

**UDENRIGSMINISTERIET**

731

Medlemmerne af Folketingets Europaudvalg  
og deres stedfortrædere

Asiatisk Plads 2  
DK-1448 København K  
Tel. +45 33 92 00 00  
Fax +45 32 54 05 33  
E-mail: um@um.dk  
Telex 31292 ETR DK  
Telegr. adr. Etrangeres  
Girokonto 300-1806

Bilag  
1

Journalnummer  
400.C.2-0

Kontor  
EUK

5. april 2004



Under henvisning til Europaudvalgets skrivelse af 12. marts 2004 (alm. del –  
bilag 604) vedlægges Miljøministeriets besvarelse af spørgsmål 51.

*P. H. Orskov*

.....

# MILJØMINISTERIET

---

*Departementet*

J.nr. M 1034-0282

Den

Miljøministerens bidrag til besvarelse af spørgsmål nr. 51 (alm. del – bilag 604) stillet af Folketingets Europaudvalg den 12. marts 2004.

**Spørgsmål nr. 51:**

Miljø- og energiministeren bedes – som lovet på Europaudvalgsrådet den 27. februar 2004 og i forlængelse af ministerens besvarelse af spørgsmål nr. 45 (EEU – alm. del bilag 474) om det finansielle instrument for miljøet LIFE – (KOM(03)668) oversende et notat, der redegør for, hvilke danske projektansøgninger, der ikke blev imødekommet under LIFE-programmet i hhv. 2001, 2002 og 2003, samt redegøre for grundene til, at ansøgningerne blev afvist. Notatet bedes endvidere redegøre for regeringens holdning til medfinansieringskravet på 50%, jf. høringsvarene fra Forbrugerrådet og Det Økologiske Råd (EUU – alm. del bilag 537).

**Svar:**

Miljøstyrelsen har i samarbejde med Skov- og Naturstyrelsen udarbejdet nedenstående oversigt over projektansøgninger, der ikke blev imødekommet, hvortil jeg kan henvise.

Da det er EU-kommissionen, der har ansvaret for og gennemfører evalueringen af ansøgninger om LIFE-støtte, herunder meddeleler tilsagn/afslag til de respektive ansøgere, kan jeg desværre ikke redegøre for grundene til, at de enkelte specifikke ansøgninger er blevet afvist. Hverken Miljøstyrelsen eller Skov- og Naturstyrelsen modtager kopi af korrespondancen mellem Kommissionen og ansøgerne.

Evalueringen og udvælgelsen af projekter til LIFE-støtte foregår efter en objektiv og grundig udvælgelse i henhold til en detaljeret procedure. Retningslinierne for evaluering af LIFE-miljø projekter er vedlagt til udvalgets orientering. Resultatet af evalueringen er en liste over støtteberettigede projekter, som er rangordnet på grundlag af en samlet score, der for hver ansøgning sammendrager vurderingen af en lang række kriterier. Med udgangspunkt i listen over støtteberettigede projekter og årets budgetramme for støtte via LIFE, forelægger EU-Kommissionen en samlet indstilling til vedtagelse i henholdsvis Life Miljø-komiteén og Habitatskomiteén. Herefter træffes der en egentlig kommissionsbeslutning, hvorefter LIFE enheden i Kommissionen kan meddele henholdsvis tilsagn og afslag til ansøgerne.

LIFE Miljø- og Habitatskomiteén forholder sig således normalt ikke til enkeltprojekter, men kun til den samlede indstilling.

Regeringen finder det vigtigt, at NGO'ers erfaringer og folkelige netværk bidrager til EU's miljøpolitiske mål og hensigtserklæringer. Jeg finder det imidlertid rimeligt, at NGO'er også bidrager med en vis medfinansiering i forbindelse med deltagelse i LIFE-programmet. Kravet om egenfinansieringen er med til at styrke organisationernes egeninteresse for deltagelse i specifikke projekter. Jeg er dog åben overfor en diskussion af medfinansieringens størrelse, som regeringen gerne vil vurdere, når der foreligger et udspil fra Kommissionen om en egentlig revision af LIFE-forordningen.

*Oversigt over danske ansøgninger til Life Miljø, der har fået afslag i perioden 2001-2003*

<b>Projekt navn</b>	<b>Ansøger</b>	<b>År</b>
<b>SOL-LIFE</b> Lokalt miljøpartnerskab	Solrød kommune	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>Superwood</b> Demonstration af superkritisk imprægnering af træ vha. CO2 teknologi	Supertræ A/S	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>NADIHAP</b> A New Approach for the Development of Indicators for Hazardous Chemicals and Products	DMU	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>Recycling of sludge</b> Nedbrydning af miljøfremmede stoffer i spildevandsslam tilført landbrugsjord	Risø	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>Immuwama.DeGr</b> Improved Municipal waste management. Denmark-Greece	KL	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>SUS SOIL REM</b> Miljørigtig oprensning af jord og grundvandsforurening anvendt i offentlig og privat regi til integration og udvikling af bæredygtig miljøforvaltning	Københavns amt	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>RENEW</b> Recirkulering af næringsstoffer og organisk kulstof til økologisk jordbrug fra organisk byaffald vha. en integreret komposteringsstrategi	Forskningscenter for Skov & Landskab	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>EuroDestination21</b> EuroDestination21 Evolution of indicators for Sustainable Tourism Management through the demonstration of Destination 21 at the European Level.	Destination 21	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>Scan-Hide</b> Environmentally friendly production of wet blue and wet white at Scan-Hide Amba (Miljøvenlig garvning af oksehuder)	Scan-hide amba	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>RECOWS</b> Demonstration af et liftbaseret vejesystem for renovationsindsamling	Diesel Mobile	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>ImaPS</b> Integreret miljøstyrings- og miljøgodkendelsesordning	Københavns amt	2001 (indsendt 2000)
<b>AGWAPLAN</b> Integrated protection of ground- and surface waters with intensive agricultural production.	Landbrugets Rådgivningscenter	2002 (indsendt 2001)
<b>LogWa</b> Logistic waste management.	Sønderjyllands TIC og Erhvervscenter	2002 (indsendt 2001)
<b>NIPURTECH</b>	Inter Aqua	2002

Nitrate purification in the agricultural sector by moving Bio-reactor technology		(indsendt 2001)
<b>IIB-Aff.G-KBH</b> Assimilation of immigrants' stores in a waste selection program in Copenhagen and information about the new situation due to enlargement of recycling station in Valby close to the vegetable market of Copenhagen.	Mohit.Miljø	2002 (indsendt 2001)
<b>Eurodestination 21</b> Demonstrating the Destination21 management process in six European tourism destinations as means of promoting a more sustainable tourism development	Destination 21	2002 (indsendt 2001)
<b>AQUILA</b> Agenda 21 Quality and Innovation System in Local Authorities	Den erhvervsdrivende fond COGI-TA	2003 (indsendt 2002)
<b>V.U.E.P.</b> Vejle Urban Environmental Project	Vejle kommune	2003 (indsendt 2002)
<b>SINA ECO-DESIGN</b> Storstroem County Industrial Network Approach to Eco-Design	Storstrøms amt	2003 (indsendt 2002)

*Oversigt over danske ansøgninger til Life Natur, der har fået afslag i perioden 2001-2003*

<b>Projekt navn</b>	<b>Ansøger</b>	<b>År</b>
The REGAIN-project. Regional Actions to Improve Nature in Odense River and Fjord <sup>1</sup>	Fyns Amt	2001 (indsendt 2000)
Conservation of salt meadows and endangered toads in Scandinavia	Vejle Amt	2002 (indsendt 2001)
Re-establishing Aarslev Lake – restoration of Aarhus River Valley	Århus Kommune	2003 (indsendt 2002)
Reestablishment of Lake Birkesoe and protecting raised bogs	Skov- og Naturstyrelsen	2003 (indsendt 2002)

<sup>1</sup> Revideret projektforslag fra Fyns Amt indsendt 2003 ser ud til at blive medfinansieret i 2004 (endelig beslutning forventes juli 2004).



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL  
ENVIRONMENT  
Directorate D - Implementation and enforcement  
ENV.D1 - LIFE

**Guide for the evaluation  
of LIFE-Environment proposals  
2003**

## **Introduction**

The selection process is carried out by the European Commission with the assistance of independent experts and in informal consultation with the National authorities.

The evaluation is made via the ESAP system (Evaluation and Selection Award Procedure). All proposals are registered in ESAP. All evaluators have access to the system and enter their comments and scores. National authorities have also access to ESAP and may enter, if they so wish, their comments and scores.

See annex 1 to have more information on ESAP

The evaluation procedure is divided into several stages, according to the type of criteria assessed and to the evaluator. A first set of criteria is assessed by Unit D.1, in charge of the monitoring of the Life instrument in DG ENV. Unit D.1 evaluates admissibility, eligibility and quality criteria, based on its experience of Life ENV project management. A second set of criteria is assessed by the units of DG ENV in charge of thematic policies (such as water, waste, air and noise, planning...). These thematic units are responsible for technical criteria, and are assisted in their task by independent experts. The evaluation procedure ends with the establishment of the list of projects to be financed, and with the revision of pre-selected proposals.

## 1. Check of Admissibility by Unit D.1

### Receipt and registration of proposals

The National authorities submit to the Commission all the proposals they have received. The deadline for receiving the proposals is 30 November 2002 at 17:00pm.

**NB:** National authorities are responsible for taking all arrangements and precautions to ensure that all proposals are received by the Commission by 30/11/2002, 17:00pm at the latest. Any document received after the deadline will be declared not admissible.

All the proposals received by the Commission before the above deadline are registered in ESAP. The Commission sends receipts to the proposers.

No further information or documents may be submitted by the National authorities after 30 November 2002.

### Check of admissibility

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit ENV.D.1

*Role of National authorities:* The National authorities are informed of any proposals found to be non admissible.

*Admissibility criteria:* if one of the criteria is not fulfilled, projects are declared non admissible and are eliminated from the selection process

- Each project must be submitted, in three identical, complete, hard copies bearing original hand-written signatures where requested to the Commission by the competent national authorities
- The proposal must have been sent via the competent national authorities and received by the Commission before the deadline for submission.
- The standard Life-Environment proposal submission must have been used.
- The Life- Environment proposal submission forms are not hand-written.
- All relevant Life Environment proposal submission forms are present and completed.
- Where required, the proposal forms are completed with dated signatures whereby status and full name of the signatory(ies) is clearly in evidence. This is



of particular importance for the applicants' signature (Form A0), as well as those of all the possible partners and co-financiers to the project for whom declarations of commitment (Annex 1 to the proposal forms) to the project are expected. These signed declarations are considered very important and failure to deliver them with the proposal will lead to the exclusion of the project from further evaluation.

See annex 2 for application and interpretation of admissibility criteria

## 2. Check of eligibility by Unit D.1 (criteria 1 and 2)

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit ENV.D.1

*Role of National authorities:* they may evaluate via ESAP these criteria if they so wish.

**Eligibility criteria 1 and 2** if the answer to one of these questions is **No**, then projects are declared ineligible and are eliminated from the selection process.

- Technical and financial soundness of participants

See pages 15-16 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

- Compliance with Life III regulation

See page 17 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

### 3. Evaluation of quality criteria by Unit D.1 (criteria 3, 4, 5 and 6)

*Evaluators:* the Commission, Unit ENV.D.1

*Role of National authorities:* they may evaluate via ESAP these criteria if they so wish.

**Evaluation criteria 3 and 4:** a score from one to ten, corresponding to the ratings unsatisfactory, poor, average, good and excellent, is given. Projects which score less than five are eliminated from the selection process.

- Coherence and quality, integration

See pages 18-21 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

- Demonstration character of the project and dissemination of results

See pages 22-23 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

**Bonus criteria 5 and 6:** projects may be given one or two additional points.

- Multinational approach

See page 24 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

- Job creation and SME

See page 25 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

#### **4. Conclusion of the evaluation phase by Unit D.1 (criteria 1 to 6)**

The National authorities may be associated informally with the conclusion of evaluation phase by unit D.1, if they so wish.

Via ESAP, the Commission has access to the comments made and scores given by the National authorities. In the same way, the National authorities have access to the comments made and scores given by the Commission.

The Commission and Member State have bilateral meetings to discuss the results.

See annex 4 for description of these bilateral meetings

The final decision concerning eligibility and scores awarded is taken by the Commission.

**Only Projects which have been assessed as eligible and have been awarded a score above 5 for criteria 3 and 4 go to the next stage of the evaluation process.**

## 5. Evaluation of technical criterion n°7 by Units in charge of thematic policies

*Evaluators:* the Commission, thematic units of DG ENV.

See annex 5 for more information on thematic units' involvement

*Consulted:* Other Directorate General

*Role of National authorities:* they may evaluate criterion 7 via ESAP if they so wish.

**Evaluation criterion 7** a score from one to ten, corresponding to the ratings unsatisfactory, poor, average, good and excellent, is given. Projects which score less than five are eliminated from the selection process.

- Community interest and environmental problem

See pages 26-27 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion

## **6. Evaluation of technical criteria 8 and 9 by independent experts, under the direction of units in charge of thematic policies**

*Evaluators:* independent thematic experts evaluate criteria 8 and 9 under the direction of the thematic units. After having completed on ESAP their individual evaluations for criteria 8 and 9, the experts all meet in Brussels to discuss jointly the scores and comments for each project. These meetings are chaired by the thematic units, with the help of Unit D1. At the conclusion of the panel meetings, scores and comments are proposed for each project for criteria 8 and 9. The Commission, represented by the thematic units, decides to accept or reject the panels' proposed scores.

**See annex 5 on to have more information on the involvement of the thematic units**

**See annex 6 on evaluation by the individual experts**

**See annex 7 to know how the expert panel meetings are held**

*Role of National authorities:* they may evaluate via ESAP these criteria if they wish so. They participate in the expert panel meetings as observers.

*Evaluation criteria 8 and 9:* a score from one to ten, corresponding to the ratings unsatisfactory, poor, average, good and excellent, is given. Projects which score less than five are eliminated from the selection process.

- Cooperation and transferability

**See pages 28-29 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion**

- Innovation and progress

**See pages 30-32 for complete set of questions and interpretation of this criterion**

## **7. Conclusion of the evaluation phase by units in charge of thematic policies**

National authorities may participate as observers in the expert panel meetings. They have access via ESAP to the comments and scores given on criteria 7 to 9 after the expert panel evaluation.

If there is a divergence concerning criterion 7, bilateral contacts between the Commission and the National authorities can take place during the period 01/04/03 to 04/04/03 .

The final decision concerning scores awarded and comments is taken by the Commission.

**Projects which have been awarded a score under 5 for one or several of these criteria are eliminated from the selection process**

## 8. Classification of projects

*Unit responsible:* Unit D.1.

Upon completion of the selection procedure, projects are listed in order of merit according to the total scores allocated by the Commission for each of the evaluation criteria and bonus criteria. The list takes no account of the subject of a project, its scope or the candidate's country of origin.

If, when the list is drawn up, there are differences in scores between Unit D1 and the thematic units dealing with one or more of the projects (e.g. a project was considered **excellent** by the technical units and **average** by Unit D1), meetings are held to investigate the reasons for these discrepancies. There may also have to be meetings to decide between projects with exactly the same scores.

In the case of equal scores between two or several proposals, the score obtained on criterion 7 "Community interest and environmental problem" is used to decide between the proposals.

The best projects are preselected up to the maximum amount of funding available. There is also a further reserve list for another 15 or 20% of the total funding available, depending on the size (amount of co-financing asked) of the pre-selected projects.

All the other proposals are considered as "not selected". The national authorities are informed. The applicants who are not selected are informed in writing of the results of the evaluation only after the Commission has adopted the decision to grant LIFE funding.



## 9. Revision phase

*Unit responsible:* Unit D.1, with the assistance of Life Environment monitoring teams.

See annex 3 for description of the role of the Life Environment monitoring teams

The comments made by the evaluators during the evaluation process are used to make suggestions of improvements to the pre-selected proposals.

Letters suggesting modifications/improvement of the original to the original proposals are sent to the applicants. The new improved versions of the proposals are entered by the applicants in ESAP. They may also send any other additional information to the Commission.

The answers received from the applicants are analysed by the Commission. Only those proposals which are assessed as satisfactory by Unit D.1 at the end of the revision phase are financed.

## **Conclusion: General advice for evaluators**

All evaluators should assess the proposals on the basis of the evaluation guide and follow as much as possible the questions for each criterion.

When relevant, the questions should be interpreted flexibly and in the context of each specific project. It will not always be possible to answer every single question or to answer by a simple yes or no. Evaluators should take account only of those points which directly relate to a project, and may ask additional questions whenever they think this is relevant. Evaluators can always answer to other questions in the summary section if they consider that they are relevant.

Evaluations should be as objective and as directly comparable as possible. Each decision (on the eligibility criteria) and each score given (for evaluation criteria and bonus criteria) must be clearly justified in the Evaluation/Selection/Award Procedure (ESAP) by reasoned comments. In their evaluation, evaluators should also try to suggest possible amendments and improvements to the project. If the project is selected, these suggestions will prove useful at the revision stage.

Evaluators should ensure that their comments make sense without any need for further explanation, and that they are always directly relevant to both the proposal and the criterion applied. Comments must be in English or French.

The table below summarises the selection procedure with reference to the Life III Regulation and lists the type and nature of criteria and the responsible evaluators.

It is followed by a detailed timetable showing the different stages of the selection procedure and their timing.

## Evaluation criteria and evaluators

<i>Regulation reference</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Type of criterion</i>	<i>Assessment</i>	<i>Eliminatory score</i>	<i>Evaluator</i>	<i>Consulta-tion</i>
	Admissibility	Admissibility	Yes/No	-	Unit D1	Member States
	<b>ELIGIBILITY</b>					Member States
Article 2(b)	<b>1.A and 1.B : Soundness of participants</b>	Eligibility	Yes/No	-	Unit D1	Member States
Articles 2(a), 4(2)(a), 4(4)	<b>2: Compliance with Life III Regulation and guidelines</b>	Eligibility	Yes/No	-	Unit D1	Member States
	<b>QUALITY CRITERIA</b>					
Articles 2(c), 4(6)(h)	<b>3: Coherence and quality, integration</b>	Evaluation	0 to 10	Less than 5	Unit D1	Member States
Articles 4(6)(a), 4(1), 7(2), 4(6)(d)	<b>4: Demonstration character and dissemination of results</b>	Evaluation	0 to 10	Less than 5	Unit D1	Member States
Article 2(3)	<b>5: Multinational approach</b>	bonus	0 to 2	-	Unit D1	Member States
Article 4(6), third subparagraph	<b>6: Job creation and SMEs</b>	bonus	0 to 2	-	Unit D1	Member States
	<b>TECHNICAL CRITERIA</b>					
Article 4(1), 2(a), 4(6)(a)	<b>7: Community interest and environmental problem</b>	Evaluation	0 to 10	Less than 5	TU	Member States
Articles 4(6)(f), 4(6)(e)	<b>8: Cooperation and transferability</b>	Evaluation	0 to 10	Less than 5	EXP and TU	Member States
Articles 4(6)(b), 4(6)(c), 4(6)(g)	<b>9: Innovative nature and progress</b>	Evaluation	0 to 10	Less than 5	EXP and TU	Member States

## Detailed timetable of the 2003 evaluation procedure

Stage in the selection procedure	Time	Beginning	End
<b>ADMISSIBILITY</b>			
Receipt of proposals		30/11/02	
Registration of proposals	7 days	Monday 02/12/02	Tuesday 10/12/02
Check for admissibility	10 days	Thursday 05/12/02	Wednesday 18/12/02
<b>ELIGIBILITY AND QUALITY CRITERIA (UNIT D.1)</b>			
Unit ENV.D.1	27 days	Thursday 19/12/03	Thursday 06/02/03
Evaluation by monitoring teams	27 days	Thursday 19/12/03	Thursday 06/02/03
Evaluation by national authorities	27 days	Thursday 19/12/03	Thursday 06/02/03
Consultation of the other DGs on the list of eligible projects	27 days	Thursday 19/12/03	Thursday 06/02/03
Consideration of comments from National authorities and other DGs and awarding of final scores	8 days	Friday 07/02/03	Tuesday 18/02/03
<b>TECHNICAL CRITERIA (THEMATIC UNITS AND EXPERTS)</b>			
Examination of proposals by individual experts	20 days	Wednesday 19/02/03	Tuesday 18/03/03
Meetings of groups of experts	3 days	Wednesday 19/03/03	Friday 21/03/03
Parallel evaluation by national authorities	29 days	Wednesday 19/02/03	Monday 31/03/03
Consideration of comments from National authorities by thematic units	4 days	Tuesday 01/04/03	Friday 04/04/03
<b>CLASSIFICATION OF PROJECTS</b>			
	4 days	Monday 07/04/03	Thursday 10/04/03
<b>REVISION PHASE</b>			
	33 days	Friday 11/04/03	Beginning of June
Preparation for LIFE Committee meeting	8 days		
LIFE Committee - Vote	1 day		
<b>Decision</b>			<b>End July</b>

**ELIGIBILITY CRITERION N° 1.A**

**Soundness of the participants**

*Technical soundness*

*Application Forms*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

Participants to a project are: the proposer, the partners and the co-financiers.

A project is eliminated on the basis of this criterion only if the evaluator has strong evidence that the proposer is not competent to carry out the project.

When external assistance represents more than 35%; the project is not eliminated on the basis of this criterion. This question is assessed under criterion n°3 "Coherence and quality" (see page 18).

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
If the project proposer or one of the participants has already been the beneficiary of a LIFE project or has already participated in a project funded by the Community		
Was the project managed well?		
Were measures taken to ensure that problems already encountered would not recur?		
Did proposer/the participants show evidence of technical competence?		
In other cases		
Does the proposer have the experience and/or expertise necessary to carry out the project?		
If the answer is No, has the proposer plans to associate with one or more partners who do have this competence?		

**Project eligible:**       Yes                       No

**ELIGIBILITY CRITERION N° 1.B**

**Soundness of the participants**

*Financial soundness*

*Application Forms*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

Participants to a project are: the proposer, the partners, the co-financiers and sub-contractors.

A project is eliminated on the basis of this criterion only if the evaluator has strong evidence that one of the participants is not reliable from a financial point of view.

Beneficiaries and partners must absolutely give a financial contribution to the project (see Application Guide Part II, Point I). If they do not, projects are eliminated on the basis of this criterion.

If there is no financial information on beneficiaries, partners or co-financiers in forms ....., projects are not eliminated. The lack of information is taken into account when assessing criterion "Coherence and quality". Additional information is asked during the revision phase.

Same interpretation when the turn over of a participant seems too low compared to his financial contribution to the project.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
According to the information available, has the proposer and/or one of the participants ever been declared bankrupt?		
Is the information available on the participants' financial situation (based on form A...) satisfactory?		
Have any audits carried out by the Community's institutions shown that the participants can abide by the administrative rules governing Community aid (in the case of LIFE, standard administrative measures)?		

**Project eligible:**       Yes                       No

**ELIGIBILITY CRITERION N° 2**

**Compliance with the LIFE Regulation**

*Application Forms*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

A project is eliminated on the basis of this criterion when it doesn't comply with one of the five priorities set out in the Life Regulation (article 4.1). If the evaluator has a doubt, he may ask the advice of the competent thematic unit.

The policy group declared by the beneficiary has to be checked by the desk officer and changed if the proposal falls obviously under a different policy group.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS (quote the specific paragraph in the guidelines to which the project relates)
Does the project relate to one of the five topics specified in the Life III Regulation (Article 4.1)?		

**Project eligible:**     **Yes**                       **No**

### EVALUATION CRITERION N° 3

#### Coherence and quality, integration

#### *Application Forms*

#### *Guidance for the evaluator*

*Projects which require a too extensive revision shall not be ranked above 4.*

#### *Planning*

A project is not eliminated if its duration seems too short. This question is dealt with during the revision phase.

#### *Technical feasibility*

- If the technical viability of the project depends on the results of some of the tasks foreseen by the project, the project is not eliminated. This risk is taken into account in the score awarded for this criterion.
- Same interpretation if research has still to be carried out to define the technical specifications of a prototype.
- If the main objective of a project is to get answers to a questionnaire, there is a risk that too few answers are obtained. This risk is taken into account in the score awarded for this criterion.

#### *Financial feasibility*

- If the agreement on the financing of the project has still to be reached within the structure supporting the project after the given project start date (for example: administration board), the project is eliminated.
- Projects where beneficiaries and/or partners do not contribute are eliminated on the basis of eligibility criterion n°1B.
- When a 30% contribution is asked, the beneficiary must at least provide a 30% funding (see application guide p....). If this is not the case, the project is awarded a score under 5 and is eliminated.

When external assistance represents more than 35% of the budget:

- The beneficiary must give an adequate justification. The amount is accepted by the evaluator and is not sanctioned in the final score awarded for criterion 3.
- If there is no justification, the project is awarded a score under 5 and is eliminated.

*Durability and integration* are used to give a "plus" to a project. A project cannot be eliminated on the basis of these two sub-criteria.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
<b>Coherence of the project</b>		
Are the starting point and the problems fully explained?		



Is the objective of the project properly explained?		
Does the purpose correspond directly with the problems stated?		
Are the expected results explained?		
Is a clear and fully detailed explanation given of the action required?		
Is the action required consistent with the results expected?		
Is there a direct link between the problems, the objectives, the action planned and the results expected?		
Are dissemination actions clearly identified and described (objectives, actions to undertake, expected results, assumptions) and are they coherent with the rest of the project?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Organisation</b>		
Is the organisation of the project appropriate for the action to be carried out (partnership)?		
Is the internal organisation adequate for proper management of the project?		
Are the human resources proposed adequate for the project?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Planning</b>		
Is the planning realistic?		
Does the sequence of tasks seem realistic?		
Does the planning include validation (indicators, reports ect.)?		
Is there a detailed list of deadlines and deliverables?		
Are dissemination actions correctly planned for achieving the specific		

objectives of dissemination??		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Technical feasibility</b>		
Are the assumptions and aims realistic?		
Are the difficulties and potential risks analysed and taken into account?		
Are the authorisations and administrative measures required described and included in the project?		
Are there plans to redesign the project if any problems occur?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Financial feasibility</b>		
Is the budgetary estimate realistic and sufficiently detailed?		
Do the costs seem consistent with the action proposed?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Durability</b>		
Will the action taken and the results have a lasting impact after the project is completed?		
Are there plans to maintain and consolidate the results of the project once it is completed?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>General quality of presentation</b>		
Is the project presented in a logical and well-argued manner?		
Is the proposal document well structured, clear and complete?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Integration</b>		

Will the project help to integrate the environment into socio-economic activities?		
Will integration last after the end of the project?		
Is the project likely to have a substantial impact on development of these activities?		
Any other question you feel relevant		

**SUMMARY:** Conclusions, plus and minus points, etc.

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

**Score:**                                                           

                         1-2 (unsatisfactory)    3-4 (poor)    5-6 (average)    7-8 (good)    9-10 (excellent)

**EVALUATION CRITERION N° 4**

**Demonstration character of the project and dissemination of results**

*Application Forms*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

*Demonstration character*

- In the case of waste water treatment plants, the project is demonstrative, even at real scale, if it is innovative. The reason is that the testing can only take place at real scale.
- In some cases, demonstration at real scale can be necessary to prove the feasibility, profitability... of a new technique.

*Dissemination of results*

- A project may be eliminated on the basis of this criterion.
- The evaluator must take into account the % of the budget affected to the dissemination. In general, this % must be around 7%. However, in some cases, a level below 7% can be accepted if the objectives are achieved by other means (for example dissemination via professional organisations).
- If the proposer has no competence to carry out the dissemination, the evaluator has to check if the project foresees the participation of competent partners or external contractors.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
<b>Demonstration character</b>		
Is Life Environment the only available funding Community scheme for the project? (Check with RTDFP, ERDF, rural development, etc)?		
Is the project a demonstration project according to Life Environment (i.e. the project should not include stages of development research or industrial application on a large scale)?		
Does the scale of the demonstration component make it possible to evaluate the technical and financial feasibility of implementing the process? Is there a validation stage?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Dissemination of results</b>		

Are the dissemination activities sufficient/appropriate to allow the project to meet its objectives in terms of demonstration and transferability?		
Does the project require specific dissemination actions to be a success? Are these actions properly planned? Is there a specific blockage that might undermine the efficiency of dissemination actions?		
Does the proposal clearly identify the target groups (2-3) for dissemination of results? Are specific objectives clearly presented for each of those? Are the objectives and the target groups appropriate??		
Are the planned actions appropriate for reaching the objectives and targets??		
Are the technical specifications of the dissemination products well adjusted to the objectives and target groups (n° of copies of leaflets to be produced, quality of the videos proposed to regional TV etc.)?		
Is geographical coverage of dissemination adequate for reaching the target groups? (EU-wide, national, local, etc)		
Does the dissemination stage come at the right point in the project?		
Is it long enough to achieve the first results during the course of the project?		
Are feed-back mechanisms into place for assessing the impact of dissemination actions and adjust these accordingly?		
Any other question you feel relevant		

**SUMMARY:** Conclusions, plus and minus points, etc

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

**Score:**                             

                  1-2 (unsatisfactory)    3-4 (poor)    5-6 (average)    7-8 (good)    9-10 (excellent)

**BONUS CRITERION N° 5**

**Multinational approach**

*Application form*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

Participation of a partner or a contractor from another country is not sufficient to award the bonus. The multi-national approach must give an added value to the project.

A bonus is awarded to projects using a multinational approach (e.g. establishment of a partnership between several National authorities) whenever this is likely to achieve project objectives more effectively in terms of feasibility and cost.

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>0</b> The problem does not require a multinational approach or if required such an approach is not foreseen	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1</b> The problem requires a multinational approach and this is partly foreseen	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>2</b> The problem requires a multinational approach and this is foreseen
--	--	---

**BONUS CRITERION N° 6**

**Job creation and small and medium-sized enterprises**

*Application forms:*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

No bonus is awarded if there are only declarations of intention.

The project must have the effect of creating permanent jobs (i.e. jobs that will not disappear once the project has been completed) which are the direct result of the project.

SMEs (small and medium-sized enterprises) may be involved both in promoting environmental awareness in the industrial sector concerned and in overcoming the technical and financial obstacles SMEs face in developing and using clean technologies. They should at least be partners in the project - subcontractor SMEs will not be considered.

An SME is defined as an entity which has fewer than 250 full-time equivalent employees, and an annual turnover not exceeding EUR 40 million or an annual balance sheet total not exceeding EUR 27 million, and is not controlled - 25% or more - by a company which is not an SME.

<input type="checkbox"/> <b>0</b> not pertinent	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>1</b> Employment creation or SME	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>2</b> Employment creation and SME
--	--	---

**EVALUATION CRITERION N° 7**

**Community interest and environmental problem**

*Application Forms*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
<b>Community interest</b>		
Does the project relate to one of the priority fields specified in the Guidelines?		
Does this project provide added value compared with current application of the policy and environment legislation in the five subject areas set out in the guidelines?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Environmental problem</b>		
Is the problem the project sets out to tackle an environment problem, and not just a technical and/or economic one?		
Is the problem addressed by the project important in the industrial sector or geographical area concerned?		
Is the pollution problem to be prevented or tackled a major one?		
Is this one of the worst sectors for pollution?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Geographical extent</b>		
Is the geographical extent of the problem small (one Member State, or two or three regions), medium (several National authorities or a dozen regions) or large (most National authorities of the Union)?		



Is this aspect significant for the project?		
Any other question you feel relevant		

**SUMMARY:** Conclusions, plus and minus points, etc

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

**Score:**                                                           

                         1-2 (unsatisfactory)    3-4 (poor)    5-6 (average)    7-8 (good)    9-10 (excellent)

**EVALUATION CRITERION N° 8**

**Cooperation and transferability**

*Application Forms A2, A3, A4, T1 and T2*

*Guidance for the evaluator*

Co-operation refers to relations between the different stakeholders concerned by the environmental problem. These stakeholders shall not necessarily be participants to the project.

Co-operation refers also to the project organisational structure in terms of management and technical competence (participants: proposer, partners, co-financiers, sub-contractors).

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
<b>Cooperation</b>		
Will the project have the effect of encouraging suitable cooperation between the different stakeholders concerned by the environment problem (local communities, businesses, associations, populations, etc.)?		
Is such cooperation necessary for the success of the project and/or the credibility of its results?		
Does the co-operation represent real added value compared to already existing co-operations?		
Will the project as constructed enable the stakeholders and/or participants to play their role in the project to the full (whether through consultation on specific issues, a steering committee, or direct participation in project activities)?		
will the stakeholders and/or participants be involved at the crucial stages of the project (conception, implementation and/or dissemination of results)?		
Is co-operation (especially partnership) a good basis for transfer?		
Any other question you feel relevant		
<b>Transferability</b>		

Can the practices, techniques or products from the project be easily reproduced and adapted for efficient use in different or similar circumstances?		
Are there plans in the project to facilitate and/or organise the transfer of results?		
Is there any incentive for the beneficiary to organise/facilitate the transfer of results?		
Can the beneficiary overcome the obstacles which could affect reproduction potential (of a commercial, technical or legal nature)?		
Are there enough potential users for the proposed practices, techniques or products (industry sector, local authorities dealing with the same environment problems, etc.)?		
Is there an incentive to use these practices, techniques or products (economic pressure to cut costs, pressure from legislation, markets, public opinion, etc.)?		
Is one specific type of technology transfer envisaged (for other potential applications or geographical areas)?		
Any other question you feel relevant		

**SUMMARY:** Conclusions, plus and minus points, etc

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION:** changes required to amend/supplement the project

**Score:**                                                           

                         1-2 (unsatisfactory)    3-4 (poor)            5-6 (average)            7-8 (good)    9-10 (excellent)

## EVALUATION CRITERION N° 9

### Innovatory nature and progress

*Application Forms S1, T1, T2 and T3*

#### *Guidance for the evaluator*

Sectors where the evaluation of the level of innovation is more problematic:

- Planning: the level of innovation is more difficult to assess than for industrial-technical projects. The questions below have to be interpreted in the light of the specificity of this topic.
- EMAS: EMAS implementation can be considered innovative if it takes place in sectors where it is not currently widely used and/or if it is in countries where EMAS registration numbers are low.

Sectors where the evaluation of the Cost-benefit ratio is difficult:

- This is particularly the case of projects relating to planning. If the evaluation of the cost-benefit ratio is impossible, only the sub-criterion "Value for money" is taken into account. Evaluators must be cautious not to penalise this kind of projects.

QUESTIONS	Y/ N	COMMENTS
<b>Innovatory nature</b>		
Is the level of innovation <b>high</b> ? Yes, if it takes the form of a new technology or practice, resulting from recent study or research, which affects all or most of a production process or service.		
Is the level of innovation <b>moderate</b> ? Yes, if it involves the transfer of a technology or practice to a new area (technical or geographical), if it affects only a limited part of a production process or service, or if it concerns support activities, partnership or some other aspect relating to the state of the art.		
Is the level of innovation <b>low</b> ? Yes, if it changes one or more details of the present process or practice, or if it relates to the immediate context, the position of the applicant or the scale (technical or geographical) on which the problem is to be resolved.		
Any other question you feel relevant		

Progress		
Is the level of progress <b>high</b> ? Yes, if the expected results of the project will <b>directly</b> bring about a significant change in the state of the environment (e.g. pollution levels or available resources), if they will effect a lasting change in the context in which the technologies or methods concerned evolve, or if the economic sector or sector of society concerned has hitherto shown a general reluctance to innovate.		
Is the level of progress <b>moderate</b> ? Yes, if the expected results will directly bring about limited change in the state of the environment, if this progress will last only for a certain time or will rely on measures taken independently of the project, or if the results expected are substantial but unlikely to bring about a fundamental transformation in practices which damage the environment.		
Is the level of progress <b>low</b> ? Yes, if the expected results will lead to no direct change in the state of the environment, if the progress to be achieved will depend entirely on measures taken independently of the project (for instance, the use made of the project's results), or if an <b>underlying</b> trend that is harmful to the environment could cancel out any benefits from the project.		
Any other question you feel relevant		
Cost/benefit ratio		
Is the cost of the technology or method proposed less than the cost of the state-of-the-art technologies and methods for dealing with the same environmental problem?		
If not, is the difference in cost justified by a difference in the results obtained?		
Will this difference be covered, directly or indirectly, by income from other sources (reduction in costs or taxes, public support, probable increase in demand for or in the selling price of the product) independently		

<u>of LIFE's support for the project?</u>		
Any other question you feel relevant		

Value for money	
Is the cost of the project (defined by the total budget) high, medium or low compared to its direct environmental benefits?	

**SUMMARY:** Conclusions, plus and minus points, etc.

**FOR:**

**AGAINST:**

**REVISION :** changes required to amend/supplement the project

**Score:**                             

1-2 (unsatisfactory)    3-4 (poor)    5-6 (average)    7-8 (good)    9-10 (excellent)

## Annex 1: ESAP

Address: [www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/life](http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/environment/life)

Internal users (Commission):

- ask for an access to the data base co-ordinator in unit ENV.D.1
- use login and password for internet

External users (National authorities, external teams, independent experts) will receive specific passwords and logins.

Available only via Internet Explorer and Netscape ...



## Annex 2: Admissibility check

### **Admissible:**

- Projects written with a small font
- A2-A4 are available, but part of the information is missing (address; VAT number...)

### **Non admissible:**

- No original signature on A0
- Declaration of partner/co-financier (annex 1 to proposal forms): no amount is indicated, but the form is signed.
- If some of the forms are not present
- If some of the forms are not completed (exception A2-A4).

### For example:

- Part of the T3 and T4 forms is not filled in (except for the part "bonus" which can be empty).
- The part "Objectives" of T1 forms is not filled in.
- A financial form (for example F5) should be filled in but is empty.

### **Case by case:**

- If a form is entirely hand written: non admissible. If only some figures or an address etc is hand written: admissible
- If a beneficiary has declared in form F2 a partner or a co-financier, the Declaration (annex 1 to proposal forms) must be available.
- The Declaration (annex 1 to proposal forms) must be available even if a participant has not yet confirmed his participation (to check)
- The A3/A4 form is missing, no partner/co-financier: admissible.

## **Annex 3: Role of the Life Environment monitoring teams in the evaluation process**

### **1. Evaluation of criteria 1 to 6:**

Life Environment monitoring teams receive paper copies of the admissible proposals.

They evaluate criteria 1 to 6 following the evaluation guide.

They provide their evaluation when completed to geographical Life desks (Unit ENV.D.1) (files in word format), after desks have made their own evaluation.

They have access via ESAP to desks' comments (in "read-only").

The Commission decides to take into account or not their comments and is sole responsible for the scores awarded and the comments expressed.

### **2. Revision Phase**

At the end of the evaluation process, the Life Environment monitoring teams have access to comments made by all evaluators. They have also attended the expert panel meetings as observers. They use this information to have a complete picture of each of the pre-selected proposals.

They prepare, for Unit D.1 and under its direction, letters for the pre-selected beneficiaries. They analyse the responses and give their opinion to the Commission. A second letter may be send if the questions have not been satisfactorily answered.

The Commission is solely responsible for deciding, at the end of the revision phase, which proposals will be financed.

**Annex 4: Conclusion of the evaluation phase by Unit D.1  
(criteria 1 to 6)  
Bilateral meetings between the Commission and National  
authorities**

National authorities are informally associated to the conclusion of the evaluation phase by Unit D.1.

Bilateral meetings are organised between National authorities representatives and Life Environment geographical desks.

During these meetings, scores given by the Commission and the National authorities are discussed. It may be useful to identify before the bilateral meetings projects where divergences are most significant.

No decision is taken at desk level. A unit meeting is organised in order to discuss the most problematic cases. The final decision on the scores and comments is taken by the head of unit.

**Annex 5: Evaluation of criteria 7 to 9  
Involvement of the units in charge of thematic policies**

**1. In each thematic unit, a Life co-ordinator is nominated. He/she is the Life unit's interlocutor for the selection process.**

The co-ordinator is in charge of attributing proposals to evaluators within his/her unit and of organising the agenda for his/her unit. He/she is also in charge of reallocating proposals to other technical units if necessary.

He/she is in charge of informing evaluators about Life Environment and the selection process. It will be helpful that a table with the names of the evaluators for each project is given to Unit D.1.

**2. Thematic units are in charge of selecting individual independent experts, on the basis of a list provided by Unit D.1.**

**3. Thematic units are in charge of assessing directly criterion 7, via ESAP.**

**4. Thematic units are also responsible for the evaluation of criteria 8 and 9.**

These criteria are first assessed by the individual independent experts. Then, expert panel meetings are held, in Brussels. These meetings are chaired by representatives of the thematic units. They are responsible for giving the final score and comments. It is advisable that the evaluator of each project is present during the discussion.

It is advisable for the thematic units to assess informally criteria 8 and 9, in order to be able to chair adequately the expert panel meetings and to decide on the final scores, after having listened to the experts comments.

## **Annex 6: Role of independent experts**

### **1. Selection of the independent experts**

A call for interest is published in the OJEC (June 2002). Selection is made by the technical units, on the basis of a list provided by Unit D.1

Selected experts must comply with competence and independence criteria.

### **2. Contracts**

Contracts are prepared and sent by Unit D.1. Experts are paid according to the number of proposals assessed and their participation to the panel meetings.

### **3. Individual evaluation via ESAP**

Cd-roms with proposals to evaluate are sent to each expert, together with the evaluation guide.

Experts enter their scores and comments directly in ESAP. Comments should be very detailed and scores justified adequately. In particular, when a score under 8 is given, comments **must** be entered in the box "Revision".

### **4. Panel meetings**

Independent experts meet in Brussels. Under the direction of the thematic units, scores and comments are debated. Based on the scores of the experts and on the collective discussion in the group, the thematic unit's representative decide on the final scores for each project.

### **5. Payments**

Payments are processed by Unit D.1

## **Annex 7: Expert panel meetings**

These meetings are chaired by the thematic units and supervised by Unit D.1. National authorities are invited to participate as observers.

30 minutes maximum is devoted to the discussion of a project. First, the experts give their opinion on each criterion. National authorities may intervene at this stage. The debate is then launched. At the end, the chair decides on the scores and comments. Suggestions for the revision phase are also entered in ESAP.

### **1. Unit D.1:**

- gives general advice to the chair, is the "Watchdog" of the meeting.
- must ensure that comments entered in ESAP are of a good quality
- can give its advice concerning the quality of the projects
- enters in ESAP comments and scores

### **2. Thematic units:**

- chair the meetings and decide on the agenda (order of discussion etc.)
- briefly present the project and their opinion on criterion 7
- decide after the debate on the final scores and comments (see page 40 point 4).

### **3. Experts:**

- give their conclusions on criteria 8 and 9
- debate and try to reach an agreement, under the direction of the thematic units

### **4. National authorities:**

- are observers
- can give their opinion after the experts and before the discussion between the experts and the Commission

### **5. Life Environment Monitoring teams**

- are observers
- take note of the experts and Commission 's comments in view of the revision phase.

### **6. If necessary, a feed back session is organised**