

EEA Grants Programme
Scholarships and inter-institutional cooperation in the Higher
Education area of Romania, Norway, Iceland and Liechtenstein
Financed by EEA Financial Mechanism

Inter-institutional cooperation projects

Quality assessment form

APPLICANT INSTITUTION:

ERASMUS ID code (if applicable):

APPLICATION NUMBER:

TITLE OF PROJECT:

INDEPENDENT EXPERT'S NAME:

Note: Each criteria will be assessed in concordance with the maximum score presented in the sections 1-9. If an application receive after the quality assessment (sections 1-8) less than 72 points it will be declared rejected. Each application will be assessed by 2 independent experts. The priority points for applications that address social sustainability issues, in particular initiatives that help combat discrimination and intolerance and initiatives that will improve the situation for the Roma population will be allocated only in cases when the project obtains at least 72 points for quality assessment.

I. QUALITY ASSESSMENT

1) Relevance	Comments
1.a The requested grant and expected results are clearly relevant to general, operational and specific objectives of the Programme and of the Measure.	
1.b Objectives are clear and realistic and refer to an adequate topic/target group.	
Overall score for section 1	/15 points
Comments:	

2) Quality of the project activities	Comments
2.a Organisation of project work is clear and appropriate for fulfilling objectives.	
2.b The activities set and distributed tasks/activities to partners in such way as to guarantee results achieved in due time and within budget	
2.c The implementation calendar is realistic.	

Overall score for section 2	/15 points
Comments:	

3) Innovative character	Comments
The project will supply innovative solutions to clearly identified needs of clearly identified target groups. This will be done either by adapting and transferring innovative approaches already existing in countries or activity fields, or by creating new, original solutions not yet available in any of the EEA countries.	
Overall score for section 3	/15 points
Comments:	

4) Quality of the partnership	Comments
4.a The consortium has all the professional competences, skills and experience required to implement the activities.	
4.b Tasks are adequately distributed among partnership organisations.	
Overall score for section 4	/15 points
Comments:	

5) Added value of transnational cooperation in the EEA	Comments
Benefits and need for transnational cooperation in the EEA (as opposed to national, regional or local approaches) are clearly demonstrated.	
Overall score for section 5	/15 points
Comments:	

6) Cost effectiveness	Comments
The proposed project is cost effective in terms of budget needed to implement planned activities.	
Overall score for section 6	/15 points
Comments:	

7) Impact	Comments
7.a Foreseeable impact on approaches, target groups and systems is clearly defined and measures to ensure the impact are in place.	
7.b Is there a procedure, methods and instruments to evaluate the progress of the project during implementation?	
Overall score for section 7	/15 points
Comments:	

8) Quality of the dissemination and exploitation plan	Comments
The dissemination and exploitation activities will allow optimal use of results beyond the interests of the participants in the project, during and after the contractual period.	
Overall score for section 8	/15 points
Comments:	

9) Specific objective	Comments
Applications for visits aiming at initiating projects that address social sustainability issues, in particular initiatives that help combat discrimination and intolerance, and initiatives that will improve the situation for the Roma population will be encouraged through additional priority points (20% of the maximum possible score)	
Overall score for section 9	/24 points
Comments:	

II. ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

Final score (overall score for sections 1-9)

(max. 120 points + 24 points for section 9 if applicable)

.....

III. OVERALL COMMENTS

The comments should relate to your assessment of the strengths, weaknesses and potential of the application, relative to the award criteria. The comments should justify the assessment conclusion.

Please formulate them very carefully as your comments will be sent to the applicant if rejected.

Comments on the proposal:

IV. SIGNATURE OF THE EXPERT

I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that I have no conflict of interest (including family, emotional life, political affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest) with the organisation(s) or any of the persons having submitted this grant application.

Furthermore, I confirm that I will not communicate to any third party any information that may be disclosed to me in the context of my work as an evaluator.

Signature of the independent expert:

Name:

Date / / (dd/mm/yyyy)