



**INTERREG VA Programme Monitoring Committee**  
**EU Programme for Cross-Border Cooperation (INTERREG VA)**  
**Selection Criteria for Project Assessment**

The purpose of this paper is to inform the Monitoring Committee of the selection criteria to be utilised during project assessment and to gain the approval of the Monitoring Committee.

**1. Assessment model**

The primary purpose of the assessment process is to assess the potential of the proposed project to deliver the specified results and outputs of the relevant programme in a cost effective manner. Thereafter, it will be used to rank projects according to an agreed scoring methodology.

The assessment criteria at both stage one and stage two, have been established as an open and clear mechanism against which the Steering Committee may;

- determine the relevance of the project;
- determine the feasibility of the project;
- use the result of the assessment as a basis for their decision;
- establish common understanding of the grounds for their decision;
- ensure transparency;
- be used in the case of complaints or review procedure.

**2. Two stage assessment process.**

- i. A concise and rigorous assessment of how the application meets the selection criteria (after the applicant has already passed the admissibility check);
- ii. Rigorous assessment of a detailed Business Plan against the selection criteria.

### 3. Stage one application form and guidelines

A stage one application form has been developed for online completion and submission. Guidelines have been developed to assist the applicants and to ensure that sufficient detail is provided to make consistent assessments.

### 4. Assessment criteria

The Cooperation Programme provides the high level criteria against which each application will be assessed. Details will be included in the call for applications, including the specific objective and the relevant result indicator(s) and output indicators which applicants will be required to meet. An Applicants Guide is also available, which describes in detail the type of information to be provided in order to score well against the criteria.

#### 4.1 Stage One Assessment Criteria

Stage one assessment will be a strategic assessment and will determine the viability and merit of the project before proceeding to a more detailed assessment of the project in stage two.

For stage one, applicants must demonstrate relevance to five criteria, each with an equal weighting, against which applications will be fully appraised and scored (0 to 5). These are:

	<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Weighting</b>
1.	Contribution of the project to the defined results and outputs of the programme	20%
2.	Quality of Project Design	20%
3.	Quality of cross-border co-operation with demonstrable added value	20%
4.	Quality of the project team and implementation arrangements	20%
5.	Value for Money	20%

In order to be successful at stage one, a minimum score of 15 (60%) must be achieved, with individual scores for each of the criteria must not be less than 3.

Unsuccessful applications at stage 1 will be formally rejected with a clear reasons for rejection. Applicants rejected at Stage 1 will have the right to a review, conducted by written procedure. (see separate paper.)

An invitation to make a stage two application is no guarantee that funding will be approved.

#### 4.2 Stage Two Assessment Criteria.

Stage two of the assessment process will scrutinise the detail of the application. Applicants will be required to submit a Business Plan. This may involve the use of assessment techniques, such as economic appraisal, technical studies, etc. to inform the decision making process. No scores are carried forward from stage one.

At Stage Two the application will be scored (0 to 5) against the following criteria and using the weighting set out below;

Criterion	Weighting
(1) Contribution of the project to the defined results and outputs of the programme	20%
(2) Quality of project design	20%
(3) Quality of cross-border co-operation with demonstrable added value	20%
(4) Quality of the project team and implementation arrangements	10%
(5) Value for Money	20%
(6) Contribution to Sustainable Development	5%
(7) Contribution to Equality	5%
Total	100%

In order to be successful at stage two, a minimum score of a minimum score of 3 for each criterion is required.

#### 5.1 Scoring and quality threshold

Scores will be awarded according to a pre-determined rating system depending on how well the evidence provided by the applicant satisfies the assessment questions listed under that

criterion. If the value of the budget requested for projects which score above the threshold exceeds the availability of the budget, the threshold may be raised.

Score	Assessment	Descriptor/Indicator
0	Nil Response	Response failed to address the question.
1	Very Poor	A very poor response with limited evidence of capacity to deliver against the criterion.
2	Poor	A poor response with some evidence of capacity to deliver against the criterion, but overall it is below the standard expected in order to be awarded funding.
3	Acceptable	A good response with evidence of capacity to deliver to an acceptable standard against the criterion.
4	Good	A very good response with strong evidence of capacity to deliver above the minimum standard expected against the criterion.
5	Excellent	An excellent response with very strong evidence of capacity to deliver well above the minimum standard expected the criterion.