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1. Introduction

The purpose of this tool is to provide applicants with a checklist which can be used for the self-assessment of their project proposals before submitting it to the programme.

It presents the strategic and operational criteria, including guiding questions, on which the quality assessment by the programme is based.

This checklist is for information purposes only, and it shall not be attached to the application form.

1. Checklist for self-assessment of project proposal

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | | Guiding questions | Yes | No |
| STRATEGIC | **Relevance** | Relevance for the targeted SO and transnationality | | |
| Is the project proposal relevant in relation to the achievement of the targeted programme specific objective and the expected result? |  |  |
| Is the importance and added value of transnational cooperation for the topic addressed clearly demonstrated? |  |  |
| Intervention logic | | |
| Is the project intervention logic (i.e. project specific objectives, outputs and expected results) clearly defined and consistent? |  |  |
| Policy relevance including horizontal principles | | |
| Does the project proposal clearly contribute to the relevant policy framework (in particular the TA 2030 aims) at different levels? |  |  |
| Does the proposal contribute to horizontal principles and integrate them in the project design? |  |  |
| Innovativeness and synergies | | |
| Is the innovativeness of the project proposal clearly demonstrated? Does it go beyond existing practices in the sector and/or participating territories? |  |  |
| Is the project proposal building on available knowledge and making use of synergies with other projects or initiatives? |  |  |
| Territorial relevance |  |  |
| Is the project proposal aligned with the territorial focus of the call, notably is it clearly addressing peripheral or lagging areas? Are qualitative characteristics and challenges of the targeted areas well explained? |  |  |
| Does the proposal put emphasis on the local or regional dimension of expected results with a clear benefit for the targeted communities? |  |  |
| **Partnership** | Partnership composition and competences | | |
| Is the partnership composition and coherent with the territorial and thematic scope of the project? |  |  |
| Does the partnership demonstrate sufficient competences and capacities to implement the planned activities in the targeted area, and achieve the expected results at the local and/or regional level? |  |  |
| Does the lead applicant have sufficient experience and capacity to manage a transnational cooperation project or is there a clear plan to acquire missing competences through e.g. additional staff or sub-contracting? Do all partners have a clear role and matching competences to fulfil their tasks? In case of partners outside the programme area, is the added value of their participation duly justified? |  |  |
| Transnational cooperation approach | | |
| Does the partnership reflect the transnational cooperation dimension and is it geographically balanced? Are partners actively involved for a joint implementation of activities? |  |  |
| OPERATIONAL | **Implementation** | Methodology and work plan | | |
| Is the methodology suitable to obtain the planned outputs and results? Are the work plan and timing of activities, deliverables and outputs realistic, consistent and transparent, considering also the limited project duration? |  |  |
| Are communication activities planned in the work plan and are they relevant for achieving communication objectives? Are local or regional target groups (and other stakeholders including associated partners) actively involved in project activities? How well does the project engage with communities through bottom-up and participatory approaches? |  |  |
| Does the project proposal clearly conceptualise the ownership/durability of outputs and do they have a good potential for upscaling? Are project outputs and results leading to an increased capacity of target groups and could they be transferred to other peripheral or lagging areas? |  |  |
| Does the management approach show good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation? |  |  |
| Budget | | |
| Does the total budget demonstrate value for money? Is there coherence between project design and budget? Are the financial contributions of the partners balanced and do they reflect partner responsibilities? |  |  |