

CRITERIA OF CONTENT-RELATED EVALUATION FOR THE ACTIVITY AREA “*Rehabilitation and modernisation of basic infrastructure and improvement of the environment*” UNDER PRIORITY 2. Environment and Infrastructure OF THE SWISS-POLISH COOPERATION PROGRAMME

Objective 3: To improve the management, the safety, the efficiency and the reliability of communal/regional public transportation systems

BASIC INFORMATION	
APPLICATION REFERENCE NUMBER	
APPLICATION TITLE	
NAME OF EXECUTING AGENCY	
FIRST NAME AND SURNAME OF THE EXPERT/S	

ELIGIBILITY CRITERION

Is the project consistent with the European Union and national legislation (including the rules for state aid, public procurement, construction law, environment protection law)?	A negative answer excludes the project from further evaluation	YES/ NO	
---	--	---------	--

NB:

Projects scored below 50% threshold in the following criteria: I. *Project relevance*, IV. *Budget/ financing and cost effectiveness*, V. *Sustainability of the project*, will not be recommended for co-financing.

CRITERION NAME	CRITERION DESCRIPTION	NUMBER OF ACHIEVED POINTS	MAXIMAL NUMBER OF POINTS	REMARKS
----------------	-----------------------	---------------------------	--------------------------	---------

I. Project relevance				
<p>1. To what extent does the project have a direct impact on stimulating the development of the transportation sector and social and economic growth of the given area?</p>	<p>15 points – the project is closely related and has direct, clearly defined impact on stimulating the development of the transportation system and as an effect of social and economic growth on the given area;</p> <p>14 - 8 points – the project has direct impact on achieving the above mentioned objective, but it has been defined in an overly generalised way;</p> <p>7 – 2 points – the project has a partial, indirect or unclear relation to stimulating the development of the transportation system and social and economic growth on the given area;</p> <p>1 - 0 points – the project has little impact or relation to stimulating the development of the transportation system and social and economic growth on the given area.</p>		15	
<p>2. To what extent is the project conducive to improving management, safety, effectiveness and infallibility of local / regional public transportation systems?</p>	<p>15 - 14 points - the project is clearly and directly conducive for improving travelling safety and standard, and also to improving traffic capacity and consequently shortening driving time. The project assumes applying modern technologies to allow achievement of anticipated objectives;</p> <p>13 - 8 points – the project is directly conducive for achievement of the above specified objectives, but it has been formulated in an overly generalised way;</p>		15	

	<p>7 - 2 points - the project is partially conducive for improving travelling safety and standard, and also to improving traffic capacity and consequently shortening driving time, or it is not directly related to achievement of those objectives;</p> <p>1 - 0 points - the project has very limited influence on the implementation of the above specified objectives.</p>			
3. To what extent is the project consistent with local, regional or national programmes or strategies related to transport policy?	<p>10 points – the project can be clearly and completely included in local/ national/ regional programmes or strategies for transportation policy;</p> <p>9 - 4 points – the project can be partly included in the local/ national/ regional programmes or strategies for transportation policy;</p> <p>3 - 0 points – the project is insignificantly related to local/ national/ regional programmes or strategies for transportation policy.</p>		10	
4. Are the proposed actions of an innovative nature and/or have a potential indispensable for putting forward of new solutions that may be applied on a larger scale (pilot projects with demonstration effect)?	<p>10 points – actions proposed by the Executing Agency are fully innovative and guarantee the potential necessary for proposing new solutions that may be applied on a larger scale;</p> <p>9 - 1 points - actions proposed by the Executing Agency are to a larger or smaller extent innovative or may guarantee the potential necessary for proposing new solutions that may be applied on a larger scale;</p> <p>0 points - actions proposed by the Executing Agency are neither innovative nor do they guarantee the potential</p>		10	

	necessary for proposing new solutions, which may be applied on a larger scale.			
5. To what extent does the project affect the implementation of horizontal policies (sustainable development, equal opportunities for both genders and for persons with disabilities)?	<p>5 points – the project implements fully at least one of the horizontal policies;</p> <p>4—1 points – the project refers to horizontal policies on an overly generalised level;</p> <p>0 points – the project executes no horizontal policies .</p>		5	
total			55	

II. Project management /implementation				
1. What is the Executing Agency's experience in management/implementation of projects /programmes within the scope that corresponds to the subject of the project in question?	<p>10 points – the Executing Agency has gained vast experience in management/implementation of projects having a similar scope in the past 5 years;</p> <p>9 - 4 points – the Executing Agency has general experience in management/implementation of projects;</p> <p>3 - 0 points - the Executing Agency has little/ no experience in management/implementation of projects.</p>		10	

<p>2. Does the project management system assure its effective implementation pursuant to SPCP requirements, and in particular to what extent is the specialist staff engaged in implementation of the project sufficient?</p>	<p>5 points – the presented project management system fully guarantees effective project implementation; the Executing Agency has considerable institutional potential to allow its implementation; it executes the project using its own highly qualified specialists or plans to outsource a part of works under the project to subcontractors, which has been clearly justified in the application and necessary for correct project implementation;</p> <p>4 - 2 points – there are reservations as regards the effectiveness of project implementation on the basis of the proposed management system; the Executing Agency has institutional potential which is not fully satisfactory to allow project implementation; it plans outsourcing a part of works under the project to subcontractors, which has not been clearly justified in the application and gives rise to concerns as whether it is indeed indispensable to allow appropriate project implementation;</p> <p>1 - 0 points – there are serious concerns as to whether the proposed management system would assure effective project implementation; the Executing Agency has insignificant institutional potential for project implementation; in addition it has insufficient specialised staff for project implementation and does not plan commissioning a part of works under the project to subcontractors.</p>		5	
<p>3. Does the Executing Agency have financial stability?¹</p>	<p>5 - 4 points – the Executing Agency has financial stability;</p> <p>3 – 1 points - financial stability of the Executing Agency is not fully stable;</p> <p>0 points – there are serious doubts as regards financial stability of the Executing Agency in the context of possible project implementation.</p>		5	

¹ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

4. Does the Executing Agency guarantee the stability of project's cofinancing sources? ²	<p>5 - 4 points – Executing Agency guarantees the stability of project's cofinancing sources;</p> <p>3 - 1 points – Executing Agency does not completely guarantees the stability of project's cofinancing sources;</p> <p>0 points – there are serious doubts as to whether Executing Agency is able to guarantee the stability of project's cofinancing sources</p>		5	
total	25			

III. Methodology and justification of project implementation				
1. Is the need and urgency of the project implementation genuine and precisely justified?	<p>5 points – the project clearly and logically points to a genuine and justified need, urgency and benefits arising from its implementation;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – the need of the project has been indicated and justified in a generalised way, or has only been partially presented;</p> <p>0 points – the project does not indicate clearly or fails to justify the genuine need of its implementation.</p>		5	
2. To what extent are activities proposed by the Executing Agency under the project necessary, reasonable and directly connected with the objectives and expected results? ³	<p>5 points – the activities have been presented in a logical and precise way. They are consistent, reasonable and directly related to objectives and results of the project;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – the activities are directly related to project objectives, but their presentation was generalised;</p>		5	

² This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

³ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

	0 points – part of the proposed activities are only indirectly related to project objectives/ results. There are concerns as regards their rationability.			
3. To what extent is the action plan clear and feasible? ⁴	5 points - the action plan is feasible and clear; 4 - 1 points - there are doubts as to the feasibility of the action plan; 0 points - feasibility of the action plan is highly questionable		5	
4. To what extent have the potential beneficiaries/target groups been correctly defined (are these the groups that need biggest support under the project)? To what extent does the project contribute to satisfying the needs of potential beneficiaries/target groups?	5 points – potential beneficiaries/target groups have been identified correctly and clearly. The project is highly conducive for satisfying needs of the above mentioned groups, and benefits for the target groups arising from its implementation are indisputable; 4 - 1 points – potential beneficiaries/target groups have been indicated in a generalised way. The project is only partly conducive for satisfying their needs or this contribution is questionable; 0 points – target groups have not been not identified or there is no indication that the project will contribute to satisfying their needs.		5	
5. To what extent does the project contain objectively verifiable and achievable indicators for the assumed activities? ⁵	5 points – the indicators have been defined precisely and are measurable; the sources of their verification have been clearly indicated and allow an objective evaluation; 4 - 1 points – formulation of the indicators enables their general evaluation, however, they have been presented too		5	

⁴ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

⁵ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

	broadly, imprecisely or the value of the indicators is inadequate for the specific nature of the project; 0 points – the indicators are not adequate for the project description or for activities undertaken under it			
total			25	

IV. Budget/ financing and cost effectiveness				
1. Is the expenditure included in the project eligible, consistent with the programme documents, in particular Paragraph 5.5 of the Framework Agreement?	<p>15 points – all expenditures indicated by the Executing Agency as eligible are consistent with the indicated documents and principles;</p> <p>7 points – the major part of expenditures indicated by the Executing Agency as eligible comply with the indicated documents and principles. The project contains some non-eligible expenditures classified by the Executing Agency as eligible; however, this does not affect project implementation;</p> <p>0 points – the project contains non-eligible expenditures that constitute an important element of project implementation.</p>		15	
2. Is the project cost effective? Are estimated costs commensurate with/ proportionate to the expected results? In the case of investment activities, do they constitute an indispensable element of the project and are they related to non-investment activities?	<p>5 points – there is no doubt that the estimated costs are commensurate with the planned results. Investment and non-investment activities under the project are indispensable from the project point of view and they are interrelated;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – the relation of inputs to the project results has been presented, however, their description or the proposed values give rise to concerns or are too general to clearly state project effectiveness. It is not clear that investment measures are necessary for the project implementation and/or that they are strictly related to non-investment activities;</p>		5	

	<p>0 points – the inputs are disproportionate to the planned effects, particular measures assumed in the project lack interrelations. There are serious doubts as regards the fact if investment measures are necessary for the project implementation and/or that they are strictly related to non-investment activities.</p>			
<p>3. Are the proposed expenditures rational as regards implementation of measures assumed under the project? Do costs presented in the project budget correspond to market prices?⁶</p>	<p>5 points – expenditures presented in the budget are rational and corresponds to market prices;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – expenditures have been estimated in an overly general way; no specific indication has been made for the expenditure level for certain measures, which impedes verification of its conformity to market prices;</p> <p>0 points – expenditures in the project budget are irrational (fail to correspond to market prices) or have not been defined precisely.</p>		5	
<p>4. Has the budget been presented in detail and clearly?⁷</p>	<p>5 points – expenditures have been defined in a logical and detailed way, and enable executing an unequivocal evaluation of the financial feasibility of the project;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – the project budget gives rise to concerns as regards the particularisation and transparency of particular items;</p> <p>0 points – it is not possible to carry out an unequivocal evaluation of the project financial feasibility, as expenditures have not been defined in a sufficiently clear, logical and detailed way.</p>		5	
total			30	

⁶ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

⁷ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project Outline

V. Sustainability of the project				
<p>1. To what extent does the project contain likely catalytic/ multiplier effects (including the possibility of project follow-up, extension of project impact and transferring information)? Will outputs that arise from measures assumed in the project continue functioning after project completion?</p>	<p>8 points – the project contains catalytic/ multiplier effects, which guarantees its execution once co-financing is ended. Results/ outputs of the project are sustainable;</p> <p>7 - 1 points – project sustainability has not been fully documented. Insignificant catalytic effect;</p> <p>0 points – the impact of the project will not exceed the time limit of its implementation, and will come to an end after project close up.</p>		8	
<p>2. Capacity of long-term management of the project/financial sustainability of the project. How will the presented measures be financed after finishing of SPCP co-financing? If the project is a part /phase of bigger investment, will this investment being continued after project's finalization?</p>	<p>8 points – a full- scope project follow-up is planned after co-financing end; stable financing sources for its further implementation have been indicated. If the project is a part /phase of bigger investment, this investment will being continued after project's finalization;</p> <p>7 - 1 points – a follow-up of the project is assumed after co-financing end, nevertheless no stable financing sources for its further implementation have been indicated. If the project is a part /phase of bigger investment, there are serious doubts that this investment will being continued after project's finalization;</p> <p>0 points – no follow-up of the project is assumed after finishing of co-financing. If the project is a part /phase of bigger investment, this investment will not being continued after project's finalization.</p>		8	
total			16	

VI. Risk and risk management

1. To what extent is the risk connected with project implementation identified properly and correctly?	<p>3 points – a correct risk analysis related to project implementation was performed;</p> <p>2 – 1 points – the risk analysis was presented on a relatively generalised level;</p> <p>0 points – the risk analysis was presented too generally or it was omitted.</p>		3	
2. To what extent is the adopted method of risk management appropriate and sufficient?	<p>3 points – the method of risk management has been indicated in an accurate way;</p> <p>2 - 1 points – the indicated method of risk management has been presented in a relatively generalised way;</p> <p>0 points – lacking or insufficient indication of risk management method.</p>		3	
total			6	

VII. Information and promotion				
1. To what extent will the Executing Agency ensure proper information and promotion of the project? To what extent will the project contribute to dissemination of information on SPCP?	<p>3 points – the promotion plan of the project and SPCP has been presented clearly and in detail;</p> <p>2 - 1 point – the promotion plan of the project and SPCP has been presented in an overly generalised way;</p> <p>0 points – no promotion plan of the project and SPCP.</p>		3	
total			3	
			160	

LIST OF PROJECT EVALUATION	
CRITERION NAME	NUMBER OF SCORED POINTS
I. Project relevance	55

II. Management / implementation of the project	25
III. Methodology and justification of the project implementation	25
IV. Budget/financing and cost effectiveness	30
V. Project sustainability	16
VI. Risk and risk management	6
VII. Information and promotion	3
total	160

RECOMMENDATIONS

JUSTIFICATION

Date

Signature of the Expert/s