

# **INTERREG V A Italy – Croatia CBC Programme**

---

## **Factsheet n. 5 ANNEXES**

**Tables of assessment criteria approved by the MC**

## Annex I – Admissibility assessment criteria

The criteria listed in this paragraph are applicable to “Standard” and “Standard+” project proposals. The criteria are common to all Specific Objectives.

CRITERIA		EXPLANATION	CONSEQUENCE	TYPE OF CHECK
A1	<b>Submission and completeness of AF and LP annexes</b>	Has the Application Form (AF) been submitted only via the SIU system ?	REJECTION of project proposal. No other method of submission of an application will be accepted. Applications submitted in any other means will be automatically rejected.	Check performed by the SIU system on submitted AF. JS countercheck is needed if applications are sent via other means.
		Has the AF and annexes been submitted within the set deadline? (CET time dd/mm/yy; h.)?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.
		Is the AF the only submitted for the given project?	REJECTION of project proposal with the same acronym (the SIU system does not allow this). Information on allowed modifications to AFs before and after submission but before the call deadline is available in factsheet n. 4 “Project Application”.	Check performed by the SIU system.
		Has the AF been filled in English?	REJECTION of project proposal if filled in in languages other than English.	Check performed by JS.
		Is the AF duly signed by LP's legal representative or by a person in charge of signature according to what foreseen in case of	REJECTION of project proposal if the LP's signature is missing, if the AF is not signed by the legal	Check performed by the SIU system on all AF signed with digital signatures in recognised formats.

		delegation?	representative or the delegation is not signed by the legal representative of the delegating LP or if mandatory delegation documents as referred in factsheet n. 4 "Project Application" are missing.	Check performed by JS on all AF signed with signatures other than the digital signature.
		Are all the compulsory LP annexes produced, completely filled in in English language and in the compulsory Programme template?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by SIU on the presence and number of submitted annexes. Check on contents and completeness of annexes performed by JS.
		Are LP annexes signed by the legal representative of the LP, or by a person in charge of signature according to what foreseen in case of delegation?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system on all digital signatures in recognised formats. Check performed by JS on signatures other than the digital signature.

## Annex II – Eligibility assessment criteria

The criteria listed in this paragraph are applicable to “Standard” and “Standard+” project proposals. The criteria are common to all Specific Objectives.

CRITERIA		EXPLANATION	CONSEQUENCE	TYPE OF CHECK
B1	Submission and completeness of PP annexes	Are all the compulsory PP annexes produced, completely filled in in English language and in the compulsory Programme template?	The PP is excluded and the exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of Assessment Manual (see below) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system on the presence and number of submitted annexes. Check on contents and completeness of annexes performed by JS.
		Are PP annexes duly signed by the legal representative of the PP, or by a person in charge of signature according to what foreseen in case of delegation?	The PP is excluded and the exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of the Assessment Manual (see below) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system on all digital signatures in recognised formats. Check performed by JS on signatures other than the digital signature.
B2	Minimum requirements for partnership	Are the project partners at least one Italian and one Croatian?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system. Countercheck performed by JS.
		Are there at least 3 (“Standard+”) / 4 (“Standard”) partners?	REJECTION of project proposal by the SIU system.	Check performed by the SIU system.
		Have at least 2 partners (one Italian and one Croatian) been involved as LP/PP in the original project (Standard+)?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system. Countercheck performed by JS.
B3	LP and PP are eligible organisations	Is the LP located in the eligible Programme area or it can be considered an Assimilated Partner?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Partial check performed by the SIU system. Countercheck performed by JS.
		Is LP complying with	REJECTION of	Partial check

		the beneficiary typologies stated in the CP and in the relevant Call for Proposals?	project proposal by the SIU system.	performed by SIU system. Countercheck performed by JS.
		Is the LP of the Standard+ project proposal involved as LP in only ONE Standard+?	REJECTION of ALL Standard+ project proposals submitted by the same LP.	Check performed by JS.
		Are PPs located in the eligible Programme area or they can be considered Assimilated Partners?	Exclusion of the PP. The exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of the Assessment Manual (see above) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Partial check performed by the SIU system. Countercheck on assimilated partners performed by JS.
		Do PPs comply with the beneficiary typologies stated in the CP and in the Call for Proposals? (requirements and restrictions set by the Call for Proposals are respected)	PP is excluded. The exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of the Assessment Manual (see above) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Partial check performed by SIU system. Countercheck performed by JS.
<b>B4</b>	<b>Project duration</b>	Is the project duration in line with the time limit set in the Call for Proposals?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.
<b>B5</b>	<b>“Standard+” and “Standard” Project proposal respects the restrictions</b>	Is the LP of the project proposal participating as LP in maximum 2 project proposals in the same Specific Objective?	REJECTION of all project proposals submitted by the same LP in the same Specific Objective.	Check performed by JS.
		Is the “Standard+” project proposal the only one capitalising an original 2007-	REJECTION of all project proposals capitalising the same original	Check performed by JS.

		2013 project funded by Adriatic IPA CBC, SEE or MED	project.	
<b>B6</b>	<b>Project proposal refers to a PA and a SO</b>	Does the project proposal refer to one Programme Priority Axis and one of its Specific Objectives?	REJECTION of project proposal by the SIU system.	Check performed by the SIU system.
<b>B7</b>	<b>No evidence of double-financing</b>	Is the evidence of double-financing included in the LP and PPs declarations?	REJECTION of project proposal if in the LP Statement is missing this point. Exclusion of the PP if in his Statement is missing this point. The exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of the Assessment Manual (see above) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Check performed by JS.
<b>B8</b>	<b>Budget requirements</b>	Is the minimum ERDF contribution per PP respected?	Exclusion of the PP. The exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of the Assessment manual (see above) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.
		Does the total financial dimension comply with the indication (min and max) included in the relevant Call for Proposals?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.
		Does ERDF co-financing not exceed 85% of total project budget?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.
<b>B9</b>	<b>Co-financing</b>	Is the amount of the	REJECTION of	Check performed by

	<b>secured</b>	co-financing indicated in the LP annexes equal or higher than the amount of the co-financing indicated in the Application Form?	project proposal	JS.
		Is the amount of the co-financing indicated in the PP annexes equal or higher than the amount of the co-financing indicated in the Application Form?	Exclusion of the PP. The exclusion leading to infringement of criterion B2 of the Assessment manual (see above) leads to the rejection of the project proposal.	Check performed by JS.
<b>B10</b>	<b>Effect on natural habitat Natura 2000 sites</b>	For projects likely to have a significant effect on natural habitat Natura 2000 sites (soft measures are exempt): is the assessment of project implications (neutral or positive) for the site according to Habitat Directive available? If not, is there a commitment on making it available before financing decision?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by JS.
<b>B11</b>	<b>Cooperation criteria</b>	Do the partners declare to cooperate at least in all the following ways: joint development, joint implementation and joint financing?	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.
<b>B12</b>	<b>Respect of horizontal principles</b>	Is the commitment for the respect of the horizontal principles (equal	REJECTION of project proposal.	Check performed by the SIU system.



		opportunities and non-discrimination, equality between men and women and sustainable development) included?		
--	--	---	--	--



## Eligibility Criteria for Specific Objectives

The following criteria refer to the presence of mandatory declarations included by the Lead Applicant in the “Commitments” and “Statements” sections of the AF.

### Specific Objective 1.1

<b>B13</b> <b>a</b>	<b>SO1.1</b>	Project proposals tackling <u>aquaculture</u> : respect of Marine Strategy Directive (2008/56/EC) is included
<b>B13</b> <b>b</b>		There is a commitment that the principles of <u>environmental sustainability</u> are addressed and taken into consideration
<b>B13</b> <b>c</b>		Project proposals involving <u>building constructions and renovation</u> : respect of Directive 2010/31/EU is included
<b>B13</b> <b>d</b>		Project proposals <u>purchasing products</u> : in case of central government authorities, a commitment to respect Directive 2012/27/EU is included

### Specific Objective 2.1

<b>B14</b> <b>a</b>	<b>SO 2.1</b>	Project proposals targeting <u>flood protection and water management</u> : the respect of the requirements to Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), RBMPs & FRMP under Directive 2007/60/EC is confirmed
<b>B14</b> <b>b</b>		Project proposals <u>purchasing products</u> : in case of central government authorities, a commitment to respect Directive 2012/27/EU is included

### Specific Objective 3.1

<b>B15</b> <b>a</b>	<b>SO 3.1</b>	Project proposals <u>promoting tourism in protected habitats (reference to caves)</u> : there is a clear and evident reference that an environmental impact assessment is going to be performed or has been already performed
<b>B15</b> <b>b</b>		There is a commitment that the principles of <u>environmental sustainability</u> are addressed and taken into consideration
<b>B15</b> <b>c</b>		Project proposals involving <u>building constructions and renovation</u> : respect of Directive 2010/31/EU is included
<b>B15</b> <b>d</b>		Project proposals <u>purchasing products</u> : in case of central government authorities, a commitment to respect Directive 2012/27/EU is included

### Specific Objective 3.2

<b>B16</b> <b>a</b>	<b>SO 3.2</b>	Project proposals tackling <u>sea environment</u> : reference to Marine Strategy Directive (2008/56/EC) is included
<b>B16</b> <b>b</b>		Project proposals targeting <u>water management</u> : the respect of the requirements of Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), RBMPs & FRMP under Directive 2007/60/EC is confirmed
<b>B16</b> <b>c</b>		Project proposals tackling issues related to <u>fish species</u> : reference to Common Fisheries Policy is included

<b>B16</b> <b>d</b>		Project proposals tackling issues related to <u>birds</u> and <u>other threatened or endemic animal and plant species</u> : reference to Birds and Habitats Directives is included
------------------------	--	--

### Specific Objective 3.3

<b>B17</b> <b>a</b>	<b>SO 3.3</b>	Project proposals targeting <u>water-related activities</u> : the respect of the requirements of Water Framework Directive (2000/60/EC), coherence with the Common Fisheries Policy, RBMPs & FRMP under Directive 2007/60/EC is confirmed
------------------------	---------------	---

### Specific Objective 4.1

<b>B18</b> <b>a</b>	<b>SO 4.1</b>	There is a commitment that the principles of <u>environmental sustainability</u> are addressed and taken into consideration
<b>B18</b> <b>b</b>		Project proposals involving <u>building constructions and renovation</u> : respect of Directive 2010/31/EU is included
<b>B18</b> <b>c</b>		Project proposals <u>purchasing products</u> : in case of central government authorities, a commitment to respect Directive 2012/27/EU is included
<b>B18</b> <b>d</b>		The project proposal's contribution to the National Air Pollution Control Programmes for reaching National Emission Ceilings or emission ceilings under the Gothenburg Protocol is confirmed
<b>B18</b> <b>e</b>		Project proposals including actions related to the <u>construction or reconstruction of the sea port infrastructure</u> : the respect of Water Framework Directive requirements is confirmed
<b>B18</b> <b>f</b>		Project proposals <u>modifying the hydro morphological characteristics of a water body causing deterioration of the status</u> : there is a commitment that the appropriate analyses as required by Article 4(7) of Water Framework Directive are planned to be carried out as early as possible in the planning process (analysis of alternatives or better environmental options, the set-up of the necessary mitigation measures, and a justification of the importance of the project for overriding public interest)
<b>B18</b> <b>g</b>		When relevant: it is confirmed that the project proposal takes into account the Air Quality Plans (in which transport measures play a key role) under Directive 2008/50/EC

## Annex III – Quality assessment criteria

The criteria listed in this paragraph are applicable to “Standard” and “Standard+” project proposals as specified. The tables display the guiding question, the value of the question, the attributed scores, the multiplier, the quantified points and where to find the related information in the application form.

### C.1 Strategic Criteria

#### C.1.1 Project context - relevance and strategy

##### For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.1.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project address common territorial challenges and opportunities in the Programme area? The need of the project for the area is concrete and evident on the basis of territorial analysis made while well describing the territorial common challenges. Reference should be made to section 1 of the CP and to annex IV.	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Fields "project description" and "Territorial challenges tackled"  Additional field only for Standard+ - Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"
		Partially	1		2	
		Yes	2		4	

For “Standard”

C.1.1.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	<p>Does the project make use of available knowledge and builds on existing results and practices in the thematic domain addressed? The project builds on existing results; specific reference shall be made to previous project experiences under ETC or any other public financing instrument.</p>	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Building on existing knowledge"
		Partially	1		2	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Yes	2		4	Section E "Partners": Field "Expertise in EU/International projects"

For "Standard+"

C.1.1.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project make use of available knowledge and builds on existing results and practices in the thematic domain addressed other than those of the specific original project?	No	0	3	0	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"; Field "Building on existing knowledge"
		Partially	1		3	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Yes	2		6	Section E "Partners": Field "Expertise in EU/International projects"

**For "Standard"**

C.1.1.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Do the project expected results contribute to EU/national/regional policies and/or strategies in the thematic domain(s) addressed by the project? Is the coherence and synergy with ERDF regional and national programmes and other relevant regional/ local financial instruments ensured?	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Fields "Synergies" and "Coherence with relevant policies and plans"
		Partially	1		2	
		Yes	2		4	

**For "Standard+"**

C.1.1.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Do the project expected results contribute to EU/national/regional policies and/or strategies in the thematic domain(s) addressed by the project? Is the coherence and synergy with ERDF regional and national programmes and other relevant regional/ local financial instruments ensured?	No	0	1	0	Section F "Project Key data": Fields "Capitalization description", "Synergies" and "Coherence with relevant policies and plans"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.1.d	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project make a positive contribution to the Programme horizontal principle: equal opportunities and non-discrimination?	No	0	1	0	Section F "Project Key data": Fields "Equal opportunities and non-discrimination description", "Project main outputs description", "Project results", and "Target groups"
		Yes	1		1	Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs"  Additional field only for Standard+ - Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.1.e	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project make a positive contribution to the Programme horizontal principle: equality between men and women?	No	0	1	0	<p>Section F "Project Key data": Field "Equality between men and women description""Project main outputs description", "Project results", and "Target groups"</p> <p>Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs"</p> <p>Additional field only for Standard+ - Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"</p>
		Yes	1		1	



For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.1.f	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project make a positive contribution to the Programme horizontal principles: sustainable development?	No	0	1	0	<p>Section F "Project Key data": Field "Sustainable development description""Project main outputs description", "Project results", and "Target groups"</p> <p>Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs"</p> <p>Additional field only for Standard+ - Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"</p>
		Yes	1		1	

**C.1.2 Cooperation character**

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.2.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	How well is the need for a CB approach demonstrated?	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project key data": Field "Cooperation need"
		Partially (a)	1		2	
		Partially (b)	2		4	Additional field only for Standard+ - Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"
		Yes	3		6	

For "Standard"

C.1.2.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Is there a clear benefit from cooperating for all the involved project partners and both side of the borders?	No	0	1	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Partially	1		1	Section E "Partners - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Yes	2		2	Section F "Project key data": Field "Cooperation need"

**For "Standard+"**

<b>C.1.2.b</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Is there a clear benefit from cooperating for all the involved project partners and both side of the borders?	No	0	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Partially	1		2	Section E "Partners - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Yes	2		4	Section F "Project key data": Fields „Capitalization description“ and "Cooperation need"

**For "Standard"**

<b>C.1.2.c</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	To what extent does the project demonstrate new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/Programme area/participating countries?	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project key data": Field "Project approach"
		Partially	1		2	
		Yes	2		4	

For "Standard+"

C.1.2.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	To what extent does the project demonstrate new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/Programme area/participating countries?	No	0	1	0	Section F "Project key data": Field "Project approach" and "Capitalization description"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**C.1.3 Project contribution to Programme’s objectives, expected results and outputs**

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.3.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	<p>Is the project intervention logic internally aligned and linked to the Programme intervention logic?</p> <p>A. The project overall objective clearly links to a Programme specific objective (reference to Annex V);</p> <p>B. The project results clearly link to a Programme result indicator;</p> <p>C. The project specific objectives clearly link to the project overall objective.</p>	No	0	2	0	<p>Standard: Section F "Project Key data": Field "Project description"</p> <p>For A: Field "Programme specific objective", Field "Project overall objective"</p> <p>For B: Field "Programme result indicator" and "Project results"</p> <p>For C: Field "Project specific objectives description"</p> <p>Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization"</p>
		Partially (a)	1		2	
		Partially (b)	2		4	
		Yes	3		6	

						description"
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

**For "Standard" and "Standard+"**

C.1.3.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Do the project main outputs clearly link to the project specific objectives and contribute to Programme output indicators?	No	0	1	0	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Project main outputs description", "Programme output indicator related" and "Project specific objectives description"  Section I "Project": Field "WP expected outputs"  Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.3.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	<p>Are project main outputs durable (i.e.: the proposal is expected to provide a significant and durable contribution to solving the challenges targeted)?</p> <p>To which extent are project main outputs replicable by other organizations/ regions outside of the current partnership (transferability)?</p>	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Outputs and results durability" and " Outputs and results transferability"
		Partially	1		2	Section I "Project": Field "WP expected outputs", " Durability of WP outputs" and "Transferability of WP outputs"
		Yes	2		4	Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"



For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.3.d	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Are the selected target groups in accordance with the project specific objectives and related main outputs?	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Target groups", "Description of the target groups" and "Target value"
		Partially	1		2	Section I "Project": Field “WPs description”  Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"
		Yes	2		4	

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.3.e	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Are results and main outputs specific and realistic?	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Project results" and "Project main outputs description"
		Partially (a)	1		2	Section I "Project": Field "WP expected outputs"
		Partially (b)	2		4	
		Yes	3		6	Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"

**C.1.4 Partnership relevance**

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.4.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project involve the relevant actors as project partners to address the territorial challenges/joint assets and the objectives specified?	No	0	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Competence", "Organisational structure and resources" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"  Section E "Partners", Field "Competence", Field "Organisational structure and resources" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"  Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"
Partially		1	2			
Yes		2	4			

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.4.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	With respect to the project’s objectives the project partnership: - Is balanced with respect to the levels, sectors, territory? - Does it consist of partners that complement each other?	No	0	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Competence", "Organisational structure and resources" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Partially	1		2	Section E "Partners" - Field "Competence", "Organisational structure and resources", and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Yes	2		4	Section I "Project": Field "WPs description"  Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"

For "Standard" and "Standard+"

C.1.4.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the partnership as a whole and does each partner have proven experience and competence in the thematic field concerned to achieve the envisaged outputs and expected results?	No	0	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Competence" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Partially	1		2	Section E "Partners" : Field "Competence" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Yes	2		4	Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.1.4.d	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Do all involved partners play a defined role in the partnership and get a real benefit from it?	No	0	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Partially	1		2	Section E "Partners - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Yes	2		4	Section F "Project key data": Field "Joint development", "Joint implementation", "Joint staffing" and "Joint financing"  Section I "Project": Field "WPs description"  Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"

## C. 2 Operational Criteria

### C.2.1 Management

#### For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.2.1.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
Does the LP have previous experience in managing ETC projects?		No	0	1	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

#### For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.2.1.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
Do the PPs have the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?		No	0	1	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Competence", and "Organisational structure and resources"
		Partially	1		1	Section E "Partners": Field "Competence" and "Organisational structure and resources"
		Yes	2		2	Section I "Project": Field "Project budget"

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.1.c</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Are the foreseen management structures (e.g.: project steering committee, project coordination unit) proportionate to the partnership and project size and needs and allow partners' involvement in decision-making?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project" - Field "WP1 description", "WP1 activities and deliverables" and "Project budget" "
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.1.d</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Have the project management risks been identified and mitigation measures foreseen?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project": Field "WP1 description" and "WP1 activities and deliverables" Section H "Budget general information" - Field "Infrastructure risk associated"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	



**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.1.e</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Have the management procedures (such as reporting and evaluation procedures in the area of finance, project content, communication) been defined in a clear, transparent, efficient and effective way? Does project management include regular contacts between project partners and ensure transfer of expertise across the partnership (internal communication within the partnership)?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project": Field "WP1 description" and "WP1 activities and deliverables"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**C.2.2 Communication**

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.2.a</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Are the communication objectives clearly linked to the project specific objectives? Are the communication activities coherently integrated in the overall project strategy?	No	0	1	0	Section G "Communication approach": Field "Communication objectives description"  Section I "Project": Field "WP2 description" and "WP2 activities"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

C.2.2.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Are the approach/tactics chosen appropriate to reach communication objectives?	No	0	1	0	Section G "Communication approach": Field "Communication tactics/approach"
		Yes	1		1	Section I "Project": Field "WP2 description" and "WP2 activities"

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

C.2.2.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	To which extent are the proposed information and dissemination activities able to achieve visibility among relevant target groups and stakeholders (e.g. the relevant target groups are clearly defined and cover the entire project area? The general approach towards each group is described through relevant channels, tailored activities, etc.)?	No	0	1	0	Section G "Communication approach": Field "Communication tactics/approach" and "Target groups of communication"
		Partially	1		1	Section I "Project": Field "WP2 description", "WP2 activities" and "WPs outputs transferability"
		Yes	2		2	

For “Standard” and “Standard+”

C.2.2.d	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Does the project make provisions for feedback mechanisms and evaluation measures for the communication activities?	No	0	1	0	Section G "Communication approach": Field "Communication tactics/approach"
		Yes	1		1	Section I "Project": Field "WP2 description", "WP2 activities" and "WPs outputs transferability"

**C.2.3 Work plan**

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

C.2.3.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Are the work plan and timing of activities, deliverables and outputs: A. realistic; B. consistent; C. transparent?	No	0	2	0	Section I "Project"
		Partially (a)	1		2	
		Partially (b)	2		4	
		Yes	3		6	

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

C.2.3.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	Is the overall project duration realistic to achieve the foreseen outputs?	No	0	1	0	Section F "Project key data": Field "Start date and end date" and "Project outputs description"
		Yes	1		1	Section I "Project": Field "WPs expected outputs"

						description"
--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------

**For "Standard" and "Standard+"**

C.2.3.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	How well is the distribution of tasks among partners appropriate to their respective expertise (e.g. sharing of tasks is clear, logical, in line with partners' role in the WPs, etc.)?	No	0	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation", "Competence" and "Expertise in EU/International projects" Section E "Partners": Field "Benefit in participation", "Competence" and "Expertise in EU/International projects" Section I "Project" : Field "WPs description"
		Partially	1		2	
		Yes	2		4	

**C.2.4 Budget**

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.4.a</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Are planned resources reasonable to ensure project implementation? Is the project budget proportionate to the proposed work plan, main outputs and results aimed for?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project": Field "Project budget"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.4.b</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	Is the distribution of budget between PPs reasonable and proportionate? Are partners’ budgets coherent with their respective role in project activities for each Work Package?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project": Field "Project budget"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.4.c</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	To which extent is: - The overall financial allocation per budget lines justified and correctly quantified? - The financial allocation per budget line within each activity justified?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project": Field "Project budget"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	

**For “Standard” and “Standard+”**

<b>C.2.4.d</b>	<b>Guiding question</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Multiplier</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Application form</b>
	To which extent is: - The distribution of the budget per period coherent with the work plan? - The distribution of the budget per Work Package coherent with the work plan?	No	0	1	0	Section I "Project": Field "Project budget"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	Section J "Financial plan"

**C.3 Priority Axis/ Specific Objective Criteria**

**Specific Objective 1.1**

SO1.1	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillars 1 and/or 3?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description".
b	Is the project proposal developing concrete applications ensuring portability of results on the targeted socio-economic reality?	4	0		Section G "Communication approach" - Field "Communication tactics/Approach". Section I "Project": Fields "WPs description", "Transferability WP outputs" and "Durability of WP outputs".
c	Is the project proposal evidently contributing to one or more S3 strategies of the regions/ countries participating in the Programme?	4	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" and "Synergies".
d	Is the project proposal supporting eco-efficiency tools and solutions?	3	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Projects main outputs" and "Project results". Section I "Project": Field "WPs expected outputs".
e	Is the project proposal including elements for fostering the inclusion of disadvantage groups and gender mainstreaming?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Field "Equal opportunities and non discrimination description". Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results", and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".



f	Is there any action focusing on the development of human capital skills and competences consistent with the results expected for the SO?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
---	--	---	---	--	--

### Specific Objective 2.1

SO 2.1	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillars 1 and/or 3?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description".
b	Is the project proposal focused on activities offering a medium-term response to a long-term phenomenon?	5	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results", "Target groups" and "Outputs and results durability". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs" and "Durability of WP outputs".
c	Is the project proposal supporting complementarities of the proposed activities with pre-existing strategies, RBMPs or instruments previously present in the cooperation area?	4	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" and "Synergies".
d	Is the project proposal focusing on marine or coastal areas (where coastal areas are the Municipalities having access to the sea)?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description" and "Activities description".

e	Is the project proposal including elements for fostering the educational and research activities?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section G "Communication approach" - Fields "Communication objective description" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
f	Does the project improve harmonization of data and procedures and exchange of information mechanisms?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results", "Target groups" and "Outputs and results transferability". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs" and "Trasferability of WP outputs".

### Specific Objective 2.2

SO 2.2	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillars 1 and/or 3?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data": Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description".
b	Is the project proposal focused on activities offering an immediate response to a sudden event?	5	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results", "Target groups" and "Outputs and results durability". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs" and "Durability of WP

					outputs".
c	Is the project proposal supporting complementarities of the proposed activities with pre-existing strategies or instruments previously present in the cooperation area?	4	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" and "Synergies".
d	Is the project proposal focusing on marine or coastal areas (where coastal areas are the Municipalities having access to the sea)?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description" and "Target groups" Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description" and "Activities description".
e	Is the project proposal including elements for raising awareness in the population on hazard management procedures?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project main outputs description", "Project results", "Target groups". Section G "Communication approach" - Fields "Communication objective description" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
f	Does the project develop common tools and schemes for monitoring the natural and man-made disasters?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Outputs and results transferability". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs" and "Trasferability of WP outputs".

**Specific Objective 3.1**

SO 3.1	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillars 3 and/or 4?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description".
b	Is the project proposal creating synergies in nature, cultural heritage and tourism and supporting the leverage capacity of natural and cultural valorisation?	3	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs" and "Project results". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
c	Is the project proposal focusing on Natura 2000 sites or sites/ areas where cultural/ natural heritage is less known or strongly affected by climate change, adverse extreme natural events, environmental degradation?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Natura 2000 sites involved" and "Project results". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs description" and "Activities description".
d	Is the project proposal focused on activities reducing the pressure on endangered and sensitive natural features on UNESCO and Natura 2000 sites, taking into account their conservation status and conservation objectives?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs" and "Project results". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs".
e	Is the project proposal fostering green certifications?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Projects main outputs" and "Project results". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs expected outputs".
f	Is the project proposal including elements for fostering the inclusion of disadvantaged groups and gender mainstreaming?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Field "Equal opportunities and non discrimination description". Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description",

					"Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
g	Is there any action focusing on the development of human capital skills and competences consistent with the results expected for the SO?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
h	Does the project proposal include building construction and renovation which go beyond cost-optimal levels according to Directive 2010/31/EU?	2	0		Section H "Budget general information" - Field "Infrastructure description".

### Specific Objective 3.2

SO 3.2	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillars 1 and/or 3?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description".
b	Is the project proposal focused on Natura 2000 sites of European importance implementing management actions reducing the pressure on endangered and sensitive natural features taking	3	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Natura 2000 sites involved" and "Project results". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description" and "Activities

	into account their conservation status and conservation objectives?				description".
c	Is the project proposal aimed at increasing the knowledge on marine biodiversity, designating and improving management of marine protected areas (especially marine Natura 2000 network) and joint management of cross-border protected areas?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), Field "Project main outputs", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section G "Communication approach" - Fields "Communication objectives" and "Target groups of the Communication". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs implementation description", "Activities description (of the WPs implementation)" and "WPs expected outputs".
d	Has the project complementarity with projects funded by LIFE Programme 2014 - 2020?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" and "Synergies".
e	Is the project proposal focussing on river basins, coastal, marine and wetland areas?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description" and "Activities description".
f	Has the project elements aiming to develop tools for integrated management of the sea, coastal and river environment and of cross-border natural resources (i.e. coordinated Maritime Spatial Planning (MSP) and Integrated Coastal Management (ICM)?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Capitalization description" (Only for Standard+), "Coherence with relevant policies and plans", "Synergies" and "Project main outputs".
g	Is the project proposal including elements for fostering the educational, and research activities?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section G "Communication approach" - Fields

					"Communication objective description" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
h	Does the project proposal include activities aimed to provide economic and employment opportunities?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Field "Project description", "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups" Section I "Project" - Field "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".

### Specific Objective 3.3

SO 3.3	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillars 1 and/or 3?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description"
b	Is the project proposal including elements supporting the shift toward the low-carbon economy?	3	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs"
c	Is the project proposal focusing on the Adriatic basin, meaning the marine and coastal area and all rivers converging to the sea?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description" and "Activities description".

d	Has the project complementarity with projects funded by LIFE Programme 2014 - 2020?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" and "Synergies".
e	Is the project proposal fostering green certifications?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Projects main outputs" and "Project results". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs expected outputs".
f	Is the project proposal including elements for fostering the inclusion of disadvantaged groups and gender mainstreaming?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Field "Equal opportunities and non discrimination description". Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
g	Is there any action focusing on the development of human capital skills and competences consistent with the results expected for the SO?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
h	Is there any action focusing on creating job opportunities and supporting youth employment?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description", "WPs expected outputs".



**Specific Objective 4.1**

SO 4.1	Guiding question	Y	N	Max score	Application Form
a	Is the project proposal evidently addressing EUSAIR Action Plan and the priority actions (where defined) for Pillar 2?	5	0	20	Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with EUSAIR" and "EUSAIR description".
b	Is the project proposal in line with the urban and regional mobility plans of the territories concerned?	4	0		Section F "Project key data" - Field "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" .
c	Is the project proposal including elements supporting the shift toward the low-carbon economy?	3	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results", "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
d	Is the project proposal focusing on marine and coastal area or on inland connections to the coast?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" Fields "Project description" and "Target groups" Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description" and "Activities description".
e	Does the project contribute to the adoption of ICT systems?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Field "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
f	Is the project proposal including elements for fostering the inclusion of disadvantage groups and gender mainstreaming?	2	0		Section F "Project key data" - Field "Equal opportunities and non discrimination description". Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Project description", "Project approach", "Capitalization description" (only for

					Standard+), "Project main outputs description", "Project results", "Target groups". Section I "Project" - Fields "WPs description", "Activities description" and "WPs expected outputs".
g	Does the project proposal include building constructions and renovation which go beyond cost-optimal levels according to Directive 2010/31/EU?	2	0		Section H "Budget general information" - Field "Infrastructure description".

## **Annex IV - Focus on Territorial Challenges**

**1.1** - There is a need to increase the level of competitiveness on international markets of SMEs by fostering sound mechanisms of innovation and creating a critical mass through cooperation; the cooperation between the innovation players in fields of relevant sectors of the blue economy shall be enhanced; there is a need to secure availability of high-skilled human resources in key economic sectors to strengthen development patterns; there is a need to facilitate involvement of SMEs in international networks for research; the area shows evident potentials for blue growth; there is a need to concentrate efforts for raising employment rate of the cooperation area; there is potential for an increase of the specialization of the workforce in specific sectors of the blue economy in which the area has competitive advantage; there is a need to support “brain circulation” amongst research institutes/academies and companies as a condition for developing cooperation in the field of blue technologies.

**2.1** Given the growing trend of climate change effects in the Programme area, such as flooding or coastal erosion, subsidence, wetland degradation or saltwater intrusion into freshwater systems, adaptive capacity shall be improved due to the higher impact of climate change, especially in the vulnerable marine and coastal parts of the cooperation area; lack of homogenous and comparable data make adaptation potentiality of the marine and maritime systems poorly known.

**2.2** - Due to the growing trend of natural disasters in the Programme area, Adriatic basin calls for cross border actions in the field of risk prevention and management; increase in human pressure and urbanization as well as the use and exploitation of water resources can be the root causes of significant risks. There is a need to improve monitoring measures for prevention of damage caused by natural disasters such as erosion, wild fires, droughts and floods, and accidents like oil spills.

**3.1** - Common characteristics of cultural heritage and shared marine natural resources can support a higher quality tourism if tackled in a sustainable way; altogether very rich cultural and environmental resources require proper conservation; specific training to human resources employed in the tourism sector can increase the quality of services offered raising awareness of the added value of a sustainable approach; coastal and marine resources represent assets that shall be tackled by joint actions; natural marine and coastal resources in the Programme area are highly valuable and constitute an important driver for economic development.

**3.2** - Natural marine and coastal resources in the Programme area suffer a strong anthropic pressure and conflicts of use; coastal and marine resources represent assets that shall be tackled by joint actions as cross-border cooperation is vital in order to ensure an efficient protection of marine biodiversity; maritime spatial planning and integrated coastal zone management can secure sustainable use of marine and coastal ecosystems and resources.

**3.3** - Adriatic is affected by micro-plastic pollution and other negative impact (derelict fishing gear); protection measures must be interconnected and inclined to take into account these changes and can be significantly improved if linked with the use of green technologies.

**4.1** - There is a need to decrease environmental impact of transport activities, such as road traffic congestion in urban areas especially along the coast; there is potential for more systemic, integrated and efficient maritime connections from/to the eligible territories and between them; there is potential for additional cooperation between ports ensuring integrated information (ICT) and ticketing (passengers transport).

## **Annex V - Focus on Programme's expected results**

Description of the expected results per each Specific Objective:

**1.1** - To increase the effectiveness of the innovation activities in the relevant fields of blue economy targeted by the Programme (blue energy, aquaculture and sustainable fisheries, maritime and coastal tourism, sea shipping, marine biotechnology, desalination, coastal protection, monitoring and surveillance), by enhancing the transfer of knowledge within the cooperation area between enterprises, R&D centres, higher education and the public sector, thus creating the premises for the commercialization of the research results and broaden the access to knowledge.

**2.1** – To support and to increase preparedness for and resilience to climate change and associated phenomena in the cooperation area: sea level rise, flooding, accelerated coastal erosion, subsidence, increasing water temperatures, acidification of marine waters, saltwater intrusion into freshwater systems, increased occurrence of heavy rainfall and severe droughts and fires.

**2.2** – To stimulate monitoring of risks and managing emergencies especially in the Adriatic Basin particularly in connection to these disasters: floods, fire, oil spill and other marine hazards.

**3.1** – To generate added value in the sustainable management of natural and cultural resources (not only in the form of historical artefacts but also traditions and folklore), valorising and preserving the rich heritage deeply permeating the area.

**3.2** – To strengthen the management and protection of ecosystems and the cooperation between public actors/managers of the protected areas in order to increase environmental benefits and to provide economic and employment opportunities, with a special focus on MPS and ICM.

**3.3** – To improve the quality of the water of the sea by using innovative/green technologies and new integrated approaches, with a special focus on waste management and treatment.

**4.1** –To improve the surveillance and coordination capacity and to create the necessary framework for substantial investments, in order to meet all the challenges for a sustainable, environmental friendly and low carbon transport system, with a special focus on compatible energy sources for vessels, adoption of ICT systems, quality and environmental sustainability of services and nodes.

## **Annex VI - Focus on Horizontal Principles**

The Programme incorporates horizontal aspects highlighted in EU regulations, namely:

### **1) Equal opportunities and non-discrimination:**

Projects have to ensure that the activities implemented do not generate discrimination of any kind (gender, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation) and to explain how the equal opportunity principle is rooted in the project design and implementation. All projects, regardless the priority axis under which they are submitted are encouraged to foresee measures or actions to promote equal opportunities and preventing any discrimination.

### **2) Equality between men and women:**

Projects have to ensure that the activities implemented are in line with the principle of equality between men and women and to demonstrate how this principle is rooted in the project design and implementation. This aspect applies to all projects, regardless the priority axis under which they are submitted

### **3) Sustainable development:**

The Italy-Croatia Programme invites to promote eco-innovation, i.e.: aiming to make a more sustainable use of natural resources under all Priority Axes. More precisely, beneficiaries are requested to describe in their project proposals the efforts they will undertake to reduce the project's "carbon footprint".

In line with the principle of sustainable development:

- Projects which have a positive effect on the environment or which conserve, enhance or rehabilitate existing endowments will be preferred to those that are neutral from this perspective;
- Projects that have a potentially harmful effect on the environment will be excluded;
- Actions designed to raise environmental awareness and compliance both within the economic and administrative sectors, and among the general public, including acknowledgement that a high level of environmental performance can provide a long term competitive advantage will be supported.

Additionally, the Italy-Croatia Programme invites all the applicants to implement actions/adopt specific measures to reduce the environmental impact. Indicatively, they can include:

- Use of video conferencing to reduce travelling;
- Publications on FSC certified paper;
- Use of "green public procurement" procedures and innovative public procurement where appropriate;
- Use of short supply chains in the implementation of projects activities;
- Raising awareness of partners, beneficiaries and target groups on sustainability issues;
- Promotion of activities with limited use of energy and natural resources.

## **Annex VII - Strategic orientation of the Programme (analysis of the pre-existing strategies and instruments present in the cooperation area)**

In order to provide the potential applicants with information regarding existing strategies/instruments, four overview lists have been prepared.

A specific table has been arranged for each type of strategy/instrument:

- The EU Strategy for the Adriatic and Ionian Region (EUSAIR)
- River Basin Management Plans (RBMPs)
- Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs)
- Smart Specialization Strategies (S3)

This overview has been drafted by MA in agreement with the NAs as an informative tool for supporting potential applicants in the framework of the 1st Call for Proposals.

**EUSAIR**

*PILLAR 1 - Blue Growth*

- Topic 1 - Blue technologies
- Topic 2 - Fisheries and aquaculture
- Topic 3 - Maritime and marine governance and services

*PILLAR 2 - Connecting the region*

- Topic 1 - Maritime transport
- Topic 2 - Intermodal connections to the hinterland
- Topic 3 - Energy networks

*PILLAR 3 - Environmental quality*

- Topic 1 – The marine environment
- Topic 2 – Transnational terrestrial habitats and biodiversity

*PILLAR 4 - Sustainable tourism*

- Topic 1 - Diversified tourism offer (products and services)
- Topic 2 – Sustainable and responsible tourism management (innovation and quality)



**River Basin Management Plans**

concerning the IT-HR CBC Programme Area

ITALY		
DISTRICT CODE	DISTRICT NAME	RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN (link to download)
ITA	Eastern Alps / Alpi Orientali	<a href="http://www.alpiorientali.it/documenti/documenti.html">http://www.alpiorientali.it/documenti/documenti.html</a>
ITB	Po Basin/ Bacino del Po	<a href="http://pianoacque.adbpo.it/">http://pianoacque.adbpo.it/</a>
ITC	Northern Appenines / Appennino Settentrionale	<a href="http://www.appenninosettentrionale.it/dist/?page_id=4">http://www.appenninosettentrionale.it/dist/?page_id=4</a>
ITE	Central Appenines / Appennino Centrale	<a href="http://www.abtevere.it/?q=node/718">http://www.abtevere.it/?q=node/718</a>
ITF	Southern Appenines / Appennino Meridionale	<a href="http://www.ildistrettoidrograficodellappenninomeridionale.it/dam_066.htm">http://www.ildistrettoidrograficodellappenninomeridionale.it/dam_066.htm</a>

CROATIA		
DISTRICT CODE	DISTRICT NAME	RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT PLAN (link to download)
HRC	Danube / Dunav	<a href="http://www.voda.hr/hr/plan-upravljanja-vodama-0">http://www.voda.hr/hr/plan-upravljanja-vodama-0</a>
HRJ	Adriatic / Jadransko	<a href="http://www.voda.hr/hr/plan-upravljanja-vodama-0">http://www.voda.hr/hr/plan-upravljanja-vodama-0</a>

**Flood Risk Management Plans**  
concerning the IT-HR CBC Programme Area

ITALY		
DISTRICT CODE	DISTRICT NAME	FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN (link to download)
ITA	Eastern Alps / Alpi Orientali	<a href="http://www.va.minambiente.it/it-IT">http://www.va.minambiente.it/it-IT</a>
ITB	Po Basin/ Bacino del Po	
ITC	Northern Appenines / Appennino Settentrionale	
ITE	Central Appenines / Appennino Centrale	
ITF	Southern Appenines / Appennino Meridionale	

CROATIA		
DISTRICT CODE	DISTRICT NAME	FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN (link to download)
HRC	Danube / Dunav	<a href="http://www.voda.hr/hr/glavni-provedbeni-plan-obrane-od-poplava">http://www.voda.hr/hr/glavni-provedbeni-plan-obrane-od-poplava</a>
HRJ	Adriatic / Jadransko	<a href="http://www.voda.hr/hr/glavni-provedbeni-plan-obrane-od-poplava">http://www.voda.hr/hr/glavni-provedbeni-plan-obrane-od-poplava</a>

**Smart Specialization Strategies (S3)**

concerning the IT-HR CBC Programme Area

ITALY		
AREA	SMART SPECIALIZATION	SMART SPECIALIZATION STRATEGY (link to download)
Italia	Aerospace	<a href="https://www.researchitaly.it/uploads/7553/Report%20di%20analisi%2012%20Aree%20di%20specializzazione.pdf?v=26a4e6c">https://www.researchitaly.it/uploads/7553/Report di analisi 12 Aree di specializzazione.pdf?v=26a4e6c</a>
	Agrifood	
	Cultural Heritage	
	Green Chemistry	
	Sea Economy	
	Energy (Environment)	
	Smart manufacturing	
	Innovation (no R&D)	
	Sustainable mobility	
	Life science	
	Smart communities	
Smart living technologies		
Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia	Agrifood	<a href="http://www.regione.fvg.it/rafvig/export/sites/default/RAVVG/fondi-europei-fvg-internazionale/Strategia-specializzazione-intelligente/allegati/06112015_Versione_10_07_2015.pdf">http://www.regione.fvg.it/rafvig/export/sites/default/RAVVG/fondi-europei-fvg-internazionale/Strategia-specializzazione-intelligente/allegati/06112015_Versione_10_07_2015.pdf</a>
	Smart manufacturing and related services	
	Maritime technologies	
	Smart health	
	Culture, creativity and tourism	
Regione Veneto	Smart Agrifood	<a href="http://repository.regione.veneto.it/public/9acbbc91ddf98b88115361095b03ebb2.php?lang=it&amp;dl=true">http://repository.regione.veneto.it/public/9acbbc91ddf98b88115361095b03ebb2.php?lang=it&amp;dl=true</a>
	Sustainable Living	
	Smart Manufacturing	
	Creative Industries	
Regione Emilia Romagna	Agricultural & food production	<a href="http://www.regione.emilia-romagna.it/fesr/por-fesr/por2014-2020/documenti/strategia-di-ricerca-e-innovazione-per-la-specializzazione-intelligente/at_download/file/C008_fondi_ris3er-web.pdf">http://www.regione.emilia-romagna.it/fesr/por-fesr/por2014-2020/documenti/strategia-di-ricerca-e-innovazione-per-la-specializzazione-intelligente/at_download/file/C008_fondi_ris3er-web.pdf</a>
	Construction	
	Mechatronics	
	Health & well being	
	Creative sectors	
Regione Marche	Health & well being	<a href="http://www.norme.marche.it/Delibere/2014/DGR0157_14.pdf">http://www.norme.marche.it/Delibere/2014/DGR0157_14.pdf</a>
	Domotics	
	Sustainable manufacturing	
	Mechatronics	
Regione Abruzzo	Automotive - Mechatronics	<a href="http://www.regione.abruzzo.it/xprogrammazione/docs/incontro_17_marzo_2015/s3_11_marzo.pdf">http://www.regione.abruzzo.it/xprogrammazione/docs/incontro_17_marzo_2015/s3_11_marzo.pdf</a>
	Life science (pharmaceuticals, R&D, ealth care)	

	ICT - Aerospace	
	Agrifood	
	Fashion - Design	
Regione Molise	Automotive	<a href="http://www.moliseineuropa.eu/sites/moliseineuropa.eu/files/Le%20strategie%20di%20R&amp;I%20per%20la%20specializzazione%20intelligente%20-%20Luglio%202014_0.zip">http://www.moliseineuropa.eu/sites/moliseineuropa.eu/files/Le%20strategie%20di%20R&amp;I%20per%20la%20specializzazione%20intelligente%20-%20Luglio%202014_0.zip</a>
	Construction	
	Fashion	
	Agrifood	
	Tourism	
	ICT	
	Life science	
Regione Puglia	Sustainable manufacturing	<a href="http://www.sistema.puglia.it/portal/pls/portal/sis.puglia.ges_blob.p_retrieve?p_tname=sispuglia.documenti&amp;p_cname=testo&amp;p_cname_mime=mime_type_testo&amp;p_rowid=AAAh67AARAAP2myAAC&amp;p_name_allegato=&amp;p_esito=0">http://www.sistema.puglia.it/portal/pls/portal/sis.puglia.ges_blob.p_retrieve?p_tname=sispuglia.documenti&amp;p_cname=testo&amp;p_cname_mime=mime_type_testo&amp;p_rowid=AAAh67AARAAP2myAAC&amp;p_name_allegato=&amp;p_esito=0</a>
	Health & well being	
	Creative digital communities	

CROATIA		
AREA	SMART SPECIALIZATION	SMART SPECIALIZATION STRATEGY (link to download)
Croatia	Health and life quality	<a href="http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2016_04_32_853.html">http://narodne-novine.nn.hr/clanci/sluzbeni/2016_04_32_853.html</a>
	Energy and sustainable environm	
	Transport and mobility	
	Safeness	
	Food and Bioeconomy	