

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

Objectives 1 and 2: To enhance municipal infrastructure services in order to increase living standards and promote economic development; To increase energy efficiency and to reduce emissions, in particular greenhouse gases and hazardous substances;

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, water law and the act on wastes)?	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				
1. To what extent does the project have a direct, significant and lasting impact on improving the condition of the natural environment?	<p>15 – 14 points – the project is closely related and has direct, clearly defined and lasting impact on improvement of the condition of the natural environment;</p> <p>13 - 7 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 improving the condition of the natural environment;</p> <p>1 - 0 points – the project has little impact on improving the condition of the natural environment.</p>		15	
2. To what extent is the project consistent with local, regional or national programmes or strategies for environment protection?	<p>10 – 9 points - the project can be clearly and completely included in local, regional and national programmes or strategies for environment protection;</p> <p>8 - 4 points – the project can be partly included in local, regional and national programmes or strategies for environment protection;</p> <p>3 - 0 points - the project is insignificantly related to local, regional and national programmes or strategies for environment protection.</p>		10	

<p>3. To what extent does the project contribute to improving services related to infrastructure for the waste management system, or to what extent does the project contribute to increasing energy savings and emission reductions, in particular greenhouse gases and hazardous substances, by way of introducing renewable energy systems, renovation and/or modernisation of municipal heating systems and of central heat sources and heating installation in public healthcare units, which provide hospitalization services and in public schools?</p>	<p>15 – 14 points – the project will contribute in a clear and direct way to improving services related to infrastructure for the waste management system by implementing at least one of the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – reducing waste volumes disposed to landfills; – increasing volume of reused waste; – assuring appropriate conditions for recovery of packaging materials at a level imposed for Poland in 2015 – reducing volumes of hazardous unprotected waste (hospital waste, asbestos) – reducing hazard arising from incorrect handling of hazardous waste (hospital waste, asbestos) – increasing the volume of hazardous waste (hospital waste) disposed of by methods specified in Regulation of the Health Minister <p>or the project will contribute in a clear and direct way to improving energy effectiveness and emission reductions, especially greenhouse gas and hazardous substances, through introduction of renewable energy systems, modernisation of municipal heating systems and central heating sources and heating installations, by assuring implementation of at least one of the below objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – limiting the use of conventional fuels – enhancing the use effectiveness of burnt fuels and efficiency of heat transmission; – increasing the share of renewable energy sources in the national energy balance; – reducing emissions to the atmosphere of noxious burning products, such as SO₂, NO_x and CO₂, as well as of dusts; <p>13 – 8 points – the project will contribute to improving services related to infrastructure for the waste management system / enhancing energy effectiveness and emission</p>		15	
--	---	--	----	--

	<p>reductions by introducing renewable energy systems and implementing at least one of the above mentioned objectives, but it has been presented in an overly generalised way;</p> <p>7 – 2 points – the project will partly contribute to improving services related to infrastructure for the waste management system / enhancing energy effectiveness and emission reductions by introducing renewable energy systems, which is to be achieved by implementing one of the above mentioned objectives;</p> <p>1 - 0 point – the project has little impact on improving services related to infrastructure for the waste management system / enhancing energy effectiveness and emission reductions by introducing renewable energy systems, which is to be achieved by implementing one of the above mentioned objectives.</p>			
<p>4. To what extent is the project complimentary with provisions of the National Development Plan/ National Strategic Reference Framework?</p>	<p>5 - 4 points – the project is fully complimentary with the assumptions of the NDP / NSRF;</p> <p>3 - 1 points – the project is partially complimentary with provisions of the NDP / NSRF; a part of its measures overlap with the EU funds;</p> <p>0 points – the project is not complimentary with provisions of the NDP / NSRF; its measures overlap with the EU funds.</p>		5	

<p>5. 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)?¹</p> <p>OR</p>	<p>15 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 (pilot projects with demonstration effect) or project on waste management assumes clear, very reasonable and effective activity on energy efficiency;</p> <p>14 - 8 points - actions proposed by the Executing Agency are to a large or a bit smaller extent innovative or may guarantee the potential necessary for proposing new solutions that may be applied on a larger scale (pilot projects with demonstration effect) or project on waste management assumes reasonable activity on energy efficiency but it was presented on fairly general level;</p>			
<p>Does the project on waste management include additional aspect of energy efficiency, assuming installation of heat recovery system?²</p>	<p>7 -1 points - actions proposed by the Executing Agency are to an average/small extent innovative or may guarantee the potential necessary for proposing new solutions that may be applied on a larger scale (pilot projects with demonstration effect) or project on waste management assumes doubtful activity on energy efficiency presented on very general level;</p> <p>0 points - actions proposed by the Executing Agency are neither innovative nor do they guarantee the potential necessary for proposing new solutions, which may be applied on a larger scale (pilot projects with demonstration effect) or project on waste management does not assume activity on energy efficiency.</p>		15	

¹ Item will be taken into account in evaluation of projects under the Objective No.2

² Item will be taken into account in evaluation of projects under the Objective No.1

<p>6. 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>	<p>5 points – the project implements all horizontal policies;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – apart from sustainable development in the environmental aspect, the impact of the project on implementation of other horizontal policies has been formulated on a general level;</p> <p>0 points – apart from sustainable development in the environmental aspect the project implements horizontal policies in an insufficient way.</p>		5	
total	65			

II. Project management /implementation				
<p>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>	<p>10 points – the Executing Agency has gained vast experience in management/implementation of projects/ programmes having a similar scope in the past 5 years;</p> <p>9 - 2 points – the Executing Agency has general experience in management/implementation of projects/ programmes having a similar scope;</p> <p>1 - 0 points - the Executing Agency has little/no experience in management/implementation of projects/ programmes having a similar scope.</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 doubts 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?³</p>	<p>10 - 9 points – the Executing Agency has financial stability;</p> <p>8 – 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>		10	

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

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 presented partially;</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, rational and directly connected with the objectives and expected results? ⁴	<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> <p>0 points – part of the proposed measures are only indirectly related to project objectives/ results. There are concerns as regards their rationality.</p>		5	
3. To what extent is the action plan clear and feasible? ⁵	<p>5 points - the action plan is feasible and clear;</p> <p>4 - 1 points - there are doubts as to the feasibility of the action plan;</p> <p>0 points - feasibility of the action plan is highly</p>		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

	questionable.			
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?	<p>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;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – potential beneficiaries/target groups are indicated in a generalised way. The project is only partly conducive for satisfying their needs or this contribution is questionable;</p> <p>0 points – target groups have not been not identified or there is no indication that the project will contribute to satisfying their needs.</p>		5	
5. To what extent does the project contain objectively verifiable and achievable indicators for the assumed activities? ⁶	<p>5 points – the indicators have been defined precisely and are measurable, and the sources of their verification have been clearly indicated and allow an objective evaluation;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – formulation of the indicators enables their general evaluation, however, they are presented too broadly, imprecisely or the value of the indicators is inadequate for the specific nature of the project;</p> <p>0 points – the indicators are not adequate for the project description or for measures undertaken under it.</p>		5	
total			25	

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

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 expenditure indicated by the Executing Agency as eligible complies with the indicated documents and principles. The project contains some non-eligible expenses classified by the Executing Agency as eligible; however, this does not affect project implementation;</p> <p>0 points – the project contains non-eligible expenses 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?	<p>5 points – there is no doubt that estimated costs are commensurate with the planned results;</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 effectiveness of the project;</p> <p>0 points – the inputs are disproportionate to the planned effects.</p>		5	
3. Are the proposed expenditures rational as regards implementation of activities assumed under the project? Do costs presented in the project budget correspond to market prices? ⁷	<p>5 points – expenditures presented in the budget are rational and correspond 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>		5	

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

	<p>0 points – expenditures in the project budget are irrational (fail to correspond to market prices) or have not been defined precisely.</p>			
4. Has the budget been presented in detail and clearly? ⁸	<p>5 points – expenditure has been defined in a logical and detailed way, allowing execution of 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, because expenditures have not been defined in a sufficiently clear, logical and detailed way.</p>		5	
total			30	

V. Sustainability of the project				
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 activities assumed in the project continue functioning after project completion?	<p>6 - 5 points – the project contains catalytic/ multiplier effects. Results/ outputs of the project are sustainable;</p> <p>4 - 1 point – 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 – it will come to an end after project close up.</p>		6	

⁸ This item shall not be taken into account in evaluation of the Project outline

<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?</p>	<p>10 - 8 points – a full- scope project follow-up is planned after co-financing end; stable financing sources for its further implementation have been indicated;</p> <p>7 - 1 point – a follow-up of the project is assumed after co-financing end, however, stable financing sources for its further implementation have not been indicated;</p> <p>0 points – no follow-up of the project is assumed after finishing of co-financing.</p>		10	
total	16			

VI. Risk and risk management				
<p>1. To what extent is the risk connected with project implementation identified properly and correctly?</p>	<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	
<p>2. To what extent is the adopted method of risk management appropriate and sufficient?</p>	<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?	3 points – the promotion plan of the project and SPCP is presented clearly and in detail;			
	2- 1 point – the promotion plan of the project and SPCP is presented generally;		3	
	0 points – no promotion plan of the project and SPCP.			
total			3	
			170	

LIST OF PROJECT EVALUATION	
CRITERION NAME	NUMBER OF SCORED POINTS
I. Significance of the project	65
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	170

RECOMMENDATIONS

JUSTIFICATION

Date

Signature of the Expert/s