

Submission and evaluation procedure



I4W



Audit trail

- Article 15 of EC regulation 1828/2006.
- An audit trail may be considered adequate where (...) it permits verification of application of the selection criteria (...) and it contains documents concerning the grant approval

Steps for call of proposals

- Submission.
- Opening session and administrative check
- Eligibility check
- Evaluation
- Award decision
- Negotiation of contract

Submission

- Electronic submission via web page upload with the following requirements:
 - Time and date of submission is registered.
 - Reasonable assurance that nobody can access the data before the opening session.
 - Only authorized persons can access the data after the dateline with simultaneous authorization.

Opening session and administrative check

- Opening session and admin check is performed by lead partner.
- Applications are registered
- Lead partners verifies that application is fully filled in and documents are submitted in time.
- Communication via email to lead applicant of the registration number and completeness of document submission.
- The lead partner may request clarifications on the submitted documentation.

Eligibility check

- Lead partner performs basic eligibility check:
 - Minimum number of partners from minimum number of regions
 - Budget between thresholds
 - All partners are bodies governed by public law.
- Communication to lead applicants of results of Administrative and eligibility check.

Technical evaluation

- All regions perform evaluation of all proposals following evaluation grid.
- Final evaluation report includes all evaluation comments plus average mark for all proposals.
- In order to exclude evaluations that are too different from the average, the highest and lowest scored on each criteria will be excluded.

Award decision

- Technical committee proposes a list of recommended projects on the base of:
 - Technical evaluation.
 - Available budget per region.
 - Complementarities between proposals to tackle all technologies and application fields.
- Steering committee takes award decision on the basis of TC recommendations. Decision may be under conditions.
- Communication to successful and unsuccessful proposals.
- A reserve list of projects to be approved may be created.

Negotiation of contract

- Modification of application for following conditions of SC.
- Submission of legal and financial documentation (including consortium agreement)
- Signature of Subsidy contract.

Evaluation Grid

EVALUATION OF THE SUBPROJECT				
ID	Evaluation criteria	Possible points	Reached points	Proposal references
A. SMARTTM evaluation of the relevance of the project and foreseen impact of the results (40 pts.)				
A1	Addressed needs also with reference to the chosen technologies and application fields	5		
A2	Pursued objectives in relation to the addressed needs	5		
A3	Pursued objectives in relation to the strategic objectives of I4W	5		
A4	Impact on I4W target users	5		
A5	Contribution to the achievement of the strategic objectives of I4W	5		
A6	Approach to possible environmental, gender and ethical issues <i>(may be 0 if no such issues are present in the project)</i>	5		
A7	Sustained impact of the proposed actions also after the conclusion of the project and relevance on the policies of the participating Regions	10		
B. SMART evaluation of the proposed approach and activity plan (30 pts.)				
B1	Implementation plan in relation to the methodology that will be followed	5		
B2	Individual <u>workpackages</u>	5		
B3	Deliverables in relation to the planned duration of the project	5		
B4	Implementation plan in relation to the pursued objectives	5		
B5	Division of tasks and responsibilities among the partners	5		
B6	Dissemination activities also with regard to the proposed indicators	5		
C. Quality of the partnership (15 pts.)				
C1	Overall quality and scope of the consortium in terms of type/number of involved organisations and Regions	5		
C2	Involvement of enterprises both in terms of participation to the project and of benefits gained by the project results	5		
C3	Clear and realistic project management plan and decision making structure also considering the previous experience of the Lead Partner	5		
D. Quality of the financial plan and "value for money" of the project (15 pts.)				
D1	EFFICIENCY – Clear and realistic mobilisation of a critical mass of resources	5		
D2	ECONOMY – Realistic calculation of costs and overall adequacy of the financial plan	5		
D3	EFFECTIVENESS – The total cost of the subproject is justified by the scope and quality of the realised actions and expected achievements	5		