



INTERREG V A Italy – Croatia CBC Programme

Factsheet n. 5 Project Selection

Version N°1 of 20th February 2017





TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. OVERVIEW	2
B. ADMISSIBILITY CHECK.....	3
C. ELIGIBILITY CHECK	4
D. QUALITY CHECK.....	5
E. COMPLIANT PROCEDURE	12
F. WHERE TO FIND ASSISTANCE	13





A. OVERVIEW

Within the INTERREG V A Italy-Croatia CBC Programme the selection of project proposals is carried out in compliance with art. 12 of ETC Regulation (No. 1299/2013) by the MC, with the support of the JS, on the basis of the methodology and criteria approved by the MC.

This document illustrates clearly and transparently the project selection procedures. These procedures are made available to the public in order to allow applicants to be aware of the criteria which are used to assess the proposals and thus develop high quality projects to support the Programme in reaching its objectives.

The project assessment procedure is based on criteria divided into:

1. Admissibility criteria;
2. Eligibility criteria;
3. Quality Assessment criteria, divided into the following sub-groups:
 - i. *Content related assessment – strategic criteria;*
 - ii. *Implementation related assessment – operational criteria;*
 - iii. *Specific criteria per SO.*
4. Assessment according to State Aid relevance.

Project applications shall be submitted via the SIU system, according to the procedures detailed in factsheet n. 4 “Project Application”. The SIU system performs a number of automatic checks on the data inserted and saved into the system. These checks should be considered a supportive tool for Lead Applicants. The checks do not substitute in any form the Lead Applicant’s responsibility to verify the compliance of the submitted proposal with all Programme requirements including the respect of formal and eligibility criteria.

In case the SIU systems undergoes any malfunctioning which prevents proper submission of the applications, the MA is formally delegated by the MC to postpone each call deadline of a number of days equal to the days of malfunctioning.

All regularly submitted project proposals, are duly and officially received by the MA through the Regional record system registration, for the subsequent assessment phase, which will be performed by the JS.

After the submission, the procedural steps to be carried out shall include:

1. Admissibility check of applications, to be performed by JS; some checks are done automatically by the SIU system;





2. Eligibility check on the basis of eligibility criteria, to be carried out by the JS; some checks are done automatically by the SIU system;
3. Quality check on the basis of the whole set of quality assessment criteria, to be carried out by JS. Minimum quality thresholds will be applied both to the strategic and operational checks. Only those project proposals reaching the strategic criteria threshold will be subject to the operational assessment and only those proposals reaching the operational criteria threshold will be fully appraised;
4. State Aid check for projects recommended for funding, to be carried out by JS with the support of external experts.

The following paragraphs illustrate in detail each step of the assessment procedure. As annexes to this document the table of approved criteria are also made available to applicants together with some useful information on the Programme or on strategies/principles which will be evaluated during the assessment phase.

The MC is in charge of the final decision on the selection of the operations for funding. Information provided in the Application Form and related annexes included in the SIU system shall be subject to the assessment.

B. ADMISSIBILITY CHECK

The first step of the assessment procedure is aimed at verifying the administrative compliance with requirements set in the related Call for Proposals. This phase of the assessment is partially done automatically by the SIU system and partially carried out by the JS.

In particular, the **admissibility check** is aimed at confirming that the proposal has been submitted via the SIU system within the set deadline, that the Application Form is complete and accompanied by all relevant LP annexes.

Admissibility criteria are of “knock-out nature” thus shall be clearly answered by YES or NO. Failure to meet admissibility requirements leads to the rejection of the proposal. Programme authorities shall not bear any responsibility for missing or misleading information causing the rejection of the project (please see also factsheet n. 4 “Project Application”).

Applications that will not fulfil one or more of the admissibility criteria will be considered as inadmissible and will not enter the subsequent assessment phase.

Moreover, as a result of this first check, in order to fulfil to the Italian law in force on the transparency of the administrative procedure, the list of validly submitted applications is published on the Programme website, containing some essential information such as:

- identification (Name and tax number) of the LA (Lead Applicant) with the specification of its location (Country);





- acronym of the project,
- priority axis/ specific objective,
- reference of the administration in charge of the procedure;
- the office and the person in charge of the procedure;
- the office where documents related to the procedure are available and can be accessed;
- the date of Regional record system registration.

Lead Applicants of inadmissible applications will be informed by MA.

C. ELIGIBILITY CHECK

The second step of the assessment procedure is aimed at verifying the eligibility compliance with requirements set in the related Call for Proposals. Only proposals that successfully passed the admissibility check shall be proceed to the eligibility check. This phase of the assessment is partially carried out by the JS.

In particular, the eligibility check is aimed at verifying the completeness and correctness of PP annexes as well as confirming that the proposal complies with requirements on: partnership, duration, budget, eligibility of partner organisations, secured co-financing, project focus and other call-specific criteria (if any).

Eligibility criteria are of “knock-out nature” thus shall be clearly answered by YES or NO, if only one of the mentioned eligibility criteria is answered with NO, the project has to be rejected as ineligible and it will not undergo quality assessment, unless the failure of the criteria leads to the rejection of a single PP and the general partnership requirements are still met by the proposal.

In case the content of the AF does not coincide with the content of the Annexes, information included in the SIU system shall prevail unless it is possible to identify which information is the correct one.

It is the responsibility of the Lead Applicant to check the uploaded information before finally submitting the proposal. Programme authorities shall not bear any responsibility for missing or misleading information causing the rejection of the project. MA/JS might contact the Lead Applicant in case additional information is needed for clarifying nationality and status of the applicants. The JS may ask support to Croatian and Italian National Authorities for any evidence supporting the respect of these criteria.





All Lead Applicants shall be informed about the results of the eligibility check. List of eligible applications will be published on the web-site. LAs of ineligible applications will be informed by MA.

D. QUALITY CHECK

The third step of the assessment procedure is aimed at evaluating the quality of admitted and eligible proposals. This phase of the assessment is carried out by the JS and is based on 3 different groups of criteria:

1. Strategic criteria
2. Operational criteria
3. Specific criteria per SO

The goal of quality check is to provide the MC with an overall picture of all relevant information on each application in order to allow its approval or rejection.

Broadly, strategic criteria measure the relevance and strategy of the content of the project proposal, determining the extent of the project's contribution to the achievement of the Programme objectives. A strong focus is given to the result-oriented approach with clear demand for visible outputs and concrete results. Strategic criteria also assess the cross-border cooperation approach, the quality of partnership and Programme horizontal principles.

Operational criteria assess the viability of implementation of the project proposal, its value for money - in terms of used resources versus delivered results, and communication items.

Criteria per SO assess Programme guiding principles, cross-cutting issues and other specific topics.

Each criterion is appraised according to one of the following scales:

- on a YES/NO basis (0 to 1);
- on a 0-1-2 basis;
- on a 0-1-2-3 basis.

Each scale has a different multiplier depending on the weight of each criterion. For quality assessment criteria and related scoring, please see Annex III – Quality assessment criteria.

Each score is described as follows:





Score	Description
0	Information missing (not filled in or not provided in the text). Information provided but proves the inexistence of the requirements.
1	Information provided and consistent with the requirements.
Score	Description
0	Information missing (not filled in or not provided in the text). Information provided but proves the inexistence of the requirements or information provided only for up to a half of the aspects that are being assessed
1	Information provided is adequate, however some aspects are not clearly or sufficiently detailed or information provided for more than a half but not for all the aspects that are being assessed
2	Information provided in detail, clearness and coherence and information covers all the aspects that are being assessed
Score	Description
0	Information missing (not filled in or not provided in the text). Information provided but proves the inexistence of the requirements
1	Information provided is adequate, however some weaknesses are identified or information provided only for up to a half of the aspects that are being assessed and other half is missing
2	Information provided is clear and coherent but details are partially missing or information provided for more than a half but not for all the aspects that are being assessed and other half is missing
3	Information provided in detail, clearness and coherence and information covers all the aspects that are being assessed





The maximum total score within the whole quality assessment are 120 points (100%), divided in criteria as highlighted in the table below.

C.1 Strategic criteria	maximum score	% on strategic criteria	overall %
C.1.1 Project context	15	23%	13%
C.1.2 Cooperation character	12	18%	10%
C.1.3 Project's contribution to Programme's objectives	22	34%	18%
C.1.4 Partnership	16	25%	13%
Total score for strategic criteria	65	100%	54%
C.2 Operational criteria	maximum score	% on operational criteria	overall %
C.2.1 Management	10	29%	8%
C.2.2 Communication	6	17%	5%
C.2.3 Work Plan	11	31%	9%
C.2.4 Budget	8	23%	7%
Total score for operational criteria	35	100%	29%
C.3 Criteria per S.O.	maximum score	% on per SO criteria	overall %
OVERALL	20	100%	17%
TOTAL OVERALL	120	-	100%

There are some minimum quality thresholds to be reached both to the strategic and operational checks of project proposals (respectively, 65% of the score of the strategic criteria section which is equal to 42/65 points, and 46% of the score of the operational criteria section which is equal to 16/35 points).

Only those project proposals reaching the strategic criteria threshold will be subject to the operational assessment, and only those proposals reaching the operational criteria threshold will be subject to the criteria per SO assessment and therefore fully appraised.

The minimum overall threshold to be reached in order to be proposed for financing is 78/120 points (65% of total score).





It shall be highlighted that for some sub-criteria “Standard” and “Standard+” proposals are scored differently, as illustrated in the table below:

C.1 Strategic criteria	“Standard”	“Standard+”	overall each criterion
C.1.1 Project context			
C.1.1.a	4	4	15
C.1.1.b	4	6	
C.1.1.c	4	2	
C.1.1.d	1	1	
C.1.1.e	1	1	
C.1.1.f	1	1	
C.1.2 Cooperation character			
C.1.2.a	6	6	12
C.1.2.b	2	4	
C.1.2.c	4	2	
C.1.3 Project's contribution to Programme's objectives			
C.1.3.a	6	6	22
C.1.3.b	2	2	
C.1.3.c	4	4	
C.1.3.d	4	4	
C.1.3.e	6	6	
C.1.4 Partnership			
C.1.4.a	4	4	16
C.1.4.b	4	4	
C.1.4.c	4	4	
C.1.4.d	4	4	
Total score for strategic criteria			65

C.2 Operational criteria	“Standard”	“Standard+”	overall each criterion
C.2.1 Management			
C.2.1.a	2	2	10
C.2.1.b	2	2	
C.2.1.c	2	2	
C.2.1.d	2	2	
C.2.1.e	2	2	
C.2.2 Communication			
C.2.2.a	2	2	6
C.2.2.b	1	1	





C.2.2.c	2	2	
C.2.2.d	1	1	
C.2.3 Work Plan			
C.2.3.a	6	6	11
C.2.3.b	1	1	
C.2.3.c	4	4	
C.2.4 Budget			
C.2.4.a	2	2	8
C.2.4.b	2	2	
C.2.4.c	2	2	
C.2.4.d	2	2	
Total score for operational criteria			35

C.3 Criteria per SO	“Standard”	“Standard+”	overall each criterion
Total score for Specific Objective	20	20	20
TOTAL			120

After the closure of the quality check each application shall get a final score. A distinct ranking list will be produced for each call, i.e. for each type of project and Priority Axis by the JS, handed to the MA for the acknowledgment of results. Each ranking list will be subdivided in:

- applications not reaching the minimum threshold for funding in any of the quality criteria and not recommended for selection;
- applications reaching the minimum threshold for funding but not in a ranking position useful for selection on the basis of the ERDF budget available for the specific call;
- applications reaching the minimum threshold for funding and in a useful ranking position, thus recommended for funding.

Applications recommended for funding shall thus be assessed in order to verify the compliance of the proposal with the European State Aid legislation according to Article 107(1) of the Treaty¹.

¹ Article 107 (1) "Save as otherwise provided in the Treaties, any aid granted by a Member State or through State resources in any form whatsoever which distorts or threatens to distort competition by favoring certain undertakings or the production of certain goods shall, in so far as it affects trade between Member States, be incompatible with the internal market".





State Aid Check

Public support given to an undertaking in the framework of the Interreg VA Italy-Croatia Programme is granted under the *de minimis* rule (Regulation (EU) No 1407/2013) by the Member State of Italy.

This implies that undertakings can receive grants from the Programme only if they have not received public aid by Italy under the *de minimis* rule amounting to more than EUR 200.000,00 within three fiscal years from the date of granting the aid.

The amount of *de minimis* aid granted to an undertaking within a project co-funded by the Interreg V A Italy-Croatia Programme is ultimately linked to the respect of the *de minimis* threshold at the moment of granting the aid.

The JS, supported by external experts if needed, shall verify State Aid compliance of the submitted applications through a dedicated assessment that will be performed during the project assessment phase following the Quality check.

Responsibilities will be shared with Italian and Croatian National Authorities in the framework of the Monitoring Committee. Information concerning previous aid received under the *de minimis* rule is to be provided through LP and PP self-declaration, signed by the legal representative, indicating any *de minimis* grant received from Italy. This self-declaration is to be provided when submitting the proposal and then updated if the project proposal is selected for funding and if further *de minimis* relevant aid occurred.

When granting the *de minimis* aid, the undertaking will be duly notified in writing by the Programme authorities about the amount of the aid and of its *de minimis* character.

The analysis of State Aid, that has to be considered as a recommendation, will get to the identification of a high or low risk of State Aid compliance associated with each project proposal, as follow:

- the project activities are not State Aid relevant and the AF does not allow identifying the risk of State Aid compliance;
- the project does contain a risk of State Aid compliance and has been identified by the partnership (list shall be provided);
- the project does contain a risk of State Aid compliance and has not been identified by the partnership (the Lead Applicant may be contacted by the JS for clarifications);

The results of this assessment, focused on the five criteria as defined by Article 107(1) of the TFEU, shall identify one of the following solutions to ensure the compliance of the approved project with State aid rules:





- Reduction of the overall project budget (and consequently of ERDF contribution) to be granted to beneficiaries acting as undertakings in the framework of the project, in respect of *de minimis* thresholds;
- Project modifications aimed at minimise/reduce or eliminate the State aid cause (e.g. wide dissemination, also to competitors, of a project output) to be addressed to the affected partners ensuring a future sound and balanced project implementation;
- Project modifications addressing specific project activities and aimed at removing indirect aid granted to project final beneficiaries (e.g. some SMEs attending for free to a training course organised within the project).

Results of State Aid check shall be approved by the Monitoring Committee and may lead to conditions for approval of those projects that are relevant to State Aid.

Project applicants shall bear in mind that sometimes State Aid relevance can be removed by adapting the activities of the project.

Should State Aid relevance be given, the INTERREG V A Italy – Croatia Cross-Border Cooperation Programme might ask the project participants to exclude certain activities from the project proposal or to take other measures in order to remove State Aid relevance.

Otherwise, if no countermeasures and conditions can be adopted ensuring compliance of the approved project with State Aid rules, the Programme may exclude the concerned partner or reject the proposal.

Additionally, State Aid relevant activities will be regularly checked during the project implementation by the MA/JS supported by the Programme bodies and authorities in both Member States (e.g. JS, MC, FLCB, etc.) in order to ensure that the Italy-Croatia projects comply with the applicable State Aid regulations and that the above mentioned basic principles of the Programme are observed.

State Aid check can be performed by external assessors coordinated by the JS.





E. COMPLIANT PROCEDURE

According to the Article 74(3) of Regulation (EU) No 1303/2013 the Interreg V A Italy-Croatia Programme sets up a complaint procedure in order to find an amicable and mutually acceptable solution avoiding any form of litigation between the MA and the LA.

In principle, the complaint procedure must be well grounded and can pertain to formal and administrative aspects and/or quality and State Aid aspects.

Reasons for complaints shall only refer to the following aspects:

- a) The assessment did not take into account the information provided in the AF;
- b) The project assessment procedure did not followed what reported in the call for proposals and/or in the Programme documents.

Any complaint related to the assessment and selection of the project proposals shall be addressed by the Lead Applicant (complaints received by project partners individually shall not be taken into consideration) on behalf of the entire partnership, to the MA (via certified e-mail or via email).

The complaint procedure is specified for every assessment phase as follows:

- a) Admissibility check: Lead Applicants will be informed in writing about the reasons why an application was not progressed in the assessment procedure; no complaint procedure can be activated at this stage.
- b) Eligibility checks: Lead Applicants will be informed in writing about the reasons why an application did not progress in the assessment procedure. Not later than 10 working days after the receipt of the communication by the MA on the MC decision the Lead Applicant can communicate to the MA duly justified observations to the reasons for exclusion. The MA, will present the complaint and the provided information for examination to a Complaint Committee composed by the MC and by representatives of the MA/JS. In the absence of valid observations, the MA will adopt the definitive act of exclusion on the basis of the final decision of the Complaint Committee.
- c) Quality assessment and State Aid assessment: Lead Applicants will receive in writing the notification of the MA on the results of the selection procedure as decided by the MC. The





Lead Applicant can file a formal complaint under the terms and conditions established in the MA communication, providing all the information useful for complaint examination. In this case, the MA will present the case for examination to the Complaint Committee (same as above). The MA will inform the Lead Applicant on such a procedure including a provisional timeline for the settlement of the case, where possible. The Lead Applicant will finally receive in writing from the MA the final decision taken by the Complaint Committee.

The complaint should include:

- name and address of the Lead Partner (or the concerned partner);
- reference number of the application which is a subject of the complaint;
- clearly indicated reasons for the complaint, including listing of all elements of the assessment which are being complaint and/or failures in adherence with procedures limited to those criteria mentioned previously;
- date, signature and stamp of the legal representative of the claimant;
- any supporting documents

The decisions taken after each complaint procedures will be final, binding to all parties and not subject to any further complaint proceedings within the Programme if the complaint is based on the same grounds. Against the final decision at every step of the selection procedure, an official litigation process could start and in this case the legal proceedings will take place in Italy. The venue is the Civil County Court in Venice. The Italian laws regulating the statute of limitations (suspension or interruption) shall not be affected by the present complaint procedure.

F. WHERE TO FIND ASSISTANCE

The Joint Secretariat (JS) is based in Venice, with two branch offices one in Zadar and one in Dubrovnik and can be contacted at any time by Lead Applicants for any queries related to project development.

Contact details of the JS are:

INTERREG V A Italy – Croatia CBC Programme Joint Secretariat

c/o Veneto Region, Organisational Unit MA of INTERREG V A Italy – Croatia CBC Programme

Dorsoduro 3494/a – 30123 Venice, Italy

e-mail: JS.Italy-Croatia@regione.veneto.it - website: www.italy-croatia.eu





c/o JS Branch Office in Zadar

Gljagoljaška 14, 23 000 Zadar, Croatia

e-mail: js.it-hr.branch-offices@arr.hr

c/o JS Branch Office in Dubrovnik

Branitelja Dubrovnika 41, 20000 Dubrovnik, Croatia

e-mail: js.it-hr.branch-offices@arr.hr





INTERREG V A Italy – Croatia CBC Programme

Factsheet n. 5 ANNEXES

Tables of assessment criteria approved by the MC



5e6ad0a2





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 Submission and completeness of AF and LP annexes	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.
B4	Project duration	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.
B5	“Standard+” and “Standard” Project proposal respects the restrictions	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.	
B6	Project proposal refers to a PA and a SO	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.
B7	No evidence of double-financing	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.
B8	Budget requirements	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.
B9	Co-financing	Is the amount of the	REJECTION of	Check performed by





	secured	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.
B10	Effect on natural habitat Natura 2000 sites	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.
B11	Cooperation criteria	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.
B12	Respect of horizontal principles	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

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

B14 a	SO 2.1	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
B14 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

B15 a	SO 3.1	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
B15 b		There is a commitment that the principles of <u>environmental sustainability</u> are addressed and taken into consideration
B15 c		Project proposals involving <u>building constructions and renovation</u> : respect of Directive 2010/31/EU is included
B15 d		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

B16 a	SO 3.2	Project proposals tackling <u>sea environment</u> : reference to Marine Strategy Directive (2008/56/EC) is included
B16 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





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

Specific Objective 3.3

B17 a	SO 3.3	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

B18 a	SO 4.1	There is a commitment that the principles of <u>environmental sustainability</u> are addressed and taken into consideration
B18 b		Project proposals involving <u>building constructions and renovation</u> : respect of Directive 2010/31/EU is included
B18 c		Project proposals <u>purchasing products</u> : in case of central government authorities, a commitment to respect Directive 2012/27/EU is included
B18 d		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
B18 e		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
B18 f		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)
B18 g		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
C.1.1.a	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. 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	No	0	2	0	Section F "Project Key data": Fields "project description" and "Territorial challenges tackled"
		Partially	1		2	Additional field only for Standard+ - Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"
		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	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Equality between men and women 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.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	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Sustainable development 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"





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+ -
		Yes	3		6	Section F "Project Key data": Field "Capitalization description"





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+"

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	2	0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"
		Partially	1		2	
		Yes	2	4	Section E "Partners - Other data": Field "Benefit on participation"	
						Section F "Project key data": Fields „Capitalization description“ and "Cooperation need"

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	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	Standard: Section F "Project Key data": Field "Project description"
		Partially (a)	1		2	For A: Field "Programme specific objective", Field "Project overall objective"
		Partially (b)	2	4	For B: Field "Programme result indicator" and "Project results"	
		Yes	3	6	For C: Field "Project specific objectives description" Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization"	





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	<p>Section F "Project Key data": Field "Outputs and results durability" and "Outputs and results transferability"</p> <p>Section I "Project": Field "WP expected outputs", "Durability of WP outputs" and "Transferability of WP outputs"</p> <p>Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"</p>
		Partially	1		2	
		Yes	2		4	





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" Section I "Project": Field "WPs description" Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"
		Partially	1		2	
		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" Section I "Project": Field "WP expected outputs" Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization description"
		Partially (a)	1		2	
		Partially (b)	2		4	
		Yes	3		6	





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		0	Section B "Lead Applicant - Other data": Field "Competence", "Organisational structure and resources" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Partially	1	2	2	Section E "Partners", Field "Competence", Field "Organisational structure and resources" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Yes	2		4	Additional field for Standard+: "Capitalization"





For "Standard" and "Standard+"								description"	
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		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	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" Section E "Partners": Field "Competence" and "Organisational structure and resources" Section I "Project": Field "Project budget"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	





For "Standard" and "Standard+"

C.2.1.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	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+"

C.2.1.d	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	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+"

C.2.1.e	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	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+"

C.2.2.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	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	

Factsheet n.5 – Annexes





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" Section I "Project": Field "WP2 description" and "WP2 activities"
		Yes	1		1	

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" Section I "Project": Field "WP2 description", "WP2 activities" and "WPs outputs transferability"
		Partially	1		1	
		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"
		Partially	1		2	Section E "Partners": Field "Benefit in participation", "Competence" and "Expertise in EU/International projects"
		Yes	2	4	Section I "Project" : Field "WPs description"	





C.2.4 Budget

For "Standard" and "Standard+"

C.2.4.a	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	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+"

C.2.4.b	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
	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+"

C.2.4.c	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
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+"

C.2.4.d	Guiding question	Value	Score	Multiplier	Points	Application form
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" Section J "Financial plan"
		Partially	1		1	
		Yes	2		2	





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".

Factsheet n.5 – Annexes





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 "Transferability 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		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	20	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 "Transferability 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". 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			
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		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	20	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". Section F "Project key data" - Fields "Coherence with relevant policies and plans" and "Synergies". 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 "Project description", "Capitalization description" (Only for Standard+), "Coherence with relevant policies and plans", "Synergies" and "Project main outputs".
e	Is the project proposal focussing on river basins, coastal, marine and wetland areas?	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".
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", "Project main outputs description", "Project results" and "Target groups". Section G "Communication approach" - Fields
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		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	20	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		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	20	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	http://www.alpiorientali.it/documenti/documenti.html
ITB	Po Basin / Bacino del Po	http://pianoacque.adbpo.it/
ITC	Northern Appenines / Appennino Settentrionale	http://www.appenninosettentrionale.it/dist/?page_id=4
ITE	Central Appenines / Appennino Centrale	http://www.abtevere.it/?q=node/718
ITF	Southern Appenines / Appennino Meridionale	http://www.ildistrettoidrograficodellappenninomeridionale.it/dam_066.htm

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





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	http://www.va.minambiente.it/it-IT
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	http://www.voda.hr/hr/glavni-provedbeni-plan-obrane-od-poplava
HRJ	Adriatic / Jadransko	http://www.voda.hr/hr/glavni-provedbeni-plan-obrane-od-poplava




Smart Specialization Strategies (S3)

concerning the IT-HR CBC Programme Area

ITALY		
AREA	SMART SPECIALIZATION	SMART SPECIALIZATION STRATEGY (link to download)
Italia	Aerospace	https://www.researchitaly.it/uploads/7553/Report di analisi 12 Aree di specializzazione.pdf?v=26a4e6c
	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	http://www.regione.fvg.it/rafv/export/sites/default/RAVVG/fondi-europei-fvg-internazionale/Strategia-specializzazione-intelligente/allegati/06112015_Versione 10 07 2015.pdf
	Smart manufacturing and related services	
	Maritime technologies	
	Smart health	
	Culture, creativity and tourism	
Regione Veneto	Smart Agrifood	http://repository.regione.veneto.it/public/9acbbc91ddf98b88115361095b03ebb2.php?lang=it&dl=true
	Sustainable Living	
	Smart Manufacturing	
	Creative Industries	
Regione Emilia Romagna	Agricultural & food production	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
	Construction	
	Mechatronics	
	Health & well being	
Regione Marche	Health & well being	http://www.norme.marche.it/Delibere/2014/DGR0157_14.pdf
	Domotics	
	Sustainable manufacturing	
	Mechatronics	
Regione Abruzzo	Automotive - Mechatronics	http://www.regione.abruzzo.it/xprogrammazione/docs/incontro 17 marzo 2015/s3 11 marzo.pdf
	Life science (pharmaceuticals, R&D,	





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

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

