

Broad criteria common to all Pillars guiding project pre-screening processes BROAD CRITERIA

(EUSAIR Action Pl. p.4-5)

Explanation

Sine-qua-non condition (excluding character).

a) Address priorities and well-substantiated needs expressed by countries, regions and stakeholders or Commission services and be widely supported.

The action/project contributes to the **objectives** laid down in the Communication and the Action Plan and presents strong linkages to EU policies relating directly to the 4 pillars.

Recommendation (of a preferential but not excluding character): Primary attention should be given to actions/projects directly linked to cross-sector, longer-term frame plans coordinated at a macro-regional/sea basin-wide/transnational scale and contributing to socio-economic/ territorial cohesion in the Region¹ (e.g. alignment to SEE 2020 priorities). Preference should be given to projects with strong support and involvement from a wide range of local/regional stakeholders, incl. civil society.

Sine-qua-non condition (excluding character).

b) Demonstrate a transnational, if not macro-regional, scope or impact

Scope: The geographical scope of actions/projects should in principle encompass several participating countries. However, there may be duly justified cases where actions/projects implemented within only one country or region can be considered, provided they have an unquestionable positive effect at macro-regional scale.

Recommendation (of a preferential but not excluding character): Primary attention should be given to actions/projects with well-developed capacity in terms of partnership-building, governance framework, networking.

Impact of the action/project throughout the entire macro-region or Adriatic-Ionian sea basin or on large portions thereof.

Recommendation (of a preferential but not excluding character): Primary attention should be given to actions/projects with a direct positive impact on large functional areas included in the Region as well as projects consistent with or complementing projects addressing similar issues under EUSDR and EUSALP in portions of territory shared by the these strategies.

c) Be realistic and credible

Actions/projects should be technically and financially feasible and based on overall agreement between national/regional authorities of countries concerned and stakeholders². Expected results shall be spelt out clearly in action/project proposals.

Recommendation (of a preferential but not excluding character): Preference should be given to actions/projects combining public and private financial sources and bringing optimal value for money.

Credibility of actions/projects also implies their sustainability over time once the project period has expired.

d) Build on existing initiatives and have reached a fair degree of maturity

Where appropriate, preference should be given to converging, complementary, coordinated or joint actions/projects already in the pipeline or resulting from completed pilot projects and/or solid feasibility studies. Less-advanced projects presenting promising, innovative approaches can also be considered, provided they benefit from adequate seed money³.

e) Pay attention to cross-cutting aspects

Actions/projects should address, as appropriate, capacity-building, including communication (for raising public awareness and support), research & innovation as well as climate change mitigation and adaptation and disaster risk management.

f) Be coherent and mutually supportive

Actions/projects should complement or re-enforce results and/or impacts of other initiatives under the same or the other three pillars.

Recommendation (of a preferential but not excluding character): attention should be given to actions/projects contributing to the objectives of at least 2 pillars⁴.

1 In that sense, all prioritised projects are strategic by nature

2 Criterion c) seems particularly useful for helping the TSGs anticipate what projects have the best chance of eventually being funded. Preference would then be given, under this criterion, to projects deemed feasible, linked to a realistic source of funding and financially viable over time, i.e. also after the project period expired.

3 By 'adequate seed money' in this particular context is meant provision of sufficient funding for preparatory studies or actions necessary for bringing a particular project to the stage of implementation.

4 This general criterion reflects the interdependent nature of the four pillars.