



**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
ENVIRONMENT  
Directorate D - Water and Environmental Programmes  
**ENV.D.1 - LIFE**

# **Guide for the evaluation of LIFE-Environment proposals 2005 - PUBLIC VERSION**

## **Disclaimer:**

This document aims at explaining the criteria and procedure that will be used for the evaluation of the 2004-2005 LIFE Environment proposals. It is a simplified version of the guidelines and it does not contain all material instructions for the evaluators.

**The Commission services are responsible for the carrying out of the evaluation of the Eligibility, Selection and Award Criteria, they may decide to use independent experts to assist in this task. They are responsible for the awarding of the final scores and the drawing up of the final selection list.**

**Receipt and registration of proposals**

The National authorities submit to the Commission all the proposals they have received. The deadline for receiving the proposals is 30 November 2004 at 17:00pm.

NB: National authorities are responsible for taking all arrangements and precautions to ensure that all proposals are received by the Commission by 30/11/2004, 17:00pm at the latest. Any document received after the deadline will be declared not eligible.

All the proposals received by the Commission by the above deadline will be registered in ESAP. The Commission sends receipts to the applicants.

No further information or documents may be submitted by the National authorities after 30 November 2004.

## 1. Check of Eligibility by Unit D.1

### Check of eligibility

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit ENV.D.1

**Eligibility criteria:** if one of the criteria is not fulfilled, projects are declared non eligible and are eliminated from the selection process

- Each project must be submitted to the Commission by the competent national authorities in two identical, **complete**, hard copies bearing original hand-written signatures where requested.
- The proposal must have been sent via the competent national authorities and received by the Commission before the deadline for submission.
- The standard Life-Environment 2004-2005 (version June 2004) proposal submission forms must have been used.
- The Life- Environment proposal submission forms are not hand-written.
- All Life Environment proposal submission forms are present.
- All relevant forms are **completed**.
- Where required, the proposal forms are completed with dated signatures whereby status and full name of the signatory(ies) is clearly in evidence. This is of particular importance for the applicants' signature (Form A0), as well as those of all the possible partners and co-financiers to the project for whom declarations of commitment (Forms 1 and 2) to the project are expected. These signed declarations are considered very important and failure to deliver them or to clearly indicate the amount of the contribution with the proposal will lead to the exclusion of the project from further evaluation. Note as stated in the Application Guide, the status of partner/co-financer commitment at this stage may be 'not fully confirmed', the declarations should give the status of the commitment. Commitments from partner/co-financer must be fully confirmed by end of procedure (end revision stage).
- The mandatory annexes are present (only public bodies are exempt) - Profit and loss account and the balance sheet of the last financial year External audit report produced by an approved auditor where EU contribution requested exceeds €300 000<sup>1</sup>

**N.B.: All proposals found non-eligible will be double checked and submitted for consideration of the group eligibility meeting held internally by Unit ENV.D.1 at the end of the eligibility check.**

---

<sup>1</sup> "where the EU contribution requested exceeds €300 000, an external audit report produced by an approved auditor. That report shall certify the accounts of the applicant for the last financial year available. In case the auditor has a doubt about the applicant's financial viability through the project period, his/her opinion in that respect should be explicitly expressed in the report." Application guide Part II chapter III.1

## **2. Evaluation of Selection criteria by Unit D.1 (selection criteria 1 and 2)**

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit ENV.D.1 with the assistance of the Contractor.

***Selection criteria 1(a and b) and 2:***

if the answer to one of these questions is **No**, then the proposal is declared non selected and is eliminated from the evaluation process.

- Technical and financial soundness of participants

See pages 14-15 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

- Compliance with the current Life regulation

See page 16 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

### 3. Evaluation of award criteria – FIRST PHASE (technical evaluation)

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit ENV.D.1 with the assistance of the Contractor

*During this phase two award criteria “Innovative nature and progress. Technical feasibility” and “Transferability of results. Demonstration character of the project and dissemination” as well as the two bonus criteria “multinational approach” and “job creation and SME” will be evaluated by the Contractor.*

*The final decision on the scores to be awarded to each proposal will be taken during a panel meeting chaired by the Commission and attended by all the Policy group co-ordinators and individual evaluators from the Contractor. This decision will be based on the evaluation of the ‘Contractor’s’ assessments and discussion during the Panel Evaluation meetings.*

Rules for scoring for award criteria: a score from one to ten, corresponding to the ratings unsatisfactory (1-2), poor (3-4), average (5-6), good (7-8) and excellent (9-10), is given

#### **Award criterion 1: Innovative nature and progress. Technical feasibility**

See pages 17-18 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

#### **Award criterion 2: Transferability of results. Demonstration character of the project and dissemination**

See pages 20-22 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

**Bonus criteria 1 and 2:** Projects may be given up to four additional points for the “multinational approach” bonus criteria and up to two additional points for the “job creation and SME” bonus criteria.

Multinational approach

See page 31 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

Job creation and SME

See page 32 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

*Projects which have been awarded a score of 5 or over for each criterion will be ranked according to total score achieved on the above-mentioned criteria (1 and 2) and bonuses (1 and 2). Subsequently, a ‘restricted’ list will be established. This list will contain twice the number of projects that could be financed according to the available budget. Projects which have been awarded a score under 5 for any one of the award criteria are eliminated from the process.*

#### **4. Evaluation of award criteria – SECOND PHASE (Quality evaluation)**

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit D.1, thematic units of DG ENV, with the assistance of the Contractor.

Rules for scoring for award criteria: a score from one to ten, corresponding to the ratings unsatisfactory (1-2), poor (3-4), average (5-6), good (7-8) and excellent (9-10), is given.

- ***Award criterion 3 : Coherence and quality, integration***

See pages 23-25 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

- ***Award criterion 4: Financial coherence and quality.***

See pages 27-28 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

- ***Award criterion 5: Community interest and environmental problem***

See pages 29 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

***Projects which have been awarded a score under 5 for any one of the award criteria are eliminated from the process.***

## **5. Conclusion of the evaluation phase and awarding of final scores by the Commission (criteria 3, 4 and 5)**

*A Group evaluation (comprising of D.1 and technical units)* will then be held by thematic area in order to elaborate the 'pre-selected/reserve' list. During this Group evaluation, the final scores for criteria 3, 4 and 5 will be validated.

Projects on the selected/reserve list will then undergo the Revision stage.

The final decision concerning scores awarded is taken by the Commission.

## **6. Classification of projects**

*Unit responsible:* Unit D.1.

Upon completion of the selection and evaluation procedure, projects are listed in order of merit according to the total scores allocated by the Commission for each of the award criteria and bonus criteria. The list takes no account of the subject of a project, its scope or the candidate's country of origin.

In the case of equal scores between two or several proposals, the score obtained on criterion 5 “Community interest and environmental problem” is used to sort the proposals. The second sorting criterion to be used, if necessary, will be award criterion 3 “Coherence and quality, integration”.

The best projects are pre-selected up to the maximum amount of funding available. There is also a further reserve list for another 20% of the total funding available, depending on the size (amount of co-financing asked) of the pre-selected projects.

All the other proposals are considered as “not selected”. The applicants who are not selected are informed in writing of the results of the evaluation only after the LIFE Committee has delivered its opinion.



## **7. Revision phase**

*Responsible:* Commission, Unit D.1

The comments made by the evaluators during the evaluation process are used to make suggestions of improvements to the pre-selected/reserve proposals. The revision is not meant to alter the objectives of the proposals; it will address specific aspects of the project identified during the evaluation which require further development/clarification. The revision may also address specific problems identified during evaluation concerning the proposed budget i.e. incorrect figures, too vague description of items, incorrect contribution rate, correction of budgets evaluated as excessive or poorly explained, etc.

Letters suggesting modifications/improvement of the original proposals are sent to the applicants with a set deadline for applicants' responses.

The responses received from the applicants are analysed by the Commission. The Commission will then request the submission of a revised project proposal which takes into account the revisions/modifications requested during the revision phase by a set date. This revised project proposal should be submitted in 3 copies and all necessary signatures must be original. All Partner and Co-financer declarations must be fully confirmed and signed.

Following the revision phase and in function of the available budget, the Commission will present to the LIFE Committee the proposed list of project to be financed including a list of projects in reserve. Only those proposals which are assessed as satisfactory by Unit D.1 at the end of the revision phase are presented to the LIFE Committee for their opinion on financing.

## **8. The LIFE Committee**

The LIFE committee is made up of representatives of the Member States and is chaired by the Commission. The projects which have submitted an agreed revised proposal within the deadline are included on a list presented to the Committee for their opinion. The list is ranked according to merit. Based on the opinion delivered by this Committee, the Commission will then decide upon the projects to be financed.

## **9. The attribution of LIFE funding**

Based on the opinion of the LIFE Committee, the Commission decides on the projects to be financed. Grant Agreements are then sent to each 'beneficiary' detailing the financial support and conditions of financing with a copy of the agreed revised proposal. Beneficiaries must advise the Commission of their acceptance of the financing within 90 days of notification by returning signed copies of the grant agreement.

-

## **10. Informing unsuccessful applicants**

The Commission will officially inform each unsuccessful applicant by means of a letter. This letter will be sent after the LIFE Committee has delivered its opinion on the proposed list of projects to be financed. Projects that have not been financed will not be automatically retained for the following round. If applicants wish to apply for financing in the following round they must present their project again in response to the Call for proposals for that round.

## Evaluation criteria and evaluators

<i>Regulation reference</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Eliminatory score</i>	<i>Weighting</i>
	<b>Eligibility</b>	Yes/No	-	
<b>Selection</b>				
Article 2(b)	<b>1.A and 1.B : Soundness of participants</b>	Yes/No	-	
Articles 2(a), 4(2)(a), 4(4)	<b>2: Compliance with Life III Regulation and guidelines</b>	Yes/No	-	
<b>Award CRITERIA</b>				
Articles 4(6)(b)&(c), 4(2) (c) 4.4	<b>1: Innovatory nature and progress. Technical feasibility.</b>	0 to 10	Less than 5	1.5
Articles 4(6) (d), 4(6) (e)	<b>2: Transferability of results, demonstration character of the project and dissemination.</b>	0 to 10	Less than 5	1
Articles 2(b)&(c), 4(6) (f)&(h)	<b>3: Coherence and quality, integration</b>	0 to 10	Less than 5	1
Articles 2 (b)&(c)	<b>4: Financial coherence and quality</b>	0 to 10	Less than 5	0.3
Article 4(1), 2(a), 4(6) (a)	<b>5 : Community interest and environmental problem</b>	0 to 10	Less than 5	1
<b>BONUS CRITERIA</b>				
Article 2(3)	<b>1: Multinational approach</b>	0 to 4	-	1
Article 4(6), third subpara	<b>2 Job creation and SMEs</b>	0 to 2	-	1

**SELECTION CRITERION N° 1.A****Soundness of the participants*****Technical soundness*****Guidance for the evaluator**

Participants to a project are: the applicant and its partners.

A project is eliminated on the basis of this criterion only if the evaluator has strong evidence that the applicant and/or its partners do not have the necessary competence to carry out the project.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
If the project applicant or one of the participants in the non-reliable beneficiary/partner list?		
Does the applicant have the experience and/or expertise necessary to carry out the project?		
If the answer is <b>No</b> , has the applicant plans to associate with one or more partners who do have this competence?		

**Project selected:**☐ **Yes**☐ **No**

**SELECTION CRITERION N° 1.B****Soundness of the participants*****Financial soundness*****Guidance for the evaluator**

Participants to a project are: the applicant and its partners.

A project is eliminated on the basis of this criterion only if the evaluator has strong evidence that either the applicant or one of the partners is not reliable from a financial point of view.

The applicant and partners must absolutely give a financial contribution to the project (see Application Guide Part II, Point I). If they do not, projects are eliminated on the basis of this criterion. If the role of partner is unclear (not real partner) i.e. contribution of work in kind; sponsorship; costs not included in budget – add comment for revision

If there is no or unsatisfactory financial information on partners or co-financiers in forms ....., projects are not eliminated. The lack of information is taken into account when assessing criterion “Coherence and quality”. Additional information may be asked during the revision phase.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
According to the information available, has the applicant ever been declared bankrupt?		
According to the information available is the applicant financially sound (based on Form A1, profit and loss account, balance sheet, Audit Report – where applicable)?		
According to the information available are there doubts as to the capacity of applicant/partners to finance the project?		
Do both the applicant and partner/s contribute financially to the project?		

**Project eligible:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

**SELECTION CRITERION N° 2****Compliance with the LIFE Regulation****Guidance for the evaluator**

A project is eliminated on the basis of this criterion when it is clearly not related to any of the topics set out in the Life Regulation (article 4.2). If the evaluator has a doubt, he may ask the advice of the competent thematic unit.

The policy group declared by the beneficiary will be retained in all cases unless indication of the contrary from the applicant itself. The applicant will be the only responsible for consequences derived of its assignment of the proposal to a given policy group.

<b>QUESTIONS</b>	<b>Y/ N</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b> (quote the appropriate paragraph in the guidelines to which the project relates in case of reallocation of the proposal between different policy groups/subgroups )
Does the project relate to one of the five topics specified in the Life III Regulation (Article 4.1)?		

**Project selected:**      ☐ **Yes**                              ☐ **No**



## AWARD CRITERION N° 1

### Innovatory nature and progress. Technical feasibility.

#### Guidance for the evaluator

This criterion combines the following criteria from the LIFE Regulation:

- *be innovative by virtue of the technology or the method applied* (Article 4 (6) (b));
- *set an example and represent progress compared with the current situation* (Article 4 (6) (c)).
- *be feasible in terms of technical proposal* (Article 2(c))
- *...shall ensure that LIFE-Environment is complementary to the Community Research Programmes and the Structural Funds and Rural Development Programmes* (Article 4.4).

This criterion is to be assessed by the expert panels and the Commission. The following **eliminary** factors have to be considered in the evaluation of this criterion:

The **innovation** represented by the proposal can be evaluated from different perspectives: a) relative to the technologies applied by the project (technological innovation), b) regarding the way technologies are implemented (innovation in processes or methods) and, c) innovation concerning the business and economic models developed by the project (economic and business innovation). These different dimensions of the innovatory nature have to be compared with the state of the art at global (world) level. Innovation should not be restricted to pure technological breakthroughs. For instance, a new procedure may change one specific step in the process of manufacturing a product or, alternatively, it may bring about a more general transformation of the entire production cycle, and thus of that cycle's total impact. The same applies for a new economic or business model which would have the potential to turn a hitherto valueless waste into an input by means of business reengineering or change in the economic model.

**N.B. Geographical technology or practice transfer alone (without a genuine development of innovative character) can not be considered as innovative.** Equally, projects which involve pure research and development or merely preparatory activities (studies, surveys, etc) can not be considered innovative per se. **Special attention must be devoted to avoid overlapping between LIFE environment projects and R&D or structural funds.** (In application of Art 4.4 of the Regulation).

Ideally, LIFE projects should have conducted a certain amount of previous research work before embarking into the proper project. This can be technological and/or market research. This research may have taken place within a national or EU scheme (framework programmes) or may have been conducted independently by the applicant or a third party. The crucial issue here is that the applicant is fully aware of the possibilities and implications of the research in which the project is based.

As regards **progress**, it is important to define as precisely as possible what exact changes the project will bring about and the progress to which it will directly lead, without taking into account any progress stemming from more remote or indirect consequences. We may expect the proposal to indicate how progress will be measured, i.e. which quantitative and/or qualitative indicators will be used.

**Technical feasibility** has to be assessed on the basis of the capacity of the proposal to correctly identify the risks of the project failing, due to technical uncertainties, differences of scale, administrative environment conditions (permits, changes in legislation, etc) or the nature of the partnership that has been established. The proposal should address these issues via contingency plans aiming at redesigning the project so as to be able to face these technical and operational risks in a satisfactory manner.

## QUESTIONS

### Innovatory nature

Is the level of innovation **high**? Yes, if it takes the form of a new technology or method, resulting from a study or research, which affects all or most of a production process or service (for land use, planning process).

Is the level of innovation **moderate**? Yes, if it involves the transfer of a technology or method to a new sector, or if it is a new technology or method but only affects a limited part of a production process or the planning process in the case of land use?

Is the level of innovation **low**? Yes, if it does not attain the innovation levels above specified for high or moderate?

### Progress

Is the level of progress **high**? Yes, if the proposal quantifies the expected results of the project and if these results will directly bring about a significant change in the state of the environment (e.g. pollution levels or available resources), if they have the potential to lead to a lasting change in the context in which the technologies or methods concerned evolve?

Is the level of progress **moderate**? Yes, if the expected results will directly bring about limited change in the state of the environment, if this progress will last only for a certain time or will rely on measures taken independently of the project, or if the results expected are substantial but unlikely to bring about a fundamental transformation in practices which damage the environment?

Is the level of progress **low**? Yes, if the expected results will lead to no direct change in the state of the environment, if the progress to be achieved will depend entirely on measures taken independently of the project. Progress should be considered low when the proposal does not give sufficient information to assess how progress will be measured, i.e. which quantitative and/or qualitative indicators will be used?

### Technical feasibility

Are the assumptions and aims of the proposal realistic in terms of technical viability and operational implementation? (Degree of availability and reliability of the key technologies that would be used by the proposal, in house –i.e. applicant, partners- knowledge of the technical aspects of the project, etc.)?

Are the difficulties and potential risks analysed and taken into account? (risk analysis)?

Are the authorisations and administrative measures required described and included in the project? (Authorisations and permits, future changes in legislation that could affect negatively to the proposal, etc.)

Are there plans to redesign the project if any problems occur at technical level? (technical contingency plans)?

**EACH SUBCRITERION MUST BE ASSESSED INDIVIDUALLY  
FOR:**

- Innovatory nature:
- Progress:
- Technical feasibility:

**AGAINST:**

- Innovatory nature:
- Progress:
- Technical feasibility:

**REVISION** : changes required to amend/supplement the project

<b>Score:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1-2 (unsatisfactory)	3-4 (poor)	5-6 (average)	7-8 (good)	9-10 (excellent)

**Projects considered low in any of these three sub-criteria can not be marked more than 4 points.  
Projects which require a too extensive revision shall not be ranked above 4**

## AWARD CRITERION N° 2

### Transferability of results, demonstration character of the project and dissemination

#### Guidance for the evaluator

This criterion combines the following criteria from the LIFE Regulation:

- *be capable of promoting widespread dissemination and the widest possible application of practices, technologies and/or products conducive to environmental protection* (Article 4 (6) (d)).
- *aiming at developing and transferring know-how which can be used in identical or similar situations* (Article 4 (6) (e)).

This criterion is to be assessed by the expert panel and the Commission.

The following factors have to be taken into account in the evaluation of this criterion:

First and most important, evaluators should consider on the one hand the **transferability potential** of the know-how developed by project, i.e. its reproduction potential and on the other hand, how this is planned for in the context of the project itself i.e. the “marketing plans” of the project.

Under transferability of the project we should understand the potential for the “know-how”, practices, technology or products developed by the project to be transferred –i.e. replicable- in identical or similar situations or with the potential to be adapted to a different context (geographically, thematically).

More directly in the context of the implementation of the project, evaluators should examine the concrete activities that are or could be planned within the proposal aimed at transferring practices, technology or products in a similar or another context. If the project has a clear transferability potential, but has not developed a transferability strategy, this should not necessarily be considered as a drawback of the proposal. Instead, the evaluator should propose (under revision comments) potential measures for the project to materialise its transfer potentials.

It must be noted here that LIFE Environment is a financial instrument for the implementation of the Environmental Technology Action Plan adopted on 28 January 2004, which strongly emphasizes the need to ensure wide transfer of the environmental innovative initiatives.

The proposal could be considered as having a clear **demonstration character** of the project if the underlying hypotheses are reliably validated or rejected as a result of the implementation of the proposal. The proposal should therefore demonstrate that the necessary steps have been taken to ensure that the foundations of these hypotheses have been appropriately secured –i.e. the type and amount of previous research needed-. As regards the demonstration scale, the project should be implemented on a technical scale that allows the evaluation of the technical and economic viability of the proposed pilot in a larger scale. The proposal must justify the choice of a particular scale for the project in the light of the above.

The results of projects funded by LIFE will only be widely known if they arouse the interest of other stakeholders. It is therefore essential that the knowledge and skills acquired through LIFE projects are made available in a form which can be widely disseminated, and that the projects themselves include procedures to organise and carry out the **dissemination** of the project. To this end any proposal should preferably outline a dissemination strategy detailing target groups, methods, detailed actions and ways to assess the impact of its strategy. Dissemination activities must form part of any proposal. In particular, global dissemination by means of a web site containing all the relevant information about the project is mandatory. Moreover, the proposal should envisage targeted dissemination actions aiming at the companies or administrations active in the particular sector. As an indicative figure, the dissemination budget of a project should be comprised between 5% and 8% of the total budget of the project.

## QUESTIONS

### Demonstration character

For a project to be really demonstrative, a series of preparatory actions must have been completed i.e. technical and market research. Does the proposal explain whether these preparatory actions have been carried out?

The project must have the sufficient dimension (time and scope wise) to demonstrate its economic and technical viability on a real scale. Does the proposal duly justify the choice of a particular scale for the project in the light of the above?

Does the project include a practical pilot or demonstrator facility which could be used to demonstrate and validate the underlying hypothesis?

### Dissemination of results

Are the dissemination actions sufficient and properly planned?

- Does the proposal clearly identify the target groups for dissemination of results?
- Are specific objectives clearly presented for each of those?
- Are the objectives and the target groups identified appropriate?
- Are the technical specifications of the dissemination products well adjusted to the objectives and target groups (n° of copies of leaflets to be produced, quality of the videos proposed to regional TV etc.)?
- What kind of information will contain the web-site? Can it give a good idea of the project objectives and developments? Will it be designed as a passive (providing information only) or as an active tool (allowing exchange and more in detail knowledge of the project)?
- Is geographical coverage of dissemination adequate for reaching the target groups? (EU-wide, national, local, etc)

### Transferability

Reproducibility of the project:

- Can the specific practices, techniques, products and business model developed in the framework of the project be easily reproduced or adapted for efficient use in different or similar circumstances? This involves identifying (and overcoming if possible) any barriers, be it commercial, technical or legal that may impact on the reproduction potential.
- Does the project foresee specific actions to identify such barriers? If so, are there actions foreseen to either overcome such barriers or to prepare the ground for this during the follow-up of the project?

Critical mass for transferability: (market demand)

- Importance of the target-group for the proposed practices, technology or products: industry sector, local administrations dealing with the same environmental problems. i.e. Has the target-group enough critical mass to justify the development of a project in this area?
- Is there a real demand for the practices, technology or products proposed by the project? : economic pressure in case of cost reduction, pressure from legislation, markets, public opinion, etc

“Marketing plans” for the project: (introduction into the market)

- Are there concrete plans to market the solution elaborated by the project? Are them realistic?

**FOR:**

- Transferability
- Demonstration character
- Dissemination of results

**AGAINST:**

- Transferability
- Demonstration character
- Dissemination of results

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

<b>Score:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1-2 (unsatisfactory)	3-4 (poor)	5-6 (average)	7-8 (good)	9-10 (excellent)

**N.B. The score must reflect the global assessment of all the above criteria and mark on an integral base. Projects which require a too extensive revision shall not be ranked above 4**

### **AWARD CRITERION N° 3**

#### **Coherence and quality, integration**

##### **Guidance for the evaluator**

This criterion combines the following criteria from the LIFE Regulation:

- *be carried out by technically and financially sound participants (Article (2) (b)).*
- *be feasible in terms of timetable, budget and value for money (Article 2 (c))*
- *promote the integration of environmental considerations into activities pursuing objectives of a mainly social and economic nature (Article 4 (6) (h)).*
- *promote cooperation in the environmental field (Article 4(6)&(f)).*

This criterion is to be assessed by at least two officials of the LIFE Unit from DG Environment of the Commission.

The following factors have to be taken into account in the evaluation of this criterion:

**Coherence of the proposal.** The evaluator must assess the quality and coherence of the description of the problems addressed, the objectives sought, the actions envisaged to achieve them and the coherence between problems addressed, objectives sought and actions implemented.

**Planning.** The evaluator must assess the quality of the proposal in terms of realistic timing, sound linking of actions, inclusion of validation and contingency plans as well as the specification of progress indicators, deadlines and deliverables.

**Internal organisation and co-operation:** 'Internal organisation' refers to the project organisational structure in terms of management, resources and organisational and technical skills (participants: applicant, partners, co-financiers, sub-contractors). The evaluator must assess whether the organisational arrangements proposed are clearly described and appropriate for the type of project proposed.

Co-operation refers to relations between the different stakeholders concerned by the environmental problem addressed by the proposal. These stakeholders shall not necessarily be participants to the project. The evaluator must assess the potential of the project to trigger real co-operation with these stakeholders.

**Sustainability: integration of the social and economic dimensions.** The evaluator will assess the capability of the proposal to achieve economic and social sustainability. The proposal should give indications of how this sustainability will be achieved (creation of the economic conditions to ensure continuation of the project beyond EC funding, analysis of the expected social benefits and acceptance, etc.). In summary, the evaluator should assess whether the project has real chances for duration after the completion of the Commission support. In the case of proposals whose objective is the elaboration of plans (i.e. coastal, urban) there must be a clear commitment from the concerned authorities to implement in a reasonable lapse of time the results of the plans elaborated (in the case the project delivers implementable plans/guidelines).

**Value for money:** here the evaluator will assess whether the project will payback in terms of environmental benefits. This assessment will indicate to the Commission whether the combined financial effort of the applicants and the Commission would translate into proportional environmental benefits.

**General quality of presentation:** Although formal, these aspects are important to be evaluated as they reveal the capacity of the applicant to structure its proposal in a clear, readable and well structured way. After all, the preparation of the proposal can be considered as a sample of a deliverable from the project.

## QUESTIONS

### Coherence of the proposal

#### The problem statement:

- Are the starting point and the problems addressed by the proposal clearly and thoroughly explained?
- Are the objectives and the expected results of the project properly stated and explained in qualitative and quantitative terms?

#### The actions:

- Is there a clear and fully detailed explanation given of the actions required?
- Are the actions required consistent with the results expected?
- Is there a direct link between the problems, the objectives, the actions planned and the results expected?

### Planning

- Is the timing realistic? Does the project need more time to be implemented safely considering the limitations imposed by authorisations, potential validation problems, complex partnership agreements, etc?
- Does the sequence of tasks seem realistic? Do tasks follow a logic order? Does the description of each tasks specify the input needed from other tasks? Is this clearly reflected in the proposal?
- Does the planning include validation steps, indicators, reports etc.?
- Does the proposal envisage contingency plans in case some actions or partners fail to deliver?
- Is there a detailed list of deadlines and deliverables for each task?



### **Organisation and co-operation**

#### Internal organisation of the project:

- Is the internal organisation adequate for proper management of the project? Are there clearly defined management structures and responsibilities? Does the proposal give some indication about the key persons in the project?
- Are the human resources proposed adequate for the project? (in terms of skills, manpower, availability, etc)
- Is the organisation of the project appropriate for the action to be carried out in terms of partnership? Is the applicant the real beneficiary of the project, or should this role be played by one of the partners? Do the partners and external assistance encompass the necessary know how to bring about the project? In the case that external assistance exceeds 35% of the total budget, is this well justified and acceptable from a technical point of view?

#### Co-operation: (How does the proposal trigger real co-operation with stakeholders?)

- Is the partnership particularly appropriate to enhance co-operation with external stakeholders?
- Are there co-operation mechanisms with the stakeholders already implemented in the proposal?

### **Sustainability and integration (durability)**

- Does the proposal give indications of how economic and social sustainability will be achieved?
- Has the project the potential to ensure a lasting impact after the project is completed? (Are there plans to maintain and consolidate the results of the project once it is completed?). In the case of proposals whose objective the elaboration is of plans (i.e. coastal, urban), is there a clear commitment from the concerned authorities to implement in a reasonable lapse of time the results of the plans elaborated?
- Are there realistic expectations on economic grounds to ensure continuation of the project beyond EC funding? (is there a clear business case behind the proposal?)
- Does the proposal give some indication on the expected social benefits and acceptance as well as the estimated and potential employment creation in the short and long term?

### **Value for money**

- Is the cost of the project (defined by the total budget) justified vis-à-vis its direct environmental benefits?
- Are the cost of the individual actions and budget headings justified vis-à-vis the benefits delivered within the project (prototype, dissemination actions, web-site, conferences attended, personnel, external assistance, etc)

### **General quality of presentation**

- Is the project presented in a logical and well-argued manner? (i.e. following the logical framework)
- Is the proposal document well structured, clear and complete?

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

**Score:**

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1-2 (unsatisfactory)	3-4 (poor)	5-6 (average)	7-8 (good)	9-10 (excellent)

**N.B. The score must reflect the global assessment of all the above criteria and mark on an integral base. Projects which require a too extensive revision shall not be ranked above 4.**

**AWARD CRITERION N° 4**

**Financial coherence and quality**

**Guidance for the evaluator**

This criterion combines the following criteria from the LIFE Regulation:

- *be carried out by technically and financially sound participants (Article (2) (b)).*
- *be feasible in terms of ... timetable, budget and value for money (Article 2 (c));*

This criterion is to be assessed by the LIFE Unit from DG Environment of the Commission with the back up of the external experts.

## QUESTIONS

### Checking of the 'declared' public status of an applicant

According to the information available is there a doubt about the status of the applicant? Yes/No

N.B. In the event that the applicant has declared public whereas he doesn't comply with the criteria set in page 8 of the Proposal Preparation Forms, the proposal will be rejected.

### Residual eligibility checks of proponent and partners

- 1/ Is the beneficiary flagged in EWS<sup>4</sup>
- 2/ Is the partner flagged in EWS?

### Coherence/Eligibility of the budget :

- 1/ Is the financing consistent with individual financing commitments (beneficiary/ partners/co-financiers)? Form F0 (Project funding and budget breakdown), F1 (Source of funding summary) - Declarations
- 2/ Are the expense forms consistent? (Forms F0 – F11)
- 3/ Is the budget balanced (cash flow against cash flow) in kind contribution to be questioned
- 4/ Does staff cost daily rate (**Personnel**) look reasonable and sufficient detailed? (Form F3)  
Are costs for service contracts for individuals clearly distinguished? In case of public organisations are the individual financing commitments at least equal to the budgeted staff costs for civil servants of the concerned public body?
- 5/ Do **Travel costs** look reasonable? (Form F4)
- 6/ Does **External assistance** cost look reasonable and well allocated? Does it exceed the 35% ceiling? Is this excess acceptable (see evaluation of this point under criteria 5-6-8) (Forms F0 and F5)
- 7/ Do **Durable goods** look reasonable? (Forms F6-F7 and F8) Is the depreciation rule (art 21.6 CP) correctly applied and corresponding cost correctly allocated (see also criterion 8)? (Forms F0 - F6 and F7)
- 8/ Do **Consumable costs** look reasonable and correctly allocated? (Form F10)
- 9/ Are bank guarantee and audit costs foreseen? <sup>2</sup> Are **other costs** reasonable<sup>3</sup> and correctly allocated? F0; F11
- 10/ Do the overhead costs not exceed the flat-rate funding of 7% of the total amount of eligible direct costs, excluding land purchase costs? (Form F0)
- 11/ In case of EC contribution limited to a 30%, does the applicant contribute as much as the Commission?

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

<b>Score:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1-2 (unsatisfactory)	3-4 (poor)	5-6 (average)	7-8 (good)	9-10 (excellent)

**N.B. The score must reflect the global assessment of the above criteria and mark on an integral base. Projects which require a too extensive revision shall not be ranked above 4.**

<sup>2</sup> For Non profit organisation please refer to financial assessment excel sheet.

<sup>3</sup> If other costs exceed 5% of the total eligible costs, it is very likely that not all costs are correctly allocated

## AWARD CRITERION N° 5

### Community interest and environmental problem

#### Guidance for the evaluator

This criterion combines the following criteria from the LIFE Regulation:

- *The general objective of LIFE shall be to contribute to the implementation, updating and development of Community environment policy and of environmental legislation, in particular as regards the integration of the environment into other policies, and to sustainable development in the Community (Article 1)*
- *The specific objective of LIFE-Environment shall be to contribute to the development of innovative and integrated techniques and methods and to the further development of Community environment policy (Article 4 (1)).*
- *be of Community interest by making a significant contribution to the general objective of LIFE (Article 2 (a))*
- *provide solutions to a problem which arises very often in the Community, or is of great concern to some Member States (Article 4 (6) (a));*

This criterion is to be assessed by the Commission services (Thematic Units from DG Environment) with the back up of the external evaluators.

The following factors have to be taken into account in the evaluation of this criterion:

As regards **Community interest**, guidelines for demonstration projects have been established as foreseen in Art 4.2 .a of the Regulation (see Application Guide document Part I, chapter III). The guidelines provide a key benchmark for assessing the Community interest of a proposal and thus its priority. However, a proposal that do not relates (or only partially relates) to the priorities set in the guidelines may not be disqualified for this reason alone.

Projects must make a significant contribution to furthering the general objective of the Community Environmental policy. This contribution must be clearly defined (and must therefore figure in the evaluator's comments on this criterion), and should go beyond merely implementing legislation or being vaguely in harmony with the general principles of Community policy or sustainable development.

When it comes to assess the **environmental problem** addressed by the proposal, the first thing to do is to identify very precisely the environmental problem the project proposes to solve (and, if possible, include a summary description of the problem addressed in the evaluator's comments). The problem in question must be environmental, and not simply technical or economic, and it must be defined in such a way as not to go beyond what the project can really hope to achieve. Thus, for instance, composting may be a solution to the problem of how to manage some types of organic waste, but not to the problem of organic waste as a whole.

## QUESTIONS

### Community interest

- Does the project relate to one of the priority fields specified in the Guidelines? If not, please specify which other Community priority area is addressed by the proposal.
- Does this project provide added value compared with current application of the policy and environment legislation in the priority fields set out in the guidelines?
- Does the project explicitly aim at supporting the development or update of EU environmental policies?

### Environmental problem

- Is the problem the project sets out to tackle an environment problem, and not just a technical and/or economic one?
- Is the problem addressed by the project important in the industrial sector or geographical area concerned? –i.e. Will the project provide solutions to a problem that arises very often in the Community or is of great concern to a group of Member States?
- Is the environmental problem targeted a major one?

### Geographical extent

- Is the geographical extent of the problem small (one Member State, or two or three regions), medium (several Member States or around ten regions) or large (most Member States of the Union)?

#### FOR:

- Community interest
- Environmental problem
- Geographical extent
- 

#### AGAINST:

- Community interest
- Environmental problem
- Geographical extent

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

<b>Score:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	1-2 (unsatisfactory)	3-4 (poor)	5-6 (average)	7-8 (good)	9-10 (excellent)

**N.B. The score must reflect the global assessment of the above criteria and mark on an integral base. Projects which require a too extensive revision shall not be ranked above 4.**

## **BONUS CRITERION N° 1**

### **Multinational approach**

#### ***Application form***

#### **Guidance for the evaluator**

This bonus refers to the following criterion in the LIFE Regulation.

- *Priority may be given to projects based on a multinational approach, when this is likely to contribute more effectively to the achievement of the objectives, taking into account feasibility and costs (Article 2, third sub-paragraph) ;*

The criterion is to be assessed by the external experts and the Commission.

With regard to this criterion, evaluators will base their assessment on the information unambiguously provided by the applicant in the proposal.

In this context, "**multinational approach**" refers in the best case to a structured partnership bringing together partners from several EU countries and/or candidate countries associated to LIFE, which adds real value to the project. In the best case, the bonus is awarded to projects using a multinational approach (e.g. trans-boundary pollution problem tackled through active involvement of entities from different countries) including specific activities in different countries whenever this is likely to achieve project objectives more effectively in terms of feasibility and cost.

To assess this bonus criteria, the evaluators should take into consideration:

- Whether the achievement of the objectives of the proposal would benefit from a multinational approach (e.g. a cross-boundary pollution problem would be best tackled if the countries involved actively collaborate for its solution) and;
- If it is so (positive reply to point "a" above), does the proposal foresee the active involvement of partners from all the relevant countries (4 points) or just part of them (3 points)?
- This bonus will be limited to a maximum of **2 points** when only a few of the countries concerned are actively involved in the project. Eventually a maximum of **1 point** will be attributed when the partners involved in the different countries are limited to a rather passive role in the project (e.g. cross border dissemination).

As a general recommendation when assessing this bonus criterion, the evaluator should take into account the quality of the synergy brought about by the multinational approach.

<b>Score:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	0 (Not pertinent)	1 (low)	2-3 (medium)	4 (high)

## **BONUS CRITERION N° 2**

### **Job creation and small and medium-sized enterprises**

#### **Guidance for the evaluator**

This bonus criterion combines recommendations made regarding the participation of Small and Medium Enterprise (SME) and the criterion from the LIFE Regulation:

*- In examining these proposals, account should also be taken, where appropriate, of their impact on employment (Article 4 (6), third sub-paragraph).*

The criterion is to be assessed both by the expert panels and the Commission.

The **job creation** can be taken into account during the assessment of this criteria on condition that: a) they are permanent posts which will not cease to exist when the project is finished, b) the jobs are created in the context of the project and would not have existed without the project. The project could also have an indirect impact on employment: for example, by leading to the creation of permanent posts in other companies in the same sector (suppliers, sub-contractors) or causing an overall change in the market which will stimulate job creation. This later aspect may only be taken into consideration if clearly described and, if possible, quantified in the proposal.

**SMEs** (small and medium-sized enterprises) may be involved both in promoting environmental awareness in the industrial sector concerned and in overcoming the technical and financial obstacles SMEs face in developing and using clean technologies. At least one SME should be part of the project either as applicant or as partners - subcontractor SMEs will not be considered to this effect.

An SME is defined as an entity which has fewer than 250 full-time equivalent employees, and an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 40 million or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 27 million, and is not controlled - 25% or more - by a company which is not an SME.

**N.B. Important: No bonus is awarded if there are only declarations of intention on job creation or if the SMEs are not directly involved in the project (applicant or partner).**

<b>Score:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	0 (Not pertinent)	1 Employment creation or SME	2 Employment creation and SME)