

**Programme:** *Home affairs*

**Thematic area PA 20:** “International police cooperation and combating crime”

**Basic information about the project**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project ID number** |  |
| **Project name** |  |
| **Applicant’s name** |  |

Notes on scoring: An application may score **up to 115 points** – 100 points for **substantive criteria** and 15 points for **promoting criteria**. Applications that meet the eligibility criteria and score at least **65 points** will be recommended for financing. The projects that have reached the minimum score (65 points) are recommended, but only projects within the limit of available funds will receive funding.

The following **eligibility criteria** were established:

* criterion 1 (*Project relevance*) where the minimum number of points for an application to be considered eligible for further substantive assessment   
   and a potential recommendation is 19 points

and at the same time:

* the applicant **choosing** at least one indicator provided for the “*Home Affairs*” Programme (pursuant to *Rules of procedure for call for projects and project selection*) *(1.1.)*
* **specifying** at least one own indicator for the project *(1.2.)*;
* in the case of the project implemented in partnership with a Norwegian institution – the applicant **choosing** at least one bilateral indicator provided for the “*Home Affairs*” Programme (pursuant to *Rules of procedure for call for projects and project selection*) *(1.3.)*;
* contribution of the project to the objective and the chosen result(s) provided for the area of the PA 20 – that means obtaining minimum 8 points in *1.4.*
* criterion 2 (*budget*) where the minimum number of points for an application to be considered eligible for further substantive assessment   
   and a potential recommendation is 10 points.

If any of the above criteria is not met, the application is rejected.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Criterion name** | **Criterion assessment rules** | **Max. number of points** | **Number of points awarded** | | **Justification/Notes** |
| 1. | *Project relevance*    **Max. 38 points**  **/ min. 19 points** | * 1. Did the applicant choose at least one indicator provided for the “*Home Affairs*” Programme? | **YES** | **NO** | |  |
| * 1. Did the applicant specify at least one own indicator for the project? | **YES** | **NO** | |  |
| * 1. Did the applicant choose at least one bilateral indicator provided for the “*Home Affairs*” Programme (if applicable)? | **YES** | **NO** | **N/A** |  |
| * 1. Does the project contribute to the objective of the programme area, i.e. *Strengthening capacity of law enforcement agencies  to prevent and detect organised crime*  and the chosen result(s) provided for the area, i.e. * *Increased effectiveness of the Polish law enforcement agencies*   and   * *Increased effectiveness of international cooperation between law enforcement agencies*? | **15** |  | |  |
| * 1. Has the need for the project been sufficiently justified? | **10** |  | |  |
| * 1. Is the indicated target group (stakeholders) relevant to the project’s objectives and to what extent does the project correspond to the target group’s needs? | **4** |  | |  |
| * 1. Are the implemented solutions innovative? | **3** |  | |  |
| * 1. Is the project consistent with the level playing field and non-discrimination rules, including accessibility for persons with disabilities and equality between women and men? | **3** |  | |  |
| * 1. Is the project consistent with regional, national and EU strategies? | **3** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 38** |  | |  |
| 2. | *Budget*    **Max. 20 points**  **/ min. 10 points** | 2.1. Have the project costs been planned  in a deliberate, cost-effective, diligent  and proportionate manner? | **6** |  | |  |
| 2.2. Are the applied rates consistent with  market rates? | **6** |  | |  |
| 2.3. Was the budget form from the application filled out correctly? | **5** |  | |  |
| 2.4. Do all expenditures declared by the applicant as eligible meet the eligibility criteria laid down in Article 8.3(1) of the *Regulation* and in *Guidelines for Project Promoters*? | **3** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 20** |  | |  |
| 3. | *Coherence*    **Max. 17 points** | 3.1. Was the project’s objective formulated clearly and according to S.M.A.R.T. criteria[[1]](#footnote-2)? | **3** |  | |  |
| 3.2. Do the planned measures optimally contribute  to the expected project results? | **3** |  | |  |
| 3.3. Are the indicators proposed by the applicant relevant  for the objective / main principles of the project? | **3** |  | |  |
| 3.4. Does the project implementation schedule reflect the sequence of actions in the project? Does it include the key stages/milestones of the project? | **3** |  | |  |
| 3.5. Are the project expenditures consistent with  the planned measures, schedule and expected results? | **3** |  | |  |
| 3.6. Have the planned tools and information and publicity measures been properly adapted to the project  principles and size? | **2** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 17** |  | |  |
| 4. | *Applicant’s and partners’  experience  (if applicable)*    **Max. 10 points** | 4.1 Is the experience of the Applicant and the Partner(s) with projects financed from outside sources (including Norway Grants or EU funds) or national funds adequate to the size of the project? | **4** |  | |  |
| 4.2. Are the personnel resources of the Applicant  and the Partner(s) sufficient  for the planned scope of the project? | **4** |  | |  |
| 4.3. Are the facilities and the equipment of the Applicant and the Partner(s) and their financial capacity sufficient to implement the project? | **2** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 10** |  | |  |
| 5. | *Feasibility*    **Max. 10 points** | 5.1. Is the proposed project management model adequate to the size of the project  and will it support its proper implementation? | **5** |  | |  |
| 5.2. Have the risks/obstacles been correctly identified? Were relevant remedies proposed? | **5** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 10** |  | |  |
| 6. | *Sustainability*    **Max. 5 points** | Will the expected results have long-term effects? Will they contribute to the development of the field? | **5** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 5** |  | |  |
| **TOTAL** | | | **Max. 100 points** |  | |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Criterion assessment rules** | **Max. number of points** | **Number of points awarded** | **Justification** |
| **Additional criteria** | Does the project include components requiring international cooperation, involving Eurojust, Europol, Interpol or Frontex? If so, what is the extent of such cooperation? | **5** |  |  |
| Does the project include components related to:  – trafficking in human beings (0-1 point),  – combating domestic violence (0-1 point),  – combating gender-based violence (0-1 point)? | **3** |  |  |
| Does the project target institutions operating as part of  the “Justice chain”[[2]](#footnote-3)? If so, to what extent? | **2** |  |  |
| Is a Norwegian partner involved in the project (in substantive/financial terms)? If so, to what extent? | **5** |  |  |
| **TOTAL** | | **Max. 15 points** |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PROJECT ASSESSMENT SUMMARY** | | | | | | | | |
| **Criterion** | **Maximum possible score** | **Project score** | **Fulfilment of eligibility criteria** | | | | | |
| Substantive criteria | 100 points |  | Criterion 1 | Minimum 19 points | Point 1.1 | Point 1.2 | Point 1.3  (if applicable) | Point 1.4. – scored at least 8 points |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Criterion 2 | Minimum 10 points | |  | | |
| Additional criteria | 15 points |  |  | | | | |  |
| **TOTAL** | **115 points** |  |  | | | | |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Notes/recommendations:** |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **EXPERT 1/2\*** | |
| **Name of the expert assessing the project** |  |
| **Date of assessment** |  |
| **Signature** |  |

\*mark the appropriate option

1. *Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Time-bound*; the concept of formulating objectives in the field of planning, which is a set of five characteristics that should be reflected in a correctly formulated objective. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. “*Justice chain*” – cooperation between institutions operating in the area of home affairs, i.e. Police, Border Guard, Office for Foreigners, National Fire Service and the judicial system, including courts, the prosecutor’s office and prison services. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)