

Second call for proposals Strategic Evaluation GRID - AB

Grid completed by	AB member X + AB member Y
Third evaluation if needed	AB member 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)

Strategic 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 other 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 section 3 of AF sub- section(s)	Max Sub- score (12)	Comments
<p>1.1 Justification:</p> <p>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?</p>	<p>1.1 e-form</p>	<p>4</p>	<p>(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator)</p> <p><u>Key questions to be answered by the Assessment Board member when drafting the comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the <u>project consistent</u> with the <u>Programme Specific Objective description</u> given in the Programme Documents?(state why) • Is the <u>project consistent</u> with the <u>Terms of Reference</u> of the Call for Green Transition proposals? • 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. <p><u>Please indicate the weaknesses when answering the key questions.</u></p>

<p>1.2 Transnational added value and impact:</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>1.2 e-form</p>	<p>4)</p>	<p><u>Key questions to be answered by the Assessment Board member when drafting the comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Real transnational dimension avoiding a mainly local/national dimension and extent of the project will have tangible benefits in all concerned territories • Real environmental value with clear contribution to the key challenges described in the Terms of Reference • Has the proposal described <u>its actual added value for the eligible territories and how the proposal provides green solutions to the common environmental challenges and specific needs of the involved territories</u> (both EU and Mediterranean Partner Countries)? • Does the proposal explain <u>the need for cooperation between partners from multiple countries to achieve the project specific objective/s?</u> • 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</u>

			<u>the proposal provides quantified data)?</u>
1.4 Transnational added value and impact: Are synergies/complementarities with other strategies and/or initiatives, particularly those related to the environmental transition, well demonstrated and likely to be exploited? In particular, does the proposal take into account existing practices, solutions and outputs in view of fostering adaptation, scaling up, wider implementation and mainstreaming?	1.4 e-form	4	(max 1000 characters per each Evaluator) <u>Key questions to be answered by the Assessment Board member when drafting the comments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the project <u>demonstrate synergies and complementarities with other major strategies and/or initiatives</u> (ref. Doc “Overview of main policies, strategies and initiatives having synergies and complementarities with Interreg NEXT MED Programme”) particularly those related to the environmental transition? Does the proposal foresee <u>the actual use of existing practices, solutions and outputs in view of fostering adaptation, wider implementation and mainstream and scale-up of results</u> developed by other relevant projects <u>Please indicate the weaknesses when answering the key questions.</u>

Total score and recommendations	Score
1.1	4
1.2	4
1.4	4
TOTAL :	12