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1. Introduction

The purpose of this tool is to provide applicants with a checklist that allows to self-assess project proposals against requirements and selection criteria set by the Terms of Reference (ToR) of the strategic call for capitalisation.

This checklist is for information purposes only. For further information on formal & administrative compliance checks and on the quality assessment of proposals, including the detailed selection criteria and guiding questions for assessment, please refer to § 9 of the call ToR.

1. Compliance with requirement on synergies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Yes | No |
| Does the proposal comply with the minimum requirement of capitalising outputs and results from:   * 2 Interreg CE 2021-2027 projects funded in the first or second call; and * 2 projects funded by Interreg cross-border cooperation (CBC) programmes addressing internal central European borders (see annex 1 of the ToR - list of Interreg CBC programmes). |  |  |

1. Checklist for self-assessment of project proposal

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criterion | | Guiding questions | Yes | | No |
| STRATEGIC | **Relevance** | **Thematic and territorial relevance and transnationality** | | | |
| Is the project proposal relevant in relation to the achievement of the targeted programme specific objective and the expected result? | |  |  |
| Is the proposal relevant for the common territorial challenges, joint assets and needs of the CE programme area, and in particular for the specific situation of the participating regions? Does the proposal put emphasis on the reduction of border effects? | |  |  |
| Is the importance of transnational cooperation for achieving the project objectives and results clearly demonstrated? Does it bring added value for the partnership and the involved territories? | |  |  |
| **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** (Sustainable development and environment protection, Equal opportunities and non-discrimination, Equality between men and women) | | | |
| Does the project proposal clearly contribute to the relevant policy framework at different levels? | |  |  |
| Does the proposal contribute to horizontal principles and clearly integrate them in the project design? | |  |  |
| **Capitalisation and synergies** | | | |
| Is the approach for capitalising on existing outputs and results clearly demonstrated and justified, also specifying which features of existing outputs or results will be further developed or adjusted? Is it likely to increase the uptake of existing outputs and results at the policy (upstreaming) or territorial (down-streaming) levels? | |  |  |
| Is the innovativeness of the project proposal clearly demonstrated, and will it bring added value beyond what has already been achieved? | |  |  |
| If applicable, is the uptake of outputs and results of other projects and initiatives beyond the minimum requirements set by the call justified? Does it bring an added value in reaching the aim of the call? | |  |  |
| **Partnership** | **Partnership relevance, coherence and competences** | | | |
| Is the partnership composition relevant and coherent with the project`s territorial and thematic scope? | |  |  |
| Is the partnership composition reflecting the capitalisation approach by including:   * organisations which were actively participating in earlier Interreg CENTRAL EUROPE projects being capitalised and organisations that were actively participating in Interreg CBC projects being capitalised? * additional organisations contributing to the upstreaming or down-streaming of existing outputs and results? | |  |  |
| Does the partnership demonstrate sufficient competences and capacities to implement the planned activities in the targeted areas and achieve the expected results at the local and/or regional level? Does the partnership hold the ownership or rights to use the outputs and results to be capitalised? | |  |  |
| Do 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? | |  |  |
| 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? | |  |  |
| **Transnational cooperation** | | | |
| Does the partnership reflect the transnational cooperation dimension and is it geographically balanced? | |  |  |
| 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? Is the joint development and/or implementation of outputs well demonstrated? In case of investments, are they clearly relevant for reaching the project objectives? Do they have a clear transnational and pilot character? | |  |  |
| Are communication activities planned in the work plan relevant for achieving communication objectives and compliant with requirements set in the call ToR? Are target groups (and other stakeholders including associated partners) actively involved in project activities? | |  |  |
| Does the project proposal clearly conceptualise the ownership/durability, long lasting effects and transferability of outputs and results? | |  |  |
| 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? | |  |  |