Interreg Co-funded by the European Union

Italy – Croatia

SEAS

## ANNEX III Content evaluation grid

| | |
|---|---|
| **Small Project Application ID** | |
| **Small Project title** | |
| **Final Recipient 1** | |
| **Final Recipient 2** | |
| **Final Recipient 3** | |

| **C1 PROJECT RELEVANCE** | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation question** | **Sub questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Evaluator's comments** | **Section in SPA** |
| C1.1 How well is the need for the Small Project justified? | The project addresses common challenge of the Programme or a joint asset of the Programme area – there is a real need for the project (well justified, reasonable, well explained). There is a clear benefit for selected target group/s.<br>New/existing solutions developed/adopted/ implemented during the project and FRs approach is well described, reasonable and well explained.<br><br>- completely: 6 points<br>- mostly: 4 points<br>- partially: 2 points<br>- does not adress: 0 points. | | | 3.1., 3.2., 3.3., 3.6. and 7 |
| C1.2 To what extent will the Small Project contribute to the achievement of Programme's objectives and indicators? | The project's overall objective clearly contributes to the achievement of the Programme priority specific objective, with outputs and deliverables clearly linked to the Programme output indicators and targets, and a realistic contribution to the Programme result indicator:<br>RCR 03 – SMEs introducing product or process innovation,<br><br>- indicator is sufficient defined and on realistic level, contribution to the programme level results is well described: 5 points<br>- indicator is partialy defined or at the low level: 3 points<br>- definition of the indicator is weak, contribution to programme level result is unclear: 0 points | | | 3.1., 3.3., 3.6. and 7 |
| C1.3 To what extent will the Small Project outputs/deliverables have an impact beyond the project's lifetime? | The project's outputs/deliverables have potential to become durable (in the sense that they bring people together and create favorable cooperation conditions) – if not, it is justified.<br>The SPA is expected to provide a significant and durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted.<br><br>- it is expected for SPA to provide a significant and durable contribution: 4 points<br>- contribution is limited or only partially durable: 2 points<br>- no significant or durable contribution or no justification provided: 0 points. | | | 3.7. |
| C1.4 To what extent is the Small Project intervention logic plausible? | The project's specific objective is clear, realistic, and achievable; the proposed outputs and deliverables are necessary to achieve it, and their contribution to the Programme indicators is realistic and feasible given the available resources (time, financial resources, workplan, and budget) and the quantification provided.<br><br>- completely: 5 points<br>- mostly: 3 points<br>- partially: 1 points<br>- none: 0 points. | | | 3.1., 3.3., 3.5., 3.6., 6 and 9 |
| | **Low innovation**<br>The Small Project mainly applies existing or standard solutions with limited added value. Innovation is weakly described, insufficiently justified, or relevant only at a very narrow level - 0 points<br><br>**Moderate innovation**<br>The Small Project introduces a new or significantly improved solution at organisational, settlement, or local level. Clear added value for stakeholders is demonstrated, but impact, scalability, or transferability remains limited - 3 points<br><br>**High innovation**<br>The Small Project delivers a clearly novel solution addressing identified gaps at programme area or sector level. Strong value-added impact is demonstrated, supported by solid justification, evidence, and clear potential for sustainability, scalability, or wider replication - 5 points | | | 3.13 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| C1.5 Level of innovation | Geographic market impact of the innovation related to the project in question:<br>- Global market impact of the developed innovation is expected (more than three countries, some of which may include the European geographical area): 4 points<br>- Impact of the developed innovation on the EU market is expected (more than two countries of the European Economic Area): 3 points<br>- Market impact of the developed innovation is expected in at least two countries: 2 points<br>- Market impact of the developed innovation is expected in at least one country in programme area: 1 point<br>- Geographic impact of the innovation is not proven: 0 points<br><br>Global market implies the reach of the innovation beyond the countries of the European geographical area and the regional and local market;<br>EU market implies the European geographical area;<br>regional market implies the surrounding countries,<br>local market implies the market of the CRO and IT. | | | 3.13 |
| | The project also introduces a marketing or organizational innovation<br>- Yes: 1 point<br>- No: 0 points | | | 3.2 |
| | Does the subject of the project relate to the development of environmentally related technologies<br>- the subject of the project relates to the development of environmentally related technologies: 3 points<br>- the subject of the project does not relate to the development of environmentally related technologies: 1 point | | | 3.2 |
| | What is the intellectual property status of the innovation that is the subject of the project?<br><br>Intellectual property is protected: 4 points<br>An application for the protection of intellectual property has been submitted: 2 points<br>There is an explained strategy for protecting developed intellectual property and/or acquiring intellectual property: 1 point<br>There is no protection of intellectual property, no application has been submitted nor has the strategy for protection and/or acquisition of intellectual property been explained: 0 points | | | 3.13 |
| C1.6 What added value does the cooperation bring? | The importance of cooperation beyond borders for the topic addressed is<br>- clearly demonstrated - 5 points<br>- partially demonstrated - 3 points<br>- is not demonstrated - 0 points<br><br>- the results cannot/can only to some extent be achieved without cooperation<br>- there is a clear benefit from cooperating for the FRs/target groups/project area/Programme area. | | | 3.4. |
| C1.7 How will Small Project contribute to EUSAIR flagships | Small Project demonstrating a contribution to EUSAIR flagships, as well as credible macro-regional effects<br>- clear, coherent and well-justified contribution - 3 points<br>- partiall contribution, not completely justified - 1 points<br>- contribution is not demonstrated - 0 points. | | | 3.8. |
| | **SCORE** | **0** | | |

**Project relevance maximum score is 45 points.**
**Score threshold: minimum number of points for a selection criterion C1: 30**
**45% (45/100)**

| C2 PARTNERSHIP RELEVANCE | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation question** | **Sub questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Evaluator's comments** | **Section in SPA** |
| C2.1 To what extent is the partnership composition relevant for the proposed project? | The Small Project involves the relevant actors needed to address the common challenge/joint asset and the objectives specified.<br><br>- yes - 4 points<br>- partially - 2 points<br>- no - 0 points | | | 3.1. and 1. |
| | All partners have defined roles within the partnership - the structure of the partnership, the role of the FRs in project implementation, and their contributions to the project are described and explained, and the Programme territory benefits from this cooperation<br>- well described and clear - 4 points<br>- partially desribed - 2 points<br>- partnership composition and structure are not described - 0 points | | | 4.1., 4.2., 3. and 7 |
| | The project partnership consists of complementary partners (FRs), with a clear and logical distribution of tasks among them, ensuring effective collaboration<br>- full complementarity - 4 points<br>- partial complementarity - 2 points<br>- no complementarity - 0 points | | | 4.1., 4.2., 3. and 7 |
| | The methodology for establishing the project implementation team is explained. The structure and competencies of all project team members are adequate for the needs of the project implementation, and their responsibilities for project implementation are realistically described.<br>- fully explained: 3 points<br>- the methodology is explained but the project team has not been appointed: 2 points<br>- partially explained: 1 point<br>- not explained: 0 points | | | 3.10 |
| | **SCORE** | **0** | | |
| **Partnership relevance maximum score is 15 points.**<br>**Score threshold: minimum number of points for a selection criterion C2: 6**<br>**15% (15/100)** | | | | |

| C3 WORK PLAN | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation question** | **Sub questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Evaluator's comments** | **Section in SPA** |
| C3.1 To what extent is the work plan realistic, consistent and coherent? | Proposed activities are relevant and lead to planned outputs/deliverables and result.<br>- yes - 8 points<br>- mostly - 4 point<br>- no - 0 points | | | 7 |
| | All activities are well elaborated in detail containing clearly defined actions - 8 points<br>Majority of the activities of Small Project are sufficiently described in detail, but the contents of some activities of the project are unclear - 4 points<br>Activities of Small Project are not sufficiently described, the contents of the activities of the project are rather unclear - 0 points | | | 3.3., 3.6. and 7 |
| C3.2 To what extent are communication activities appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders? | Communication activities are appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders:<br>- completely - 4 points<br>- partially - 2 point<br>- not appropriate - 0 points | | | 3.5. and 7 |
| | **SCORE** | **0** | | |
| **Work plan maximum score is 20 points.**<br>**Score threshold: minimum number of points for a selection criterion C3: 10**<br>**20% (20/100)** | | | | |

| C4 BUDGET AND RECOURCES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Evaluation question** | **Sub questions for evaluation** | **Score** | **Evaluator's comments** | **Section in SPA** |
| C4.1 To what extent is the Small Project budget proportionate to the project activities and results? | The Project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan, project outputs/deliverables and project's contribution to Programme indicators<br>- proportionate - 8 points<br>- mostly proportionate 5 points<br>- partially proportionate 2 points<br>- not proportionate - 0 points | | | 7 and 9 |
| C4.2 To what extent the Small Project has sufficient resources? | Does the project have the human, technical and technological resources to implement the project:<br>- Fully: 4 points<br>- Partially: 2 point<br>- No: 0 points | | | 2 |
| C4.3 To what extent is the Small Project budget balanced between FRs? | If SP consist of two (2) FRs:<br>- 1 point if one FR has 71 – 80 % and other FR has 20 – 29 % of the total Grant contribution<br>- 4 points if one FR has 60 – 70 % and other FR has 30 – 40 % of the total Grant contribution<br>- 8 points if both FRs are within 41 – 60 % of the total Grant contribution<br><br>if SP consist of three (3) FRs:<br>- 1 point if one FR has more than 50 % and other FRs have 20 – 25 % of the total Grant contribution<br>- 4 points if one FR has 40 – 50 % and other FRs have 25 – 30 % of the total Grant contribution<br>- 8 points if all FRs are within 30 – 40 % of the total Grant contribution | | | 7 and 9 |
| | **SCORE** | **0** | | |
| **C4 Budget maximum score is 20 points**<br>**Score threshold: minimum number of points for a selection criterion C4: 10**<br>**20% (20/100)** | | | | |

| HORIZONTAL PRINCIPLES | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Reference** | **Horizontal principles** | **Score** | **Evaluator's comments** | **Section in SPA** |
| C5 Sustainable development | The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principle sustainable development as set out in Article 11 TFEU, taking into account the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement. | | | 6 |
| C6 Equal opportunities and non-discrimination | The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principle equal opportunities and non-discrimination based on gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation. | | | 6 |
| C7 Gender equality | The project makes a positive contribution to Programme horizontal principal equality between men and women, gender mainstreaming and the integration of a gender perspective. | | | 6 |
| | **SCORE** | **neutral** | | |
| **Fulfillment of required minimum in horizontal principles has a neutral contribution in entire evaluation process.**<br>**Negative assessment in one of the horizontal principles will lead to rejection of the Small Project.** | | | | |

| **Evaluation criteria** | **Maximum score** | **Achieved score** |
|---|---|---|
| **1 Strategic evaluation criteria** | **60** | **0** |
| 1.1 Project relevance | 45 | 0 |
| 1.2 Partnership relevance | 15 | 0 |
| **2 Operational criteria** | **40** | **0** |
| 2.1 Work plan | 20 | 0 |
| 2.2 Budget | 20 | 0 |
| **TOTAL** | **100** | **0** |

**For evaluation of Small Project Applications, a total of 100 points can be achieved.**
**Small Project Application is ineligible for granting if total score of Small Project Application is under 60 points.**

Date: 20.10.2026
Evaluated by:

_____
(Name and Surname)

_____
(Signature)