

STAGE A. COMPLETENESS AND ELIGIBILITY AUDIT					
PROGRAMME:		WATER MANAGEMENT			
Outcome:		Status of water bodies improved			
Output:		Knowledge of importance of water bodies with "Good Status" increased			
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE:		SMALL GRANT SCHEME			
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:					
CRITERIA		STAGE A. FUNDING APPLICATION COMPLETENESS CHECKLIST			
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value		Remarks
1	In time submission of proposal	The Proposals submission date falls within the deadline fixed in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
2	Project promoter falling within the scope of the call for proposals	It is examined whether the project promoter submitting the proposal falls within the eligible applicants set out in the call	YES		
			NO		
3	Partners falling within the call	It is examined if the partners fall within the eligible partners specified in the call. It does not apply in case of partners' absence.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
4	Project promoter's competence for the project	It is examined if the project promoter submitting the proposal is competent to execute the project. The check is based on the documentation data (e.g regulatory decisions, articles of association of the bodies involved etc) being attached upon submitting the proposal and specified in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
5.1	Partnership agreement for the project implementation	It is examined if the proposal includes a draft partnership agreement or a letter of intent, pursuant to article 7.7 of the Regulation. It does not apply in case of partners' absence.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
5.2	Partnership agreement for bilateral relations actions	It is examined if the proposal includes a draft partnership agreement or a letter of intent, pursuant to article 7.7 of the Regulation for the bilateral relations actions. It is not applied in case of absence of proposals on bilateral relations.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
6	Formal completeness of the submitted proposal	The proposal is signed by the body's legal representative	YES		
			NO		
		The data specified in the call were submitted (such as studies, licensing, administrative acts etc)	YES		
			NO		
		The requested budget is within the limits fixed in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
7	Implementation period within the eligibility period of the call for proposals	It is examined if the implementation period of the suggested project falls within the programme's eligibility period, unless a different deadline is set in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
8	Non overlapping of the granted funding	It is examined (Solemn declaration by the project promoter's legal representative) if it is ensured that grants will not be awarded to finance twice the same expenditure from other Programmes, financial instruments or/and national resources	YES		
			NO		
9	Project's Technical Bulletin Check	The correctness in filling out the Project's Technical Bulletin and whether it is duly signed are examined.	YES		
			NO		
10	Submission of decisions by competent or collective bodies of the beneficiary or other competent bodies	It is examined if decisions by competent or collective bodies of the project promoter or other competent bodies are submitted, as stipulated by the legislation in effect.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
11	Admissibility of the application	It is examined whether the Project matches the Objectives of the Programme and Call. Are the suggested activities/the project's physical object eligible for funding?	YES		
			NO		
STAGE A CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT: The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria	The project proceeds to the Stage B' evaluation		
			The project is rejected		
	Date				SIGNATURES

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

ΠΡΟΓΡΑΜΜΑ: WATER MANAGEMENT
 Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
 Output: Knowledge of importance of water bodies with "Good Status" increased
 CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: SMALL GRANT SCHEME
 SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B1 COMPLETENESS AND CLARITY OF THE PROPOSAL'S CONTENT			
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value		Remarks
1.1	Completeness and clarity of the suggested project's physical object	It regards: a) the effectiveness and suitability of the implementation methodology and analysis of the project's implementation or of its individual subprojects, any required actions, time sequence of the actions, b) the presentation of the project's deliverables, c) the publicity/communication of the suggested project (suitability of communication actions, of similar extent like the suggested project), d) the Project implementation feasibility, e) the coverage of target-groups, f) the implementation of actions on pre-determined islands	YES		
			NO		
1.2	Completeness and clarity of the suggested bilateral relations actions' physical object	In the context of bilateral relations development, eligible are: a) Actions aimed at strengthening the bilateral relations between the Donor states and Greece (b) Actions relating to cooperation with partners from the Donor states for drawing up and submitting a proposal, further to this call for proposals (the eligible amount for this category of action shall not exceed € 2.000,00 per submitted proposal) (c) Networking, exchanges, exchange and transfer of knowledge, technology, experiences and best practices between bodies in Greece and bodies in the Donor states or/and international organizations.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
2.1	Realism regarding the suggested project budget	The elements to be evaluated are: a) how complete the suggested budget is (it is examined if it includes all the necessary costs for the physical object/deliverables implementation), b) whether the costing of the suggested project is reasonable, c) the sound budget allocation to the individual projects/types of expenditure and the reasonable budget allocation to the projects/types of expenditure in relation to the suggested physical object/deliverables, the compliance with the national eligibility rules and any specific terms of the call for proposals in order to avoid non necessary or non eligible costs.	YES		
			NO		
2.2	Realism regarding the suggested budget for bilateral relations actions	The elements to be evaluated are: a) how complete the suggested budget is (it is examined if it includes all the necessary costs for the physical object implementation), b) whether the costing of the suggested project is reasonable, c) the sound budget allocation to the individual actions/types of expenditure and the reasonable budget allocation to the actions/types of expenditure in relation to the suggested physical object, the compliance with the national eligibility rules and any specific terms of the call for proposals in order to avoid non necessary or non eligible costs.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
3.1	Realism of the project completion timetable	The project completion is examined in relation to: a) the physical object, b) the selected implementation method c) the possible risks associated with the project implementation or probable delays in the issuing of regulatory decisions required for the project implementation, d) the project's maturity level.	YES		
			NO		
3.2	Realism regarding the completion timetable for bilateral relations actions	The completion of actions is examined in relation to: a) the physical object, b) the selected implementation method c) the possible risks associated with the implementation d) the maturity level of bilateral relations actions.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
STAGE B1 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT: The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria	The project proceeds to the Stage B2 evaluation The project is rejected		

STAGE B. EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSAL PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: **WATER MANAGEMENT**
 Outcome: **Status of water bodies improved**
 Output: **Knowledge of importance of water bodies with "Good Status" increased**
 CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: **SMALL GRANT SCHEME**
 SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B2 ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLES, INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND INTEGRATION OF HORIZONTAL POLICIES			
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value		Remarks
4	Compliance with EEA FM 2014- 2021 principles of implementation	It is examined if the suggested project does not breach the principles of respect to human integrity, freedom, democracy, equality, rule of law and respect of human rights, including the rights of people belonging to minorities.	YES		
			NO		
5	Compliance with sound governance principles	Governance of participation, without exclusions, accountable, transparent, responsive, efficient and effective, showing zero tolerance to corruption.	YES		
			NO		
6	Compliance with sustainable development	It is examined if the suggested project is aligned with sustainable development, long-term economic growth, social cohesion and environmental protection	YES		
			NO		
7	Compliance with gender equality and non discrimination	It is examined if the suggested project is not contrary to the gender equality principles and if it prevents discrimination on the ground of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.	YES		
			NO		
8	Safeguard accessibility of people with disability	It is examined how the project ensures the accessibility of people with disability, in accordance with the applicable legal framework.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
9	Compliance with the rules of public contracts, studies, public procurement and services	It is examined if the suggested legal framework of subprojects' implementation is aligned with the national, EU law & the EEA FM 2014- 2021 legal framework.	YES		
			NO		
STAGE B2 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT: The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria		The project proceeds to the Stage B3 evaluation	
				The project is rejected	

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
 Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
 Output: Knowledge of importance of water bodies with "Good Status" increased
 CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: SMALL GRANT SCHEME
 SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B3 PROJECT FEASIBILITY			
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value		Remarks
10	Project implementation necessity	The project implementation necessity to cope with the need or the identified predicament is examined.	YES		
			NO		
11.1	Project contribution to the programme's indicators	The project's contribution to the programme's indicators is evaluated	YES		
			NO		
11.2	Project contribution to bilateral relations indicators	The subproject contribution to the bilateral relations indicator 'Number of projects involving cooperation with a Donor Project Partner' is evaluated	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
12	Sustainability, Functionality, Utilization	Is the way of utilizing the Project's deliverables sufficiently described and is the way of safeguarding the Project's maintenance and operation documented?	YES		
			NO		
STAGE B3 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT: The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Non Applicable' in all criteria, barring the criterion 11.2 that could be awarded a negative 'NO' value.		The project proceeds to the Stage B4 evaluation	
				The project is rejected	

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Knowledge of importance of water bodies with "Good Status" increased
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: SMALL GRANT SCHEME
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B4 PROJECT PROMOTER MANAGING CAPACITY			
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value		Remarks
13	Administrative capacity	It is examined if the potential project promoter has the organizational structure and the necessary procedures to implement the suggested project.	YES		
			NO		
14	Operational capacity	The following are being considered: a. Past experience of the project promoter in implementing similar projects. b. availability /sufficient staff (project team), i.e the number and qualifications (education – professional experience) of the executives to be employed in the project implementation.	YES		
			NO		
15	Financial capacity	The project promoter's capacity to contribute to the suggested project implementation on own resources is examined.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
STAGE B4 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT: The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria		The project proceeds to the Stage B5 evaluation The project is rejected	

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: **WATER MANAGEMENT**
 Outcome: **Status of water bodies improved**
 Output: **Knowledge of importance of water bodies with "Good Status" increased**
 CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: **SMALL GRANT SCHEME**
 SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B5 PROJECT SCORING				
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value	Weighting factor	Scoring	Remarks
16	Project effectiveness	The contribution of the suggested project to attaining the indicators' task value, as set out in the Call, is examined. The degree of contribution is expressed as the quotient of an output indicator value of the project to the value of said indicator in the call for proposals: $\Pi v = (\text{output or outcome Indicator value of the project}) / (\text{output or outcome indicator of Call for proposals})$. The following indicator is considered: Number of people targeted by the information/awareness campaign. Each proposal's scoring is determined after comparative evaluation of all proposals. The proposal with the highest contribution percentage is granted the highest scoring (value=10). The scoring of the rest of proposals is calculated proportionally to the value 10 [(% of each proposal / % of best proposal) X 10]. If it is ascertained that the output or outcome Indicator value is not correct in the proposal, the evaluator carries out an evidence-based correction of the indicator value in the project	$B = 10 * \Pi v / \Pi k$ where Πk is the proposal with the highest contribution percentage	30%		
17	Project's efficiency/cost effectiveness	The output or outcome indicators values in relation to the call's budget are examined. The quotient is calculated: $\text{Of (project indicator / call indicator) to (project budget / call's budget)}$. The following indicator is considered: Number of people targeted by the information/awareness campaign.	The corresponding indicator is $\geq 1,00 : 10$	30%		
			The corresponding indicator is $0,75 \leq$ and $< 1,00 : 8$			
			The corresponding indicator is $0,50 \leq$ and $< 0,75 : 5$			
			The corresponding indicator is $\geq 0,50 : 2$			
18	With a partner from Donor States	A partner from donor states involved in the implementation of the project.	With a partner from Donor States: 10	5%		
			without a partner from Donor States 0			
19	Innovation	The proposal includes elements of innovation, such as combination of online and offline communication actions (e.g. hybrid events), a risk management plan for urgent needs affecting the communication environment where the campaign is conducted, development of a content marketing strategy and its transformation into commitment and desirable action on behalf of target-audiences.	online and offline events: 2	35%		
			Quality Assurance & Risk Management methodology: 3			
			Special events for young people: 2			
			KOLs articles: 3			
			Total Scoring:			

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Knowledge of importance of water bodies with “Good Status” increased
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: SMALL GRANT SCHEME
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

S/N	Group of criteria	Value/Scoring	Total Scoring:
B1	PROPOSAL'S CONTENT COMPLETENESS AND CLARITY	YES/NO	YES
B2	ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLES, INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND INTEGRATION OF	YES/NO	YES
B3	PROJECT FEASIBILITY	YES/NO	YES
B4	PROJECT PROMOTER MANAGING CAPACITY	YES/NO	YES
B5	PROJECT SCORING		
REMARKS: (Any changes suggested by the evaluator regarding individual parts of the submitted proposal, being a prerequisite for this scoring performance, are filled in)			
	Date		SIGNATURES