

**Interreg
Europe**



European Union | European Regional Development Fund



2. Harmonisation and final recommendations

05 September 2018 | QA briefing - Lille

1. Assessment harmonisation



Quality assessment Strategic assessment criteria

Index				
Acronym				
Staff member in charge				
Date of assessment				
Result of strategic assessment	Criterion 1	Criterion 2	Criterion 3	Average score

Criterion 1 - Relevance of proposal	Score:	
-------------------------------------	--------	--

Detailed assessment:

The relevance of the proposal to the programme is excellent/good/adequate/poor/very poor.

Conditions for approval (if applicable):

Criterion 2 - Quality of results	Score:	
----------------------------------	--------	--

Detailed assessment:

The quality of results is excellent/good/adequate/poor/very poor.

Conditions for approval (if applicable):

Criterion 3 - Quality of partnership	Score:	
--------------------------------------	--------	--

Detailed assessment:

The quality of partnership is excellent/good/adequate/poor/very poor.

|

Conditions for approval (if applicable):

- Word document
- To be integrated in the database when reviewed



Assessment harmonisation

How to fill in the form?

- Comments under each criterion but not necessarily under each sub-category
- Positive or negative comments have always to be based on 'objective' evidence
- Minimum average score to be recommended for approval: **3**



Assessment harmonisation

How to fill in the form?

- Standard sentence to introduce each criterion
- “*Conditions for approval*”: list of points that need to be fulfilled. In principle, conditions are directly related to assessment’s comments
Needs to be clear and self-explanatory (approved LP do not receive full QA)



Assessment harmonisation

How to use the guidelines?

Criterion 1 – Relevance of proposal	
Sub-category	Indicative assessment questions (and indicative source in application form)
Relevance of the theme tackled	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are the theme tackled and policy instruments addressed clearly in line with one of the programme's specific objectives? Is the issue addressed by the project sufficiently focused? (B.1, C.2)• Is the theme addressed clearly related to regional development in general and the EU cohesion policy in particular? Is it clearly in line with the competences of the relevant authorities at local, regional and national level? (B.2.1.1, B.2.1.2, C.2)• Is the theme tackled clearly reflected the different policy instruments addressed? (B.1, C.2)• Are the issues tackled at regional level linked to the regions' smart specialisation strategies? If so, has the link been sufficiently explained and justified? (B.2.1.1)

No specific hierarchy between the sub categories or between the questions:

- The non-fulfilment of only one core question may lead to a negative score
- The order of sub categories may not be followed



Assessment harmonisation

How to use the guidelines?

Questions listed in the 'guidelines' are indicative:

- The comments should focus on the most important elements per criterion
- New issues may arise in very specific cases

In each criterion, final comments have to reflect the score

Assessment harmonisation



Quality Assessment harmonisation

03 September 2015

The harmonisation of the quality assessment (QA) is a particularly challenging task. This challenge is applied not only at the formal level (i.e. ensuring the consistency of the style) but it is applied also at the level of content. This document introduces a certain number of standard sentences and provides further guidelines for improving the harmonisation process.

1. Harmonisation of the style used within the QA

1.1. Capital and small letters

- **Capital letters** have to be used

For institutions, funding instruments and EU documents:

- ~~institutions~~: Member States, Partner States, European Commission, Interreg Europe, etc.
- ~~programmes/funds/strategies~~: Structural Funds programmes, European territorial cooperation (ETC), Investment for Growth and Jobs programmes, European Regional Development Fund, ERDF and ESF Funds, Europe 2020 strategy, Regions of Knowledge (~~RoK~~), Digital Agenda for Europe (DAE), NATURA 2000, Horizon 2020 Smart Specialisation Strategy (S3) platform, etc.
- EU documents: ~~Regulation~~ (EC), ~~Directive~~ (EC), ~~European~~ Commission Communication on...

- **Small letters** have to be used

For programme related documents and expressions:

- application form, programme manual, lead partner, project partner, advisory partner, first level controller, interregional cooperation project, policy learning platform, stakeholder group, action plan, smart specialisation strategy etc.

For institutions:

- managing authority, joint secretariat, certifying authority, monitoring committee, audit authority

1.2. Financial information

- **Euros**

EUR in front of the figure + comma to indicate thousands and dots before cents

E.g. EUR 925

EUR 1,000 (and not 1.000 euros)

EUR 1,000,000.50 (and not EUR 1.000.000,50)

NB: the sign € should be avoided because it can cause technical problems in some countries or when converting documents into PDF for example.

- **Percentage**

Percentage should not be used without reference (e.g. 23% of the total budget)



Assessment harmonisation

Points of attention

- Make the overall assessment as self-explanatory as possible. Again, if possible, each statement should be supported by a precise and objective argument
- Assessor should not highlight a weakness if he/she is not sure about it (to always be on the safe side)
- Same rule apply to scoring. If assessor hesitates between two scores, he/she should always choose the higher option
- Be careful to standard texts. Context is crucial!

2. Recommendations



- For people that are new to this task, do not hesitate to rely on experienced colleagues (in particular when doubts on criterion 1)
- **Check whether the application is a resubmission**
If yes, take into consideration first assessment
- Be able to ‘defend’ each statement in front of the applicant (each word used in the assessment should be carefully thought through)
- To discuss each difficult case during the meetings



Conflict of interest

Article 37 c) of the EEIG GECOTTI – PE

Charter: Conflicts of interest and integrity

“All employees agree to immediately inform their management:

- of any conflict of interest that may occur between their personal situation (in relation to their private life or other jobs or responsibilities that they occupy for example) and their responsibilities within the European Programme for which they are working (project evaluation or payments, for example).
- of any attempt to improperly influence their opinion regarding projects, partners or lead partners.”

Conflict of interest



What to do in case of potential conflict of interest?

1. fill conflict of interest declaration
2. submit to head of unit
3. agree on measures how to deal with situation

GECOTTI note de service:

\\ifiles\IR-E\07 HR & Administration\3- GECOTTI (charte, regulations & meetings)\Notes de service\9 - conflit d'interet

Final recommendations



Core questions for drafting quality assessment:

- Am I confident this project has a chance to contribute to programme's objective (i.e. improve policies)?
- In relation to this, what are its main strengths and weaknesses?
- If I identified weaknesses, can I demonstrate them (re-read the text at stake)?
- If it is not recommended, which core message should be passed to the project?
- **Be sure you can defend each statement / word of the assessment to the project**



Questions & answers