

**Programme:** *Home affairs*

**Thematic area PA 18:** “Asylum and Migration”

**Basic information about the project**

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

Notes regarding scoring: An application may be awarded **up to 115 points** – 100 points for **substantive criteria** and 15 points for **additional criteria**. Applications that meet the eligibility criteria and receive **at least 65 points** will be recommended for co-financing. Projects that have received the minimum number of points (65 points) are recommended for funding, which is not equivalent to receiving funding. Projects will be funded within the limits of available funds.

The following **admission 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 output 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 a project implemented in partnership with a Norwegian institution – the applicant **choosing** at least one bilateral output 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 outcome and the chosen output(s) provided for the PA 18 – that means obtaining minimum 8 points in *1.4.*
* criterion 2 (*Budget*) for which the minimum number of points for the application to be eligible for further substantive assessment and 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 output 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 output indicator provided for the *Home Affairs* Programme (if applicable)? | **YES** | **NO** | **N/A** |  |
| * 1. Likeliness that the project will contribute to the outcome of the programme area: *Increased capacity in the area of asylum and migration* and that the project will achieve the selected indicator(s) of output 1.1. or 1.2.:   + *Enhanced support for migrants and asylum seekers;*   + *Improved co-ordination and capacity building between relevant authorities and NGO*? | **15** |  | |  |
| * 1. How well does the project addresses the identified needs? 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? | **14** |  | |  |
| * 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 application budget form 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-1)? | **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 external 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** | **Rationale** |
| **Additional criteria** | Does the project include cooperation between public administration and non-governmental organisations (such as joint conferences, meetings, training)? If so, what is the extent of such cooperation? | **4** |  |  |
| Does the project include any international cooperation:   * bilateral cooperation, i.e. with a Norwegian institution (0–2 points), * with a foreign institution, other than Norwegian (0–2 points),   If so, what is the extent? | **4** |  |  |
| Does the project include elements related to:   * combating trafficking in human beings (0–2 points), * supporting voluntary returns (0–2 points), * support and services for unaccompanied minors seeking asylum and other groups  with special needs (0–2 points) * combating gender-based violence (0-1 point)? | **7** |  |  |
| **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) | Minimum 8 points for  point 1.4 |
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| 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 a correctly formulated objective should have. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)