

Interreg Programme Management Handbook

Guide to the 2021-2027 period

The Interreg Programme Management Handbook comprises a series of factsheets. They can be read individually, or collectively, to understand the relevance of certain aspects of Interreg management. They cover the relevance, legal basis, key challenges and approaches to the given subject.

Factsheet | **Project Selection Process**

1. What is it? What is the definition of this work?

The aim of the selection process is to select projects which contribute most to the achievement of programme objectives. It begins with the received project applications and finishes with the selection of the projects. There are four phases within the selection process: (1) call for proposals with received project proposals; (2) assessment process divided in three steps - (a) administrative check, (b) eligibility check, and (c) quality assessment; (3) selection procedure followed by a vote from the Monitoring/Steering Committee; (4) contracting of selected projects.

2. Why are we discussing it?

The selection process is a crucial part of the programme life cycle, because at this stage programmes select projects on which the programme performance will depend. The programme needs to determine to what extent each project will contribute to the achievement of programme objectives and if the partnership is able to implement the project with the given resources.

Due to the nature of Interreg programmes, several agreements regarding the selection process need to be negotiated already at the programming stage and before the first call for proposals opens. From the programme management point of view, there are many important aspects to be taken under consideration, yet one of the crucial is to what extent the selected projects contribute to the achievement of the output and result indicators, to make sure that in the end it will be possible to aggregate them at programme level, in order to measure the overall performance of the programme.

3. What are the Legal references and basis for this topic?

ETC (Interreg) Regulation 2021/1059 (24.06.2021) article 22 describes the selection of operations (projects) in the cooperation programmes. It is stated in article 22 (1) that operations under cooperation programmes shall be selected by a monitoring committee in accordance with the programme's strategy and objectives. That monitoring committee may also set up one or, in particular in the case of sub-programmes, more steering committees which can act under its responsibility for the selection of operations.

Functions of the managing authority as regards the selection of operations are set up in the CPR Regulation (2021/1060) article 73.

According to ETC 46 (2), the managing authority shall establish joint secretariat, with the main task to assist the managing authority and the monitoring committee in carrying out their respective functions. That includes supporting selection process i.e. by assessing applications.

In the current perspective it is allowed for programmes of A, B and D strands to establish so called “small project fund” described in the article 25 ETC. The selection of small projects shall not be delegated to an intermediate body and shall stay in the responsibility of managing authority article 25 (4).

Legislative framework:

- ETC Regulation (EU) No 2021/1059 articles 22, 25, 46
- CPR Regulation (EU) No 2021/1060 article 73

4. What are the challenges, key considerations and frequently asked questions?

When establishing the project selection procedure all programmes need to agree on the following:

- How to organise calls for proposals effectively?
- How to organise assessment procedure, which is simple, quick and effective, and most importantly non-discriminatory?
- Which assessment criteria to use to be able to select the most relevant projects for the programme?
- Who should be assessing projects?
- How to prepare and train the assessors?
- How the final decision will be reached and what it should be based on?
- Which selection decisions to use?

The answers to these questions, accompanied with recommendations (where possible), can be found in the next chapter.

5. How are they addressed?

5.1. CALLS FOR PROPOSALS AND APPLICATION PROCEDURE

5.1.1 Types of calls for proposals

Types of calls of proposals based on focus

Open calls - Open calls are calls for proposals where projects can apply for all programme priorities where funds are still available.

Targeted calls - Targeted calls can be used during the whole lifespan of the programme and are often used towards the end of a programme’s lifetime when in certain programme priorities the envisaged values have not yet been reached, or when a specific topic needs addressing. They can also be used when the available budget is limited, as targeting helps limit the number of applications (thus saving resources). Calls can be limited to a specific priority axis, budget, and certain type of organisations or project topics. In general, the decision to launch targeted calls should result from a well-informed and well-argued debate within the Monitoring/Steering Committee which demonstrates the need for such a call.

Targeted calls can be used during the whole lifespan of the programme and are often used towards the end of a programme’s lifetime when in certain programme priorities the envisaged values have not yet been reached, or when a specific topic needs addressing.

Calls for strategic projects – Calls for strategic projects are often defined from the beginning within a programme’s Cooperation Programme, and sometimes by the MC/SC during the programme implementation. They focus on a specific initiative which has derived from the needs of a thorough

programme analysis. They tend to be based upon a set of highly detailed criteria, which need to be met by a project designed explicitly for this purpose (e.g., building a bridge between x and y cities over the river z).

Calls for small projects- Each programme has different rules as to what “small” means, but in most cases, it refers to projects which are smaller in size, required resources and impact. The programme opens a special call for proposals, or it can be attached to a regular call for proposals.

Types of calls of proposals based on duration of the submission phase

Ongoing calls - Ongoing calls are calls which don't have any deadline for submission. Projects can submit their proposal any time. Programmes decide either in advance when the projects will be assessed (e.g., once a year), or they wait until a sufficient number of projects is available for assessment before they start the assessment procedure.

Restricted calls - Restricted calls have a set deadline for submission. If needed, programmes have the possibility of adjusting the selection criteria for each call. However, the drawback is that the call cycle does not necessarily coincide with the project maturity cycle, and projects which are ready for submission might need to wait for the next call to open.

5.1.2. Application procedure

There are mainly two types of application procedure: one-step and two-steps.

One-step application procedure

This is the simplest approach, where fully-fledged project proposals are submitted to the programme and every project is assessed to the full extent, provided they are compliant with the programme rules (Administrative and Eligibility Check). It requires extensive involvement from both sides (project and programme), at the same time to the highest extend secures equal chances for all applicants.

Two-step application procedure

This is mostly used in programmes where a substantial number of project proposals are expected, and where the programme has the possibility of helping applicants develop their project proposal.

It has several advantages and disadvantages:

- + less time and technical assistance resources are needed, as not all projects are assessed in-depth during the first phase, thus there is a lowered risk of investing extensive efforts in assessing many low-quality proposals;
- + time and costs saved at applicant level, as they do not have to submit full application to find out that e.g. their idea is not welcomed by the programme;
- + possible coaching from the development of the project idea to its full proposal (if only a limited number of proposals are invited to submit the full project proposal);
- projects proposal approved in the first step might not develop further assuming that they are already approved;
- insufficient information provided in the first step to decide if the proposal has potential to be moved to the second step;

How does it work in practice?

In the first step, the applicants must submit a simplified project proposal, often called an Expression of Interest (EoI) or Concept Note (CN). The programmes usually ask for a description of project objectives, foreseen results and outputs, a general description of the work plan, an estimated overall budget and the structure of the partnership.

The pre-selected projects are then invited to apply using the second step, submitting the full application. The project data from the Expression of Interest can be changed only to a certain extent (e.g., the budget can increase up to 20 %, or only two partners can be changed) and is binding in some parts (e.g., project objectives, proposed results).

Please note that pre-assessment of projects based on a Concept Note, which is offered to projects by some programmes, is only optional and the decision is not binding, therefore, the project can still be submitted.

Project assessment is much shorter in the first step as only some parts of the quality assessment are applied, due to the shorter project description. Formal requirements and partner eligibility are not checked, to avoid a higher workload at the national level. The assessment in the first step focuses more on the content of the project, namely its objectives and results, whereas in the second step all assessment criteria are applied when assessing the detailed project proposal. Although projects pass the first step, they may not be successful at the second step. In both steps, the final decision is made by the Monitoring/Steering Committee.

5.2. ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Assessing projects is an important step in the selection process as it assures transparency and accountability in spending EU funds. By establishing and publishing assessment criteria, the quality standards against which projects are assessed are set. They are needed to secure quality of programme implementation and to guide applicants towards considering important issues before applying.

5.2.1. Assessment steps and criteria

The assessment process begins as soon as the call for proposals closes (if the call is not on-going), when all project applications have been submitted. First, the programme administrative and eligibility checks of projects are performed, and only then will the quality assessment start when core assessment criteria are applied.

In some programmes, administrative and eligibility checks are done at the same time. The check are based on questions which can be answered with “yes,” “no” or “not relevant for particular project”. A “no” answer can lead to (1) outright rejection of the application, or (2) request for further information or clarification. Negative outcomes could be avoided if and when the project carefully reads the programme requirements published in the call for proposals and other programme documents, and by contacting the programme secretariat when in doubt.

Once the quality assessment starts, which implies in-depth assessment of the project. Various conclusions regarding the quality of the project can already be drawn based on the eligibility check (e.g., partnership composition, intensity of cooperation, overall budget). Nevertheless, the quality of the project is assessed from different perspectives at this stage. How does one assess projects to ensure quality? In general, quality is subjective – it is a matter of perception and individual judgement. It is necessary to ensure that project quality requirements are collectively understood and supported by all relevant programme bodies. Thus, very clear instructions are needed to all parties involved in the process.

There is one more important element to be assessed, namely the State aid. In a simple word, each project should be verified if any of its activities distort or have the potential to distort competition in the market. Very often programmes externalise this task due to lack of internal capacity of competence. There is a dedicated fact sheet on the State Aid.

INTERACT, together with Interreg programmes, has developed harmonised assessment templates which include assessment questions and guiding principles for all three assessment steps. Together with a harmonised application form the assessment questions address the need to fund projects that contribute to the change sought by the programme to the greatest extent possible.

5.2.2. Assessment methodology

Assessors

As a general rule every project should be assessed by at least two assessors. These can be selected from joint secretariat staff, managing authority, consultants with specific sectoral knowledge, university professors, other ministry staff, regional bodies, steering committee members, etc. Only the Joint Secretariat staff are considered internal assessors. If possible, especially in the case of cross-border cooperation, each side of the border should be represented in the group of assessors.

If the programme lacks capacity and/or expertise for internal assessment of projects, they can involve external assessors. It is recommended that one of the two assessors should be external and the other a member of Joint Secretariat, as this results in better representation of programme and transnational/cross border aspects during assessment. An external expert could also be used as an additional assessor in cases where specific knowledge is needed (thematic or horizontal issues experts). Where a third assessor is needed because of significant differences in the first set of scores, an internal assessor should be selected to assess the project, as they have a better understanding of what is needed to achieve programme objectives.

The following table lists advantages and disadvantages of selecting internal and external assessors.

Table: Advantages and disadvantages of internal and external assessors

	Internal assessors	External assessors
ADVANTAGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involved in identifying programme priorities/objectives. Know the programme well. Have a better understanding of the specificity of cooperation programmes. Experienced with regard to what does/doesn't work. Knowledge of what is there (projects, results). Can detect early warning signs. Commitment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have the necessary professional background. Possess specialised knowledge. A fresh look at the issues. Are independent from both the applicants and the MC/SC/MA/JS. Remain anonymous to the applicants.
DISADVANTAGES	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are not impartial. Lack of sectoral experience. Potential high staff turnover. Inexperienced new staff assessing projects. Capacity (if too many applications are received). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Often no in-depth knowledge about the programme. Lack of knowledge on Territorial Cooperation. They don't have to "live" with the consequences of their recommendations. Tend to focus on their field, leaving some aspects of the quality assessment aside. Are possibly not as committed to assessment as the Joint Secretariat. Costs.

When using external assessors, the programme might consider:

- inviting them to programme meetings about specific programme themes where sub-themes, interpretations and priorities related to the theme are discussed together with project officers;
- arranging regular briefings between external assessors and programme staff;
- using the same external experts (more than one per theme and from different countries participating in the programme), especially if they have been "tested" and found to be reliable;
- identifying cases where external expertise is necessary (if not using them on regular basis);
- inviting them to Monitoring/Steering Committee meetings.

All assessors selected, especially when they are external to the programme, should sign a self-declaration of confidentiality and impartiality. This is usually available as a template.

Assessment approach

There were two approaches which programmes used when assessing projects: descriptive and numerical. The ranking of projects based on scores is recommended because it renders the procedure more transparent. In this case the numerical assessment is indispensable as the descriptive part does not lend itself to aggregation. Additional indications of the project's strengths and weaknesses need to be provided as comments.

Some examples of the scale used in the numerical assessment approach are presented in the table below.

Table: Examples of simple numerical assessment scales (of each criterion)

Scale 1	Scale 2	Scale 3
1 – poor / very poor	-2 – very poor	0 – insufficient
2 – fair / poor	-1 – poor	1 – sufficient
3 – good / adequate	0 - fair	3 – appropriate
4 – very good / good	+1 – good	5 – completely appropriate
5 – excellent	+2 – excellent	

Some programmes are using more sophisticated approach by putting weights to the score. To give more emphasis on the assessment criteria which programmes considers most relevant, weighting of scores and setting of thresholds is used (see example below).

Table: Example of weighting and thresholds

Criterion	Max score	Weighting	Weighted Final Score
1. STRATEGIC CRITERIA			
1.1 Project's context (relevance and strategy)	10	x3	30
1.2 Cooperation character	10	x3	40
1.3 Project's contribution to programme's objectives, expected results and outputs	10	x4	40
1.4 Partnership relevance	10	x1	10
2. OPERATIONAL CRITERIA			
2.1 Management	10	x3	30
2.2 Communication	10	x1	10
2.3 Work plan	10	x2	20
2.4 Budget	10	x2	20
TOTAL			200
QUALITY THRESHOLD (65 %)			130

When applying weighting scores, each assessment question is multiplied with the pre-agreed number (which depends on the importance of the assessment question), and the final score is considered.

The aim of the threshold is to approve only those projects that lie above a certain level, despite the fact that there are funds available for all projects. To avoid providing funds to projects of lower quality, the

programme should set minimum thresholds already when opening the call for proposals. Some programmes use the threshold for the level of assessment questions as well; e.g., a minimum 50 % score must be achieved in the assessment question “Cooperation character”.

Assessment tools

A programme might consider preparing, in advance, different templates to enable efficient assessment (assessment grids, assessment reports, standard letters to be sent to applicants) to be used throughout the entire process. They should be prepared in a way which allows assessors to include basic data (project title and acronym, project number, lead partner, etc.) as well as a date and signature on the document. It is important that templates allow some flexibility to accommodate case-specific issues.

Guidance for assessors – programmes prepare an assessment manual (instruction), which can have the following characteristics:

- it is an agreement between programme partners regarding how certain topics should be understood and assessed;
- it gives guidance to assessors, whether external or internal, experienced or less experienced, but above all, it explains in a coherent way what the programme values;
- it usually comprises the basic rules and main principles of the assessment, description of the selection process of the assessors, the assessment procedure and timelines, rules governing correspondence and the handling of documents, different templates in annexes (assessment sheet, declaration of impartiality and confidentiality, request for missing documents and clarifications, rejection/approval letter, etc.);
- if the programme uses external assessors, the guidance is more detailed and also includes basic information about the programme;
- programmes could offer additional guidance for assessors by explaining in which cases projects should get a certain score; e.g., the project gets the highest score because it demonstrates strong cooperation as it complies with all four cooperation criteria.

Assessment sheets

- These are first completed by each assessor individually, then a joint assessment sheet is prepared, usually based on a discussion within the Joint Secretariat or a group of assessors.
- It is helpful for assessors if the sheet indicates where the information needed for assessing a certain topic can be found on the application form, especially when the consistency of the project is checked.
- If developed in on-line or Excel format, interconnected entry fields are possible – there is no need to retype or calculate the scores separately and manually.

5.3. SELECTION PROCEDURE AND FOLLOW-UP

5.3.1. Selection procedure

The ultimate body responsible for project selection is the Monitoring/Steering Committee. Usually, the decisions are made at the Monitoring/Steering Committee meeting, where each project is looked at and discussed (in some justified cases, the decision can be taken in a written procedure). The main input for the decision is based on the main sources of information. The first is the project application and the other is the assessment prepared by the Joint Secretariat (or in some cases Managing Authority).

The members of the Monitoring/Steering Committee select the project proposals by voting. The most used voting system in Interreg programmes is consensus. The detailed rules of the voting should be included in the rules of procedure of the MC/SC, which shall be adopted by the Monitoring Committee once the programme is approved by the European Commission. The rules of procedure of the Monitoring/Steering Committee shall prevent any situation of conflict of interest when selecting Interreg operations and shall include provisions regarding voting rights and rules for attending the meetings.

Once taken, the decisions on project selection should be publicly available and published on the programme website.

5.3.2. Types of selection decisions

After the assessment process projects are either approved or rejected, but they could also be approved with conditions or rejected with a recommendation to re-apply.

Conditions need to be clear, met within a deadline, and cannot fundamentally change the project. The procedures in place need to clarify who verifies that conditions have been met (Joint Secretariat, Managing Authority, Monitoring/Steering Committee).

Again, one needs to strike a balance between the efforts invested in such procedures and the alternative of inviting the project applicant to come back for the next call. It is important that the number and types of conditions are reasonable, so as not to delay the programme implementation by waiting for projects to fulfil the conditions.

There are times in the programme's life cycle when conditional approvals are well justified, e.g., when money in each priority is more or less spent and when the programme is running its last calls. If the conditions are not met or if there are too many significant changes needed, the programme can reject the project with a recommendation to re-apply.

5.3.3. Communication of the results of project selection

Following standard transparency requirements, the selection decisions need to be communicated to all projects assessed and to the general public. The projects are notified by the Joint Secretariat about the selection decisions made at the Monitoring/Steering Committee meeting in the following way:

- Lead Partners of the approved projects will receive a letter stating the decision of the Monitoring/Steering Committee, as well as the total ERDF fund approved.
- Applicants of the rejected applications will receive a notification letter together with a summary of the assessment results, listing the reasons why their application has failed. Similarly, projects approved with conditions will receive explanations of conditions and deadlines for their fulfilment.

Disclaimer: Cooperation can be complex, and while Interact’s job is to make it easier, Interact cannot offer assurances on the accuracy of our pan-European information in any specific context.

Furthermore, understanding and knowledge evolves throughout the programming period. If you spot something out of date or inconsistent, please contact us at communication@interact.eu

Copyright: This product is licensed under Creative Commons, under the 'Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International' license (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

You are permitted to share and adapt this work. You are required to attribute the work, indicating if changes were made. You are required to offer revised work on the same license basis. The material cannot be used for commercial purposes.

For more information about this license please visit creativecommons.org

Publisher | Interact programme
Date | 10.04.2025
Author | Robert Mazurkiewicz
Contributors | Kelly Zielniewski

