

CRITERIA OF CONTENT-RELATED EVALUATION FOR THE FOCUS AREA “*Biodiversity, protection of ecosystems and support of cross-border environmental initiatives*” UNDER PRIORITY 2. Environment and Infrastructure OF THE SWISS-POLISH COOPERATION PROGRAM

Objective 2: To protect nature and functioning of ecosystems in a sustainable manner in the geographic focus areas

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 and water 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, significant and lasting impact on improving the condition of the natural environment?</p>	<p>15 points – the project is very closely related and has direct, clearly defined and lasting impact on improving the condition of the natural environment;</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 improving the condition of the natural environment;</p> <p>0 points – the project has little impact on improving the condition of the natural environment;</p>		15	
<p>2. To what extent is the project consistent with local, regional or national programmes or strategies for environment protection?</p>	<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 affect nature protection and ecosystem functioning in a sustainable way on geographic focus areas (<u>for projects regarding cross-border environmental initiatives also as regards cross-border impact</u>) ?</p>	<p>15 points – the project will contribute in a clear and direct way to nature protection and ecosystem functioning in a sustainable way on geographic focus areas (for projects regarding cross-border environmental initiatives also as regards cross-border impact) by implementing at least one of the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - improving ecological coherence of Natura 2000 network and of other protected areas; - enhancing monitoring of biodiversity (incl. 		15	

	<p>inventory);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - propagation of knowledge and raising awareness related to protecting naturally valuable areas, - supporting sustainable tourism on protected areas; - supporting/intensification of actions of the administration and pro-ecological non-governmental organisations aiming to protect biodiversity within the Carpathian Convention; - multifunctional development of naturally valuable areas; - propagation of knowledge and raising ecological awareness of officials, especially as regards 'green' work places and 'green procurement and purchases'; - intensification of actions of the administration and pro-ecological non-governmental organisations that are conducive to protection of the natural environment; - increasing the volume of 'green' products made in Poland; - propagation of knowledge and raising ecological awareness of the society, especially administrative staff as regards building pro-ecological attitudes (via trainings, workshops, seminars and e-learning platforms); - building correct ecological attitudes of children and youth; - creating and popularisation of partnerships between administration and proecological non-government organisations; - enhancing the operating effectiveness of institutions from the public administration sector as regards environment protection laws; - implementation of appropriate management as 			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>regards habitat and species protection;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - intensification of protective measures aimed at assuring suitable habitat conditions for endangered fauna species; - restoration and preservation of endangered habitats; - popularisation of appropriate management as regards habitat and species protection on protected areas, including NATURA 2000; - intensification of cross-border cooperation and enhancing effectiveness and complexity of protective measures executed by administrative authorities and pro-ecological non-governmental organisations; - more effective cooperation between neighbouring countries with respect to nature protection, especially on NATURA 2000 areas, - better protection of naturally valuable areas. <p>14 – 8 points – the project will contribute in a direct way to nature protection and ecosystem functioning in a sustainable way on geographic focus areas (for projects regarding cross-border environmental initiatives also as regards cross-border impact), but it has been presented in an overly generalised way;</p> <p>7 – 2 points – the project will partly contribute to nature protection and ecosystem functioning in a sustainable way on geographic focus areas (for projects regarding cross-border environmental initiatives also as regards cross-border impact), which is to be achieved by implementing one of the above mentioned objectives;</p> <p>1 - 0 point – the project has little impact on nature protection and ecosystem functioning in a sustainable way on</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	geographic focus areas (for projects regarding cross-border environmental initiatives also as regards cross-border impact).			
4. To what extent is the project complimentary with provisions of the National Development Plan/ National Strategic Reference Framework?	<p>5 - 4 points – the project is fully complimentary with the provisions 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	
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 at least one horizontal policy (apart from sustainable development in the environmental aspect);</p> <p>4—1 points – impact of the project on implementation of horizontal policies (apart from sustainable development in the environmental aspect) has been formulated on less or more 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			50	

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	10 points – the Executing Agency has gained vast experience in management/implementation of projects/ programmes having a similar scope in the past 5 years;		10	

<p>project in question?</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>			
<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 based on 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 little 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>		<p>5</p>	

3. Does the project Executing Agency have financial stability? ¹	<p>10 - 9 points – the Executing Agency has financial stability;</p> <p>8 - 1 points - the Executing Agency does not have full financial stability;</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	
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 to benefits arising from its implementation;</p> <p>4 - 1 points – the need of the project implementation 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, reasonable and directly connected with the objectives and expected results? ²	<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 activities are only indirectly related to project objectives/ results. There are concerns as</p>		5	

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

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

	regards the rationability of the action plan.			
3. To what extent is the action plan clear and feasible? ³	<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 questionable.</p>		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?	<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 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 measures? ⁴	<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>		5	

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

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

	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 expenditure indicated by the Executing Agency as eligible complies with the indicated documents and principles. The project contains small 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? In case the project includes small investment measures (up to 30% of eligible costs), do they constitute necessary element of the project and are strictly related to non-investment activities?	<p>5 points – there is no doubt that the estimated costs are commensurate with the planned results. Small investment measures are necessary for the project implementation and are strictly related to non-investment activities (since they serve realization of the latter);</p> <p>4 - 1 points – the relation of inputs to the project results has been presented, yet their description or the proposed values give rise to concerns or are too general to clearly state effectiveness of the project. It is not clear that investment measures are necessary for the project implementation and/or</p>		5	

	<p>that they are strictly related to non-investment activities (that they serve realization of the latter);</p> <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 activities assumed under the project? Do costs presented in the project budget correspond to market prices?⁵</p>	<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> <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?⁶</p>	<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	

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

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

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	
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>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 points – 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				
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</p>		3	

	was omitted.			
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 is presented clearly and in detail;</p> <p>2 - 1 point – the promotion plan of the project and SPCP is presented generally;</p> <p>0 points – no promotion plan of the project and SPCP.</p>		3	
total			3	
			155	

LIST OF PROJECT EVALUATION	
CRITERION NAME	NUMBER OF SCORED POINTS
I. Project relevance	50
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	155

RECOMMENDATIONS

JUSTIFICATION

Date

Signature of the Expert/s