The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses more than strengths.
2	adequate	The proposal shows adequate features with regard to the evaluation criterion although some notable weaknesses are detected. Improvements would be necessary.
3	good	The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible. Identified features demonstrate a good overall quality.
4	very good	The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are assessed as minor.

These scores are added to give the total score for the section concerned. The totals for each section are then listed in table “Total score and recommendations” and added together to give the total score for the full application.

Each section contains a box for comments. These comments should address the issues covered by that section. Comments must be made on each section. If an evaluator gives a score of 1 (very poor), 2 (poor), 3 (good) or 4 (very good) to a subsection, the reasons for giving such a score must be explained in the comments box. Extra space may be used for comments if required. Bearing in mind that the comments have to be read by the members of the Assessment board and by the same applicant, it is of utmost importance to prepare

clear and factual-based comments. E.g.: avoid acronyms, abbreviations and illogical sentences. If an evaluator gives a score of 1 (very poor), 2 (poor), 3 (good) or 4 (very good) to a subsection, the reasons for giving such a score must be explained in the comments box. Extra space may be used for comments if required.

1. RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT	Ref. to AF section(s)	Max Sub-score (12)	Comments
<p><b>1.1 Justification:</b></p> <p><b>Why is the proposal needed and relevant in the context of the environmental/climate challenges affecting the Interreg NEXT MED Programme cooperation area? How will the project contribute to the achievement of the Programme Priority and Specific Objective under which it has been submitted taken into account the environmental issue(s) addressed by the proposal?</b></p>	<p>Sections 2 "Summary" and Section 3.1.1</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator)</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the <b>project consistent</b> with the <u>Programme Specific Objective description</u> given in the Programme Documents? (state why)</li> <li>• Is the <b>project consistent</b> with the <u>Terms of Reference</u> of the Call for Green Transition proposals?</li> <li>• Does the project describe <u>how</u> it contributes to the achievement of the Programme Priority and Specific Objective under which it has been submitted? If so, please state if the project demonstrates its added value towards the Programme context.</li> </ul> <p>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</p>

<p><b>1.2 Transnational added value and impact:</b></p> <p>Does the proposal have a real transnational and environmental added value? Why is cooperation needed to achieve the project Specific Objective/s? How relevant from a transnational point of view is the proposal to the common environmental/climate challenges and related needs of the involved territories? Is the proposal likely to have tangible benefits in all concerned territories in terms of fostering the green transition?</p>	<p>Section 3.1.2 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Real</u> transnational dimension avoiding a mainly local/national dimension and extent of the project will have tangible benefits in all concerned territories</li> <li>• Real environmental value with <u>clear contribution to the key challenges</u> described in the Terms of Reference</li> <li>• Has the proposal described <u>its actual added value</u> for the eligible territories and <u>how the proposal provides green solutions</u> to the common environmental challenges and specific needs of the involved territories (both EU and Mediterranean Partner Countries)?</li> <li>• Does the proposal explain <u>the need for cooperation between partners</u> from multiple countries <u>to achieve the project specific objective/s</u>?</li> <li>• Does the project explain <u>how the expected change will affect the identified needs/challenges</u> (both in terms of mid- and long-term impact) and will generate tangible benefits for the green transition in all concerned territories (both EU and MPCs)? If so, please mention <u>if the proposal provides quantified data</u>?</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.3 Needs and quantification of target groups/final beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>Does the proposal appropriately define the needs of the target groups and final beneficiaries from the environmental/climate challenges point of view? Are the involved target groups and final beneficiaries clearly defined, quantified, and strategically chosen?</p>	<p>section 3.1.3 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator)</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have final <u>beneficiaries</u> been clearly <b>defined, quantified and strategically</b> selected? If so, does the project explain <u>how</u> and <u>why</u> they were identified and involved in project preparation?</li> </ul>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Have <u>relevant target groups</u> been clearly defined, <u>quantified and</u> strategically selected? If so, does the project explain how and why they were identified and involved in project preparation? Are local actors (public authorities, private sector and communities) involved starting from the project formulation to the project implementation stage?</li> <li>Have the climate/environmental <u>needs and constraints</u> of the target groups been <u>identified and described</u></li> </ul> <p>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</p>
--	--	--	--

2. DESIGN OF THE PROJECT	Ref. to AF section(s)	Sub-score Max 16	Comments
<b>2.1 Climate-Friendly and Green Transition Solutions:</b> Is the project designed in a way it is likely to produce climate-friendly, environmental oriented and/or nature-based solutions that have the potential to contribute to the green transition in the Mediterranean?	section 3.2.1 e-form	4	(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator) <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the proposal have an <b>actual green impact</b>?</li> <li>Will the proposal lead to climate-friendly, environmental oriented or nature-based solutions?</li> <li>Does the logic of the project have <u>an actual potential</u> to contribute to the green transition?</li> </ul>

<p><b>2.2 Clear, realistic, and achievable objectives: Are the project's Specific Objective(s) and expected results clearly defined, realistic, and achievable? Will they effectively contribute to the Overall Objective? Are the project outputs and activities well-designed and aligned with the Specific Objectives?</b></p>	<p>Sections 3.2.2, 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator)</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the proposal <u>clearly define the Specific Objective(s) and expected result(s)</u> in line with the Guide for project preparation.</li> <li>• Are they <u>realistic and likely to be achieved?</u> (state <u>why</u>)</li> <li>• Will the expected results and specific objective <u>effectively contribute</u> to achieve the project overall objective? (State why)</li> <li>• Are the outputs well identified <b>relevant</b> to contribute to the achievement of the project Specific Objective(s) and Expected Result(s)?</li> <li>• Are the dimension and number of outputs/activities well justified and reasonable? Please <u>state why</u>.</li> <li>• Are main activities relevant to contribute to the achievement of the project outputs?</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the weaknesses when answering the key questions.</u></p>
<p><b>2.3 Consistence with needs of target groups/final beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>Is the project intervention logic (objectives, expected results, outputs and activities) consistent with the needs of</p>	<p>Sections 3.1.3 and 3.2.3 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator)</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project show how <u>Specific Objective (s)</u>,</li> </ul>

<p>the target groups and final beneficiaries? In particular, is the project likely to deliver tangible support and environmental benefits to the target groups and final beneficiaries?</p>			<p><u>expected results, outputs and main activities are consistent with the needs of the target groups and final beneficiaries especially those linked to climate and the environment?</u> (state why)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project <u>highlight the benefits</u> of the project towards them? (state how tangible)</li> </ul> <p>Please indicate the weaknesses when answering the key questions.</p>
<p><b>2.4 Indicators:</b></p> <p>Are the indicators (both at Expected Result/s and outputs level) realistically quantified and achievable with the planned resources (time, partners and budget)? Are they coherent with the Programme indicators?</p>	<p>section 3.2.4 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator)</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the chosen <u>indicators</u> <b>(both at expected result(s) and outputs level)</b> in <u>line with the planned resources (time, partners and budget)?</u> State <u>why</u></li> <li>Are the chosen indicators <b>coherent with the Programme indicators target values?</b> (check the PERFORMANCE FRAMEWORK METHODOLOGY PAPER” for their definition and how to set the target values and Annex 1 to the Terms of References)</li> </ul> <p>Please indicate the weaknesses when answering the key questions.</p>

3. PARTNERSHIP: OPERATIONAL AND FINANCIAL CAPACITY	Ref. to AF section(s)	Max sub Score 12	Comments
<b>3.1 Lead Partner's capacity, expertise and experience: Does the Lead Partner demonstrate the adequate experience and capacity to coordinate, manage and implement the project (financial, human resources and thematic expertise in order to ensure the involvement of the chosen stakeholders)? Does it have stable and sufficient financial capacity to ensure the cash-flow all along the project implementation?</b>	Sections 3.3.4 and 3.3.6 e-form	4	<p>max 1500 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the Lead partner have <u>demonstrated experience</u> within respective country/region/location, in particular in the management of EU/international cooperation projects?</li> <li>• Does the Lead partner have <u>sufficient level of management capacity</u>, taking into consideration the project complexity and financial dimension?</li> <li>• Do the management structures of the Lead partner show <u>sufficient capacities</u> to effectively secure content wise and sound financial management?</li> <li>• Does the Lead partner have adequate and experienced <u>internal staff able to manage</u> EU / international projects? If not, does the Lead partner identify solutions in order to ensure a proper management of the project activities?</li> <li>• Does the Lead partner rely on <u>stable and sufficient financial capacity</u> to work within possible cash flow constraints (refer also to the legal status)?</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>

<p><b>3.2 Partners' capacity, expertise and experience:</b> Do the partner organisations have the experience, expertise and competence in the thematic field(s) concerned as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources and capacity to ensure the involvement of the chosen stakeholders)? Do the partners have specific experience in initiatives related to environmental sustainability?</p>	<p>Sections 3.3.3, 3.3.5 and 3.3.6 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>max 1500 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do the partners' organisation have <u>demonstrated experience</u> within respective country/region/location, in particular in the management of EU/international cooperation projects?</li> <li>• Do the partners' organisation have <u>sufficient level of management capacity</u>, taking into consideration the project complexity and financial dimension?</li> <li>• Do the management structures of the partners show <u>sufficient capacities</u> to effectively secure content wise and sound financial management?</li> <li>• Do the partners' organisation have adequate and experienced internal <u>staff able to manage</u> EU / international projects? If not, does the Lead partner identify solutions in order to ensure a proper management of the project activities?</li> <li>• Do the partners' organisation rely on <u>stable and sufficient financial capacity</u> to work within possible cash flow constraints (refer also to the different legal status)?</li> <li>• Do they have proven <u>experience</u> in the field of <u>climate change and/or environment</u>.</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE:</b> if project submitted under the Youth Strand check against the specific criteria related to the specific experience, expertise and competences in managing and implementing projects for the youth.</p> <p>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key <u>questions</u>.</p>
---	---	----------	--

<b>3.3 Consistence of roles and tasks:</b> Are the roles and tasks of the Lead Partner and partners clearly defined and appropriately distributed? Do all partners actively contribute to the project's implementation? Is the integration of their expertise and experience, along with their respective levels of responsibility in territorial governance, appropriate for the project's scope and expected results?	section 3.3.7 e-form	4	max 1500 characters per each Evaluator  <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the <b>roles</b> and <b>involvement</b> of the Lead Partner and partners <b>clearly defined</b>?</li> <li>• Is there a <b>balanced task distribution</b> among partners, each playing a crucial role in project activities, management, reporting, and monitoring and budget? (State why)</li> <li>• Are their expertise and experience <b>integrated enough</b> (they complement each other) to reach the project's objectives?</li> <li>• Does the description demonstrate that each partner organisation actively contributes to the implementation of the project? (State why)</li> <li>• Does <b>each</b> single partner have <b>an actual added-value, differentiated from the others?</b> (State why)</li> </ul> Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key <u>questions</u> .

4. EFFECTIVENESS	Ref. to AF section(s)	Max sub core 20	Comments
<b>4.1 Management, coordination, monitoring:</b> Is the proposed management and coordination methodology clear and effective to ensure the achievement of the project objectives? Does the project foresee specific	sections 3.4.1 + WP1 Management e-form	4	max 1000 characters per each Evaluator  <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u>

<p>tools and resources to ensure proper monitoring of the execution of the activities, risk management, and achievement of project objectives and results?</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are the <u>roles</u> of the of the Applicant and partners in ensuring efficient management of the project clearly defined?</li> <li>• Is the <u>decision-making processes</u> clearly described and likely to be effective?</li> <li>• Are Project partners supporting the reporting tasks?</li> <li>• Is the <u>management methodology</u> likely to ensure the achievement of the project objective(s) and expected result(s) (state why)</li> <li>• Are the <u>potential risks and external conditions</u> well described and based on relevant background information?</li> <li>• Are the <u>internal monitoring</u> and <u>evaluation procedures</u> and tools in line with the complexity of the partnership/project?</li> <li>• Is the <u>monitoring strategy</u> of the Project in line with the work packages and compatible with the project management procedures?</li> <li>• Are a Monitoring or Evaluation Plan as well as a Risks Prevention and Adaptation Plan foreseen (also in WP1 outputs)?</li> </ul> <p>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key <u>questions</u>.</p>
--	--	--	--

<b>4.2 Work plan:</b> <b>Is the work plan clear, feasible and accurately planned in terms of human, financial and other resources? Is the time schedule realistic with logically sequenced activities and outputs likely to be implemented and delivered?</b>	Sections 3.4.2, 4.3 and 4.4 e-form	4	max 1000 characters per each Evaluator  <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are main <u>activities</u> and <u>outputs delivery</u> feasible and focused on <u>practical application</u>? (State why)</li> <li>• <u>Is there a proper allocation of human and financial resources</u>? (State why)</li> <li>• Is the <u>logical time sequence</u> and the duration of the <u>activities realistic</u>? (State why)</li> </ul> Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.
<b>4.3 Innovation:</b> <b>Does the project propose innovative or novel solutions and approaches that build on and go beyond the existing practices and knowledge to tackle climate change?</b>	Section 3.4.3 e-form	4	max 1000 characters per each Evaluator  <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the proposal include <b>innovative solutions</b> and approaches that go beyond existing practices?</li> <li>• Does the project address climate change in a <b>novel way</b> (knowing of course that completely innovative proposals are unlikely).</li> </ul> Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.
<b>4.4 Communication:</b> <b>Are the communication strategy and connected activities well designed, adequate and cost-effective to reach and inform target groups, media, policy makers/institutions and general audience? Is the communication strategy likely to promote better environmental awareness, eco-friendly</b>	Section 3.4.4 Section 4 – WP2 Communication e-form	8 (4x2 double score)	max 1000 characters per each Evaluator  <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project consider strategic communication to foster environmental policy changes?</li> <li>• Are the roles of the PPs in communication and their</li> </ul>

behaviours and potential positive changes among target groups and final beneficiaries?			<p>responsibilities, under the overall supervision of the LP clearly defined and consistent with partners' expertise and experience?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Are outputs and activities well described and logically connected?</li> <li>• Are communication activities and capitalisation of the results cost-effective? (state why)</li> <li>• Does the communication strategy include effective tools (on-line and offline) as regards the identified target groups and the general audience (communication plan, an Inception Video and a Final Video as well as a project Poster?</li> <li>• Does the project foresee the use of creative content formats to boost people's engagement in sustainable actions?</li> </ul> <p>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</p>
--	--	--	--

5. SUSTAINABILITY	Ref. to AF section(s)	Max sub Score 12	Comments
<b>5.1 Levels of sustainability:</b> To which extent is the proposed project sustainable: - financially (how will the results be financed after the end of the project?) - technically (will the project outputs continue to be functioning/used after its end?)	Section 3.5.1 e-form	4	<p>max 1000 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project explain how the results will be financed and maintained after the end of the project? (State how)</li> <li>• Does the project explain how the "ownership" and use of</li> </ul>

<p>- at policy/institutional level (where applicable) (what will be the structural impact of the project -e.g., will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc)?</p> <p>- environmentally (does the project foresee specific eco-friendly measures for its daily activities - especially concerning events/meetings, production of communication material, etc. – that reduce the overall ecological footprint of the intervention – concept of greening project implementation)?</p>			<p>the results of the project both in EUMC and MPC will be supported after the project life? (State how)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is there any <b>structural impact</b> of the project -e.g., and will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc.). Does the proposal mention any commitment of <b>public institutions</b> in adopting project results?</li> <li>• Does the project describe concrete measures or actions to minimize its <b>impact on the climate and on the environment</b>?</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>
<p><b>5.2 Long-term impact:</b></p> <p>Is the proposal likely to provide a significant and durable contribution to addressing the environmental/climate challenges identified? Does the project foresee a strategy to ensure that results and outputs will have a long-term positive environmental impact far beyond the project lifetime?</p>	<p>Section 3.5.2 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>max 1000 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project indicate any strategy or actions to guarantee the <b>long-term impact</b> of the project results on the environment in a realistic approach?</li> <li>• Does the Partnership demonstrate to have the <b>means</b> to ensure the climate/environmental long-run impact of the project after its end?</li> <li>• Are project beneficiaries going to still benefit from the results <u>once the project is over</u> with the indication of the time length. (state why)</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>

<p><b>5.3 Transferability and replicability:</b>  <b>Are the project main outputs applicable and replicable by other organisations/regions/countries outside the current partnership? Does the project foresee specific actions to transfer and upscale the main outputs?</b></p>	<p>Section 3.5.3 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>max 1000 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project include a <u>strategy/action</u> to encourage the applicability and replicability of the project results in other geographical areas, other sectors or sub-sectors etc.?</li> <li>• Does the proposal foresee <u>Multiplier realistic effect</u> taking into account the project beneficiaries and both sides of the cooperation area? (State why)</li> <li>• Does the project indicate any capitalization plan for the project results explaining how they will be further exploited?</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>
---	---------------------------------	----------	---

6. COST EFFECTIVENESS	Ref. to AF section(s)	Max sub Score 12	Comments
<b>6.1 Budget:</b> <b>Does the project budget appear realistic, consistent and proportionate to the proposed work plan, project outputs and project's contribution to Programme indicators aimed for? Is the budget transparent and well-designed?</b>	Sections 3.6.1 and 5 (budget for the project and financial plan) of the e-form	4	max 1000 characters per each Evaluator <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the project overall budget <u>sound</u>?</li> <li>• Does the proposal explain how the budget has been elaborated, with a clear link between the budget planning and the project strategy?</li> <li>• Are Budgeted costs justified, clearly explained, and referred to the proposed activities?</li> <li>• If applicable, are specific budget lines (e.g. external expertise, equipment, infrastructures) supported by relevant justifications?</li> </ul> <u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u>
<b>6.2 Costs vs results:</b> <b>Is the ratio and balance between the estimated costs and the quantification of the expected results satisfactory? Is the need for engaging external expertise justified? Are the costs necessary and properly justified?</b>	Sections 3.6.2, 4.2 and 5 (budget for the project and financial plan) of the e-form	4	max 1000 characters per each Evaluator <u><b>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</b></u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Value for money</b> - Is the total budget <b>reasonable</b> compared with the proposed project (activities, outputs and expected results) and the size of the partnership?</li> <li>• <b>Are Staff costs realistic</b> and proportionate to the activities?</li> <li>• Is the foreseen budget for the different budget lines <b>consistent with</b> the description of the <b>work-packages and summary of activities</b>?</li> <li>• Are the main <b>sub-contracted costs justified to</b></li> </ul>

			<p>exclude that the partners can perform the tasks sub-contracted? (please note that the bulk of the project activities cannot be sub-contracted!)</p> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>
<b>6.3 Budget breakdown:</b> <b>Is the budget properly allocated during the time and among partners? Is it logically distributed along the duration of the project to ensure the timely delivery of the outputs and the management of the project cash-flow?</b>	Sections 3.6.3, 4.2 and 5 (budget for the project and financial plan) of the e-form	4	<p>max 1000 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the budget <b>properly allocated to each PP</b> in relation with the activities to be implemented?</li> <li>• Is the budget <b>per year consistent with the action plan?</b> Make sure that the main part of activities, and in particular the pilots, are foreseen <b>during the first half</b> of the project!</li> <li>• Is the distribution by <b>Cost Category</b> consistent with the project objectives, avoiding artificially inflated Cost Categories?</li> <li>• Is there a risk that the project faces any <b>cash shortage</b> which may affect the timely delivery of the outputs? (State why).</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>

7. HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES	Ref. to AF section(s)	Max sub Score 4	Comments
<b>7.1 To what extent does the proposal take into account (the relevant) horizontal principles and will ensure the compliance, during the implementation phase, with:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ respect of fundamental rights</li> <li>➤ promotion of gender equality</li> <li>➤ prevention of discrimination including accessibility for people with disabilities</li> <li>➤ promotion of sustainable development and contribution to the Just Transition</li> <li>➤ compliance with the "do no significant harm" principle (where applicable)</li> <li>➤ promotion of the New European Bauhaus key principles, meaning support to projects that are sustainable, aesthetic and inclusive (where applicable)</li> </ul>	Section 3.7 e-form	4	<p>max 1000 characters per each Evaluator</p> <p><b><u>Key questions to be answered by the External Evaluators when drafting the comments</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project indicate how it has taken into account the horizontal principles when conceiving the proposal and specific project activities?</li> <li>• Is there any reference to the specific outputs which may be relevant for any of the horizontal principles? (State which ones)</li> <li>• Does the project foresee any strategy or action to avoid any type of discrimination (gender, race, etc.) or to negative impact (environment, climate, aesthetics, etc.)? (State which ones)</li> </ul> <p><u>Please indicate the <b>weaknesses</b> when answering the key questions.</u></p>

Total score and recommendations	Score
Relevance	12
Design of the project	16
Financial and operational capacity (Partnership)	12
Effectiveness and feasibility	20
Sustainability	12
Budget and cost-effectiveness	12
Horizontal principles	4

<b>TOTAL :</b>	<b>88</b>
Short summary of the analysis (max 2000 characters per each Evaluator).	
Strengths:	
Weakness:	