



URBACT II
CALL FOR PROPOSALS

ANNEX 2
ASSESSMENT CRITERIA
FOR DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

THEMATIC NETWORKS	
Criterion 1: Relevance of the proposal and European value added	Out of 25
1.1 The project is contributing to the main objectives of the URBACT II programme 1.2 The project is contributing to the themes outlined in the URBACT II call for proposals 1.3 The declaration of interest clearly analyses the nature of the problem to be tackled (e.g. through use of a problem tree) 1.4 The problem exists in all of the partner cities and this has been evidenced 1.5 The project is clearly building on the stated experiences of the partners 1.6 The expected results are innovative (they bring clear added value compared to other current or past initiatives) 1.7 There is a European level interest in the work that they propose (e.g. clear contribution to Lisbon/Gothenburg agendas) 1.8 The project has been explicitly designed and organized to generate a low carbon footprint	
Criterion 2: Coherence of the proposal	Out of 25
2.1. Quality of the strategy: The issue tackled by the project, the objectives and expected effects (outputs and results) are clearly defined and meaningful 2.2. The objectives, the work programme and the expected outputs and results are logically interrelated 2.3. The project has a clear focus on the exchange of experiences and transfer of good practice and this has been evidenced in the work programme and expected results 2.4. The activities in the work programme have been set out as indicative work packages (specific objective, actions, time frame, leader) 2.5. The proposed activities in the work packages are in line with the objectives and expected effects	
Criterion 3: Quality of the expected results	Out of 20
3.1 The expected outputs/results are in line with what has been outlined in the Call for proposals 3.2 The expected outputs/results are concrete (visible and measurable). They are specified precisely and quantified 3.3 The activities and outputs are explicitly interrelated 3.4 The expected impact of the project on the policies and future actions of the partners is clearly demonstrated (i.e. There is a commitment to implement the results among the partners through their local action plans)	
Criterion 4: Quality of partnership and lead partner	Out of 20
4.1 There is an adequate balance between partners from Competitiveness and Convergence regions 4.2 There is substantial commitment of each partner in the implementation of the project (e.g. different leadership and participation in the proposed work packages). There is evidence that each partner commits to set up and run an URBACT Local Support Group. 4.3 The candidate Lead partner has real evidenced experience of the problem being addressed in this field 4.4 The candidate Lead partner has real experience of leading exchange of experience projects in fields close to the proposed project (i.e. utilising existing departmental capacity) 4.5 The named officer to act in the name of the Lead partner (<i>project coordinator</i>)	

<p>has good experience (from attached CV) of leading this type of work</p> <p>4.6 A political decision-maker has been nominated within the Lead partner local authority to guarantee a strong political backing to the project</p> <p>4.7 The skills needed to achieve the expected results have been identified and integrated in the partnership &/or the expertise</p> <p>4.8 A Lead Expert has been identified and designated</p>	
Criterion 5: Budget and Finances for Development phase (phase I)	Out of 10
<p>5.1 The budget is logically distributed between the budget lines and components</p> <p>5.2 The budget reflects the planned activities in the development phase</p> <p>5.3 The budget adds up to the total (vertically and horizontally!)</p> <p>5.4 The budget allocated to management and coordination tasks (Component 1) is reasonable (e.g. percentage of total costs)</p> <p>5.5 The budget foresees a reasonable allocation to finance the creation and the first activities of the URBACT Local Support Groups</p>	
TOTAL	Out of 100

WORKING GROUPS		
Criterion 1: Relevance of the proposal and European value added		Out of 20
1.1	The project is contributing to the main objectives of the URBACT II programme	
1.2	The project is contributing to the themes outlined in the URBACT II Call for proposals	
1.3	The declaration of interest clearly analyses the nature of the problem to be tackled (e.g. through use of a problem tree)	
1.4	The problem exists in all of the partner cities and this has been evidenced	
1.5	The project is clearly building on the stated experiences of the partners	
1.6	The expected results are innovative (they bring clear added value compared to other current or past initiatives)	
1.7	There is a European level interest in the work that they propose (e.g. clear contribution to Lisbon/Gothenburg agendas)	
1.8	The project has been explicitly designed and organized to generate a low carbon footprint	
Criterion 2: Coherence of the proposal		Out of 25
2.1.	Quality of the strategy: The issue tackled by the project, the objectives and expected effects (outputs and results) are clearly defined and meaningful	
2.2.	The objectives, the work programme and the expected outputs and results are logically interrelated	
2.3.	The project has a clear focus on the exchange of experiences and transfer of good practice and this has been evidenced in the work programme and expected results	
2.4.	The activities in the work programme have been set out as indicative work packages (specific objective, actions, time frame, leader)	
2.5.	The proposed activities in the work packages are in line with the objectives and expected effects	
Criterion 3: Quality of the expected results		Out of 20
3.1	The expected outputs/results are in line with what has been outlined in the Call for proposals	
3.2	The expected outputs/results are concrete (visible and measurable). They are specified precisely and quantified	
3.3	The activities and outputs are explicitly interrelated	
3.4	The expected impact of the project on the policies and future actions of the partners is clearly demonstrated (i.e. There is a commitment to implement the results among the partners through their local action plans)	
Criterion 4: Quality of partnership and lead partner		Out of 25
4.1	There is an adequate balance between partners from competitiveness and convergence regions	
4.2	There is substantial commitment of each partner in the implementation of the project (e.g. different leadership and participation in the proposed work packages). There is evidence that each partner commits to set up and run an URBACT Local Support Group.	
4.3	The candidate Lead partner has real evidenced experience of the problem being addressed in this field	
4.4	The candidate Lead partner has real experience of leading exchange of experience projects in fields close to the proposed project (i.e. utilising existing departmental capacity)	

4.5	The named officer to act in the name of the Lead partner (<i>project coordinator</i>) has good experience (from attached CV) of leading this type of work	
4.6	A political decision-maker has been nominated within the Lead partner authority to guarantee a strong political backing to the project	
4.7	The skills needed to achieve the expected results have been identified and integrated in the partnership &/or the expertise	
4.8	A Lead Expert has been identified and designated	
Criterion 5: Budget and Finances for Development phase (phase I)		Out of 10
5.1	The budget is logically distributed between the budget lines and components	
5.2	The budget reflects the planned activities in the development phase	
5.3	The budget adds up to the total (vertically and horizontally!)	
5.4	The budget allocated to management and coordination tasks (Component 1) is reasonable (e.g. percentage of total costs)	
5.5	The budget foresees a reasonable allocation to finance the creation and the first activities of the URBACT Local Support Groups	
TOTAL		Out of 100