Attachment 4b to the Rules of Procedure of the open call for proposals

*CONTENT-RELATED EVALUATION GRID OF THE PROJECT OUTLINE[[1]](#footnote-1)*

**for the application form (no.): ……………………………………………………………………………………………………………**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of criterion** | **The point of the Project outline** | **Scope of scoring/scoring awarded[[2]](#footnote-2)\*** | **Description of a criterion** | **Remarks of the Evaluator** |
| **Scale of negative phenomena and the threat of town marginalisation (the so-called negative criterion)** |  | **10 points in total** |  |  |
| *The town is on the list of 122 towns which lose social and economic functions, which are in an unfavourable social and economic situation (the list developed for the purposes of SRD)*  *The list is available at:* [*https://www.power.gov.pl/media/54173/pakiet2.pdf*](https://www.power.gov.pl/media/54173/pakiet2.pdf) | II.2 | 0-2-4-6-8-10/… | **0 points** - the absence on the list  **2 points** - the number of points on the list: 55-60 points (a moderately unfavourable situation/a moderate intensification of social and economic problems)  **4 points** - the number of points on the list: 61 - 70 points (quite an unfavourable situation/quite a high intensification of social and economic problems)  **6 points** - the number of points on the list: 71 - 80 points (an unfavourable situation/a high intensification of social and economic problems)  **8 points** - the number of points on the list: 81-90 points (a very unfavourable situation/a very high intensification of social and economic problems)  **10 points** - the number of points on the list: 91 - 96 points (the most unfavourable situation/the highest intensification of social and economic problems compared to the country) |  |
| **Project outline evaluation (the so-called positive criteria)** |  | **90 points in total** |  |  |
| **II. Quality of diagnosis of problems and development potentials of the town** |  | **15 points in total** |  |  |
| 1. *Was the diagnosis of problems and development potentials of towns conducted? Was it prepared and justified in an objective and reliable manner, i.e. was it based on quantitative data which is in the resources of a town or other public entities and were surveys of a local community - stakeholders used? Was the tool developed by the Association of Polish Cities used as a starting point for the applicant’s problem analysis and carrying out a comparative analysis of a situation in a town against the backdrop of similar towns used?* 2. *Do the discussed problems have an impact to a significant extent on a slower pace of the town development and are they interconnected (do they form a whole of interrelated and interdependent factors, the simultaneous solving of which is sufficient to achieve a desired change? (5 points)*   *3) Were project objectives which are to contribute to solving an identified problem(s) indicated (are adequate)? (5 points)* | **II.2**  **II.2**  **II.3** | **0 – 5 points**  **0 – 5 points**  **0 – 5 points** | **0 points** – the diagnosis of problems of the town was not carried out  **1 point** - the diagnosis of problems or potentials was conducted but it was not carried out in a sufficiently in-depth and reliable manner, i.e. determining problems/challenges and development potentials, quantitative and qualitative data was not referred to (surveys of a local community); the tool developed by the Association of Polish Cities as a starting point for the applicant’s problem analysis and carrying out a comparative analysis of a situation in a town against the backdrop of similar towns was not used.  **2- 4 points** - the diagnosis of problems and potentials was conducted but it was not justified in a sufficiently in-depth and reliable manner, i.e. determining problems/challenges and development potentials, either quantitative or qualitative data was not at all referred to or only to minor extent (surveys of a local community); the tool developed by the Association of Polish Cities as a starting point for the applicant’s problem analysis and carrying out a comparative analysis of a situation in a town against the backdrop of similar towns was not used at all (max. 2 points for this sub-criterion) or only partially.  **5 points** - the diagnosis of problems or potentials was conducted in an in-depth and reliable manner, i.e. determining a problem/challenges and development potentials, quantitative or qualitative data was referred to (surveys of a local community); the tool developed by the Association of Polish Cities as a starting point for the applicant’s problem analysis and carrying out a comparative analysis of a situation in a town against the backdrop of similar towns was used.  **0 points** - the key nature of identified problems was not demonstrated to mitigate negative phenomena in the town, including their impact on a slower pace of the town development; their interrelations (referred to in the wording of a sub-criterion) were not demonstrated.  **1 - 4 points** - the key nature of identified problems was partially demonstrated to mitigate negative phenomena in the town, together with their impact on a slower pace of the town development. Their interrelations (referred to in the wording of a sub-criterion) were partially demonstrated.  The concentration of negative phenomena was not demonstrated or their interrelations were not presented or their significant role in holding back the town’s development was not shown.  **5 points** - the key nature of identified problems was unequivocally demonstrated to be the cause of negative phenomena in the town, including their role in holding back the town’s development. Their interrelations (referred to in the wording of a sub-criterion) were demonstrated.  **0 points** - lack of indicating the project objective(s) or it is not linked to identified problems.  **1 - 4 points** - a part/the majority of the project objectives was indicated, not sufficiently (only partially) demonstrating if/to what extent they may contribute to solving the indicated problems.  **5 points** - the project objectives were indicated and it was demonstrated that they may be a solution of identified problems / are adequate to them. |  |
| **III. Concept of the town development** |  | **45 points in total** |  |  |
| *1) Are proposed directions of project activities referred to in Point 5.3 and 5.6 of the Rules* of Procedure of the open call for proposals *justified in the context of the diagnosis of a town situation, i.e. may they be a response to identified problems and are they adequate to assumed objectives? (15 points)*    *2) Are proposed directions of project activities logical, complete and comprehensive? (15 points)* | II.3 | 0-15/…  0-15/… | **0 points** - no connection of planned project activities with identified problems and project objectives was presented (activities are not reasonable from the viewpoint of identified problems and objectives)   1. **7 points** – a part of planned project activities is justified, is a response to identified problems and may contribute to their solution. A part of project activities is adequate to assumed project objectives.   **8 - 14 points** – the (vast) majority of planned project activities are justified, constitute a response to identified problems as well as they will contribute to their solution. The (vast) majority of project activities are adequate to assumed project objectives  **15 points** - full compliance, reasonableness and adequacy of all planned project activities with problems and project objectives.  **0 points** - planned project activities are incomplete (lack of important elements or activities from the viewpoint of implementation of project objectives) and incomprehensible (internally inconsistent). There is no logic in determination of planned interventions (lack of a causal link or appropriate sequence of activities, conceptual chaos).  **1-7 points** - proposed project activities are partially incomprehensible, incomplete and partially illogical in determination of the planned intervention.  **8-14 points** - proposed project activities are mostly comprehensive and complete. As a rule, they are logical in determination of the planned intervention.  **15 points** - proposed project activities are internally comprehensive, complete and logically interrelated. |  |
| *3) Does the proposed approach allow for the preparation / implementation of the integrated and comprehensive Development Plan / Action Plan?* | II.3 | 0-15/… | **0 points** - one-dimensional / monothematic activities were proposed in 4 compulsory thematic dimensions. These activities are not complementary (there is no synergy between them; one cannot speak of mutual reinforcement of activities). No optional dimension was taken into consideration.  **1 - 7 points** - comprehensive activities as part of 4 compulsory thematic dimensions will be implemented. However, one cannot speak of their great complementarity due to a small synergy and limited degree of mutual reinforcement of activities. None or only one of the optional dimensions was taken into consideration.  **8 - 14 points** - comprehensive, partially integrated activities will be implemented as part of 4 compulsory thematic dimensions and more than one optional. One can speak of their medium/great complementarity due to their synergy and a medium/high degree of mutual reinforcement of activities.  **15 points** - comprehensive, fully integrated activities will be implemented as part of 4 compulsory thematic dimensions and at least three optional ones. There is full complementarity of planned activities due to a high degree of interpenetration and reinforcement of activities. The synergy effect is full. |  |
| ***IV. Potential of the national partnership***  *Is the project implementation planned in the national partnership? What is value added arising from the cooperation of various national partners in the project?*  *Will the proposed composition of the partnership (their division of obligations, functions in the project) deliver significant benefits and synergies which would not appear in the event of the lack of cooperation both during the project implementation and as part of the planned future intervention?* | II.4 | 0-10/… | **0 -1 point** - a partnership is not planned (0 points) or no value added arising from the cooperation of partners was demonstrated (1 point)  **2 - 5 points** - value added (benefits, synergies) arising from the cooperation of partners is at various levels. The participation of a part of partners was sufficiently justified as vital from the viewpoint of project objectives. Partners are from one sector (either inter-governmental at the local level or inter-sectoral). There are no representatives of entities/institutions vital from the viewpoint of the planned activities. The partnership will function only in the project implementation phase.  **6 - 9 points** - value added (benefits, synergies) arising from the cooperation of partners is at a high level. The participation of the majority of partners was sufficiently justified as vital from the viewpoint of project objectives. Partners have both an inter-governmental at the local level and inter-sectoral profile. There is no representative of an entity/institution vital from the viewpoint of the planned activities. The partnership functions in the phase of preparation and implementation of the project.  **10 points** - value added arising from the cooperation of partners was demonstrated both in the phase of preparation, implementation of the project and in the future. The partnership is very differentiated (both inter-self-governmental and inter-sectoral) and justified from the viewpoint of the planned activities and implementation of the project objectives. No key identity is missing. |  |
| ***V. Social participation dimension***  *To what extent will representatives of inhabitants, users of the town as well as social partners and other stakeholders be included into the process of preparation and implementation of the project?*  *Furthermore, the thematic scope and range of planned consultations in the project are subject to evaluation (intensity and variety of activities to be taken by a project promoter in order to inform and include a local community into the planned undertaking, consulting activities, proposed procedure of their implementation, including the manner of evaluating submitted proposals, the manner of using results; used mechanisms of social co-decision.* | II.5 | 0-10/… | **0 points** - the inclusion of the local community into project works was not envisaged  **1-5 points** - more or less specified participation of one or several interested groups in preparing soft activities or investments was provided (catalogue of groups of a local community/stakeholders vital from the viewpoint of project is too poor). Various forms and techniques of including the community into the implementation of project activities were envisaged, but mostly they provide passive information and consultation (less frequently an actual inclusion into decisive processes). They do not guarantee the information on project activities for a local community and its inclusion into works. The scope, frequency, nature and range of planned consultations are insufficient in relation to the assumed project objectives. The manner of using the outcomes of social consultations was not presented.  **6 -9 points** - the participation of the majority of potentially interested groups of stakeholders in the preparation and implementation of soft activities or investments was provided. Various forms and techniques of including the community into the implementation of project activities were envisaged, they are mostly an actual inclusion into decisive processes. There is a high probability not only of informing but also including a local community into project works. The scope, frequency, nature and range of planned consultations are sufficient in relation to the assumed project objectives. The manner of using the outcomes of social consultations was presented more or less generally.  **10 points** - the real, broad participation of full range of the local community (constituting an exhaustive catalogue of potential stakeholders) in developing and implementing soft and investment activities was guaranteed. Thus, the most mature, inclusive tools for including a local community, providing its co-decision was proposed. The scope, frequency, nature and range of planned consultations are largely sufficient in relation to the assumed project objectives. The manner of using the outcomes of social consultations was presented in detail.  The entity/entities actually representing a local community, in particular inhabitants, e.g. NGOs, associations of inhabitants, housing estate councils, etc. were invited for participation in the project as a partner. |  |
| ***VI. Potential of dissemination of best practices***  *Whether/to what extent was the information on manners and tools for dissemination of own experience and sharing the knowledge gained during the implementation of the project with other interested entities/inhabitants presented?* | II.6 | 0 – 10/ …. | **0 points** - the issues in question were not referred to 1 -5 points - manners and tools for dissemination of own experience gained at one or several stages of the project implementation or only after its completion were presented in general. The range of potentially interested recipients of this knowledge for the applicant/project promoter was generally provided.6 - 9 points - manners and tools for dissemination of own experience gained at the majority of stages of the project implementation, also after its completion, were presented. The range of potentially interested recipients of this knowledge for the applicant/project promoter was provided, together with a general justification.10 points - manners and tools for dissemination of own experience gained at all stages of the project implementation or after its completion were presented in detail. The range of potentially interested recipients of this knowledge for the applicant/project promoter was indicated and justified. |  |
| ***VII. Accessibility dimension***   1. *Do the proposed activities concerning accessibility (up to PLN 100,000) have a positive impact on the implementation of accessibility principles, and in particular are they compatible with accessibility standards, referred to in the document the Accessibility Plus Programme 2018-2025?[[3]](#footnote-3)* 2. *Are the above-mentioned activities justified from the viewpoint of accessibility needs of inhabitants/town users?* 3. *Will the outcome(s) of these activities be accessible for persons with disabilities, being really useful for them?* | II.7 | **YES/NO** | **NO -** the project does not take into consideration the accessibility issue or a response to any of these three questions is “NO”.  **YES -** activities referred to in a given point of the outline implement the accessibility dimension. They are compatible with accessibility standards stipulated in the document of the Accessibility Plus Programme 2018-2025. Activities from this scope are justified, reasonable and useful from the viewpoint of town users/inhabitants with disabilities or various physical or intellectual limitations (appropriate sources were referred to, the situation of inhabitants/users of the town was analysed and evaluated). | In the event of obtaining a negative evaluation in this sub-criterion, the applicant will not be able to count on the grant for implementation of these activities (such a possibility will concern applicants who will not receive financing for the implementation of the project selected at Stage II of the call for complete project proposals). Detailed information in this regard are contained in Point 8 of the Rules of Procedure of the open call for proposals. |
| ***VIII. Horizontal issues***  The project is compatible with general principles laid down in the Regulation (EU) of the European Parliament and the Council no. 1303/2013;   * equality between men and women, * non-discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, * sustainable development, in particular positive impact on the implementation of **4R** principle[[4]](#footnote-4). | II.8 | YES/NO | **In the event of identifying activities violating the principle of equal treatment and non-discrimination, the project outline will not be recommended to Stage II of the call.** |  |
| **The total result and recommendations of the Evaluator/possible comments** |  | …..points/100 points |  |  |

**DECLARATION OF IMPARTIALITY AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

I, the undersigned, declare that, by submitting this declaration, I hereby acknowledge that I have familiarised myself with information concerning the competition procedure and I will obey it. Furthermore, I declare that I will fulfil my obligations honestly and fairly.

There is no dependence between me and the applicant or persons cooperating with it which can positively or negatively affect the result of my evaluation/opinion in an justified manner. To the best of my knowledge and belief there are no facts or circumstances, in the past or present, or such which may take place in the nearest future, questioning my independence in the eyes of either party; if it turns out during the evaluation process that such a connection exists or has been established I shall resign from the participation in the evaluation process immediately.

I undertake to maintain the confidentiality concerning all information or documents (“confidential information”) disclosed to me or obtained by me or prepared by me in the course of or as a a result of the evaluation. Furthermore, I undertake to use them only for the purposes of evaluation and not to disclose them to third parties. Moreover, I agree that I will not store copies of written or electronic information or their prototypes which will be delivered to me.

Date ............................ Signature ...................................

1. Stage I - open call addressed to 255 towns indicated in SRD [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <https://www.miir.gov.pl/strony/zadania/dlaczego-dostepnosc/>. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. It is recognised that the projects under which at least one of 4R principles (reduce, reuse, recycle, repair) is being implemented have a positive impact, where:

   * **reduce** concerns the reduction of the number of packaging and waste,
   * **reuse** means the possibility of using raw materials processed in production and the possibility of using products many times,
   * **recycle** means the possibility of processing of packaging and waste which cannot be reused (it is recognised that the project will meet the principle in this point in the situations in which the applicant plans to process waste on its own. If the applicant is going to return waste to other entities, it is impossible to regard that the project has an impact on the implementation of the above-mentioned principle),
   * **repair** means the possibility of prolonging the product life cycle by its cost-effective repair.

   [↑](#footnote-ref-4)