

MERIT CRITERIA – STAGE I

Eligibility criterion – To be assessed by the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management

No.	Criterion	Criterion description	Assessment rules: Yes/No	Comment
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
	Project eligibility	It will be assessed whether the type of project fits in the catalogue indicated on the open call announcement. Basis for assessment: application form with attachments	Yes/No	

State aid appraisal – To be filled in by the technical unit responsible for the assessment in the field of state aid

No.	Criterion name	Criterion description	Assessment rules: Yes/No	Comments
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
	The financing is in line with the state aid rules	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appraisal if the co-financing constitutes state aid; • if the grant constitutes state aid, appraisal if the aid complies with the provisions/regulations governing the state aid 	Yes/No	

Financial evaluation - To be completed by the technical unit responsible for the financial evaluation of the project

No.	Criterion name	Criterion description	Assessment rules: Yes/No	Comments
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
	Applicant's financial standing/situation –current and forecasted - including feasibility and financial durability analysis	<p>As part of the criterion, the following will be assessed, in particular:</p> <p>1) the applicant's ability to ensure the feasibility and financial sustainability of the project on the basis of analysis of the applicant's financial reports and projections;</p> <p>2) the correctness of the assumptions used for financial analysis;</p> <p>3) confirmed, reliable sources of project co-financing (if applicable);</p>	Yes/No/Non-applicable	

		<p>4) possibility of establishing a financial security (if applicable).</p> <p>The criterion will be assessed using the provisions of the Instruction: "Securing the NFEPWM's claims arising from contracts for project co-financing", regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rules for setting collaterals for any claims under loans/subsidies arising from concluded contracts and contracts in the process of conclusion for co-financing projects from the NFEPWM, including projects co-financed from non-returnable foreign funds, and - defining the general principles for carrying out financial evaluations of grant applications. <p>Basis for assessment: application form with attachments.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

Equality criterion – To be assessed by the National Fund for Environmental Protection and Water Management

No	Criterion	Criterion description	Assessment rules: Yes/No/Not applicable	Comment
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
	The project is in line with equal opportunities and non-discrimination rules	<p>As part of the criterion, it will be assessed whether the project has a positive (or at least neutral) influence on in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessibility for people with disabilities. • Gender equality 	Yes/No/Not applicable	

MERIT CRITERIA – STAGE II

Application evaluation criteria		Score
Feasibility criterion		
1.1	Applicant's organisational capacity to implement the project	0 – 8
1.2	Risk assessment	0 – 5
Justifiability criterion		
2.1	Justification of the project in the light of EU, national and local strategic documents	0 – 3
Cost efficiency criterion - planned expenses in relation to project tasks		
3.1	The eligibility of expenses planned to be incurred and correctness of estimated costs	0 – 9
3.2	The rationality of expenses planned to be incurred	0 – 9
Planned results - project impact on achieving the objective, outcome and output of the Programme (one of the two following activities)		
4.2	Increased protection against invasive alien species and preventing their spread	0 – 40
Criterion of increasing public awareness about ecosystems		
5.1	Campaign coverage - the number of people reached by awareness raising campaigns	0 – 5
Criterion of bilateral relations		
6.1	Participation of partners from Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein	0 – 5
Project location criterion		
7.1	Implementation of the project in wetlands or including this topic in the scope of the project	0 – 5
TOTAL		0 – 89

The required minimum score allowing the project to be assessed positively amounts to 45.

The minimum score in each criteria qualifying the application for the subsequent proceeding is more than 0 number (except 1.1, 6.1 and 7.1). Feasibility criterion - maximum score 13

1.1	Applicant's organisational capacity to implement the project	Score
	The applicant's experience in project implementation covers at least three projects in the Environment and Ecosystems programme area . The implementation of projects has been completed within 5 years before submission of the application.	8
	The applicant's experience in project implementation covers at least one project in the Environment and Ecosystems programme area . The implementation of projects has been completed within 5 years before submission of the application.	6
	The applicant's experience in project implementation covers at least three projects outside the Environment and Ecosystems programme area . The implementation of projects has been completed within 5 years before submission of the application.	4
	The applicant's experience in project implementation covers at least one project outside the Environment and Ecosystems programme area . The implementation of projects has been completed within 5 years before submission of the application.	2
	The applicant has no experience in the project implementation in or outside the Environment and Ecosystems programme area.	0

1.2	Risk assessment <i>*Specification of solutions: - "optimal solutions" are deemed as solutions ensuring the most effective risk minimisation to achieve the project's effects/results; - "sufficiently" are deemed as solutions minimising risk occurrence and sufficient to achieve the project's effects/results; - "solutions developed insufficiently" are deemed as solutions insufficient to achieve the project's effects/results;</i>	Score
	Risk factors along with their significance and probability of occurrence have been well defined and justified , whereas the risk management plan and counteracting plan for risks that may negatively affect the project includes optimal solutions* .	5
	Risk factors along with their significance and probability of occurrence have been defined and justified to a sufficient agree and the risk management plan and counteracting plan for risks that may negatively affect the project has been developed sufficiently* , but the solutions are not optimal.	3
	Risk factors along with their significance and probability of occurrence have been defined insufficiently or the risk management plan and counteracting plan for risks that may negatively affect the project has been developed insufficiently* .	1
	Risk factors along with their significance and probability of occurrence have been defined incorrectly or have not been specified and there is no risk management plan and counteracting plan for risks that may negatively affect the project.	0

Justifiability criterion - maximum score 3

2.1	<p>Justification of the project's in the light of EU, national and local strategic documents <i>EU and national strategic documents, among others, contain:</i></p> <p><i>EU Biodiversity strategy for 2020,</i> <i>The programme of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity along with Action Plan for the period 2015-2020</i> <i>(http://biodiv.gdos.gov.pl/wdrazenie-konwencji/programme-conservation-and-sustainable-use-biodiversity),</i> <i>Strategy for responsible development until 2020 (with a view to 2030).</i></p>	Score
The project complies with the EU, national and local strategic documents.		3
The project does not comply with EU, national and local strategic documents.		0

Cost efficiency criterion - planned expenses in relation to project tasks - maximum score 18

3.1	<p><i>The eligibility of expenses planned to be incurred and correctness of estimated costs</i></p>	Score
<p>The project's estimated budget has been prepared on the basis of generally valid price lists or market bids of suppliers and contractors or printouts from websites or historical data (taken from other projects, the implementation of which has been completed within 5 years before the submission of application).</p> <p>100% of eligible costs have been estimated correctly (deviations from the average values of particular costs do not exceed 20%).</p>		9
<p>The project's estimated budget has been prepared on the basis of generally valid price lists or market bids of suppliers and contractors or printouts from websites or historical data (taken from other projects, the implementation of which has been completed within 5 years before the submission of application). ≥75% of eligible costs have been estimated correctly (deviations from the average values of particular costs do not exceed 20%).</p>		6
<p>The project's estimated budget has been prepared on the basis of generally valid price lists or market bids of suppliers and contractors or printouts from websites or historical data (taken from other projects, the implementation of which has been completed within 5 years before the submission of application). ≥50% of eligible costs have been estimated correctly (deviations from the average values of particular costs do not exceed 20%).</p>		3
<p>The project's estimated budget has not been prepared on the basis of generally valid price lists or market bids of suppliers and contractors or printouts from websites or historical data (taken from other projects, the implementation of which has been completed within 5 years before the submission of application) or</p> <p><50% of eligible costs have been estimated correctly (deviations from the average values of particular costs exceed 20%).</p>		0

3.2	The rationality of expenses planned to be incurred	Score
	The expenditures for the project's implementation are reasonable and the ratio of costs and expected project effects/results indicate high cost efficiency.	9
	The expenditure for the project's implementation is reasonable and the ratio of costs and expected project effects/results indicate sufficient cost efficiency.	6
	The expenditure for the project's implementation is reasonable, however the ratio of costs and expected project effects/results indicate low cost efficiency.	3
	The expenditure for the project's implementation is unreasonably high and the ratio of costs and expected project effects/results indicate no cost efficiency.	0

Planned results – maximum score 40

4.2	Increased protection against invasive alien species and preventing their spread <i>As part of the result, it is possible to implement one/several or all of the following actions:</i> <i>limiting the pressure of invasive alien species, identifying sources and pathways for invasive alien species spread, including eliminating sources or introducing barriers/restrictions preventing their spreading.</i> <i>In the case of project implementation in protected areas, it is necessary to submit an opinion confirming the legitimacy of project implementation by the relevant regional director for environmental protection, the General Director for Environmental Protection (in the case of supra-regional projects, i.e. more than one voivodeship) or the director of the national park.</i> <i>For the project implemented by the national park within its area, the opinion of the national park's scientific council is required.</i>	Score
	The diagnosis of needs was made based on the current data. The results of the diagnosis indicate the existence of the problem that determines the need to implement the project.	0 - 10
	Possible ways of solving the problem were analysed and the method/methods to be used in the project were selected, justifying it accordingly.	0 - 10
	The proposed actions form a logical and coherent whole, are appropriate for achieving output and the assumed ecological impact of the project.	0 – 10*
	The choice of indicators was justified, they are appropriate and consistent with the scope of the Programme, the choice results from the material scope of the project, achieving target values is realistic in the light of the planned activities in the project.	0 - 5
	The information and educational activities planned in the project are in line with the needs of the target group (s), ensure effective access to it/them, are related to other activities included in the project.	0 - 5

* the project in terms of the current state of knowledge and the possibilities of implementing the project may contain innovative techniques/methods of action, which, if successful, will create new role models

Criterion for increasing public awareness about ecosystems - score 5

5.1	<p>Campaign coverage - the number of people reached by awareness raising campaigns. Preparation and implementation of an awareness raising campaign connected to substantive scope of the project</p> <p><i>Awareness raising campaign should be understood as a set of various media activities planned during the implementation of the project, the purpose of which is to increase knowledge, change thinking, behaviour towards the identified local environmental problem.</i></p> <p><i>Awareness raising campaigns proposed may only concern issues related to the substantive scope of the project.</i></p>	Score
	As part of the project, the educational campaign will be planned and implemented in the substantive scope of the project, which will cover over 20 000 people.	5
	As part of the project, the educational campaign will be planned and implemented in the substantive scope of the project, which will cover between 10 001 – 20 000 people.	3
	As part of the project implementation, the educational campaign will be planned and implemented in the substantive scope of the project, which will cover between 5 001–10 000 people.	2
	As part of the project implementation, the educational campaign will be planned and implemented in the substantive scope of the project, which will cover up to 5 000 people (inclusive).	0

Bilateral cooperation criterion - maximum score 5

6.1	Participation of partners from Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein	Score
	The project is implemented in partnership with a partner from Donor States: Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein (letter of intent or partnership agreement).	5
	The project is implemented in cooperation with a partner from Donor States: Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein (other documented partner participation/cooperation).	3
	The project is not implemented in partnership/cooperation with a partner from Donor States: Norway, Iceland or Liechtenstein.	0

Project location criterion - maximum score 5

7.1	Implementation of the project in wetlands or including this topic in the scope of the project	Score
	The project is implemented in wetlands.	5
	The project is not implemented in wetlands.	0