

EFF AXIS 4 Sustainable Development of Fisheries Areas

SCORING SYSTEM

These criteria will be used by the FLAG to appraise every application that is submitted for funding. They have been drawn up to assist the fair and open assessment of projects that are submitted to the Programme.

	Criteria	Score Range
1.	<p>Fit with Local Fisheries Development Strategy (LFDS) Does the outline of the project fit within the Local Fisheries Development Strategy which is to be implemented within the local area?</p> <p>0 Does not fit, not relevant to LFDS at all 1 - 3 Some elements of the project fit within the LFDS 4 - 6 Most of the project elements fit with LFDS, although some do not 7 - 10 significant fit with FLAG proposals within the LFDS</p>	0 - 10
2.	<p>Fit with Axis 4 Eligible Measures To what extent does the project meet with the eligible measures for grant assistance under EFF Axis 4?</p> <p>0 Does not fit within any of the eligible measures 1 - 3 Limited evidence of fit within one of the eligible measures 4 - 6 Significant evidence that the completed project would fit within one or more of the eligible measures 7 - 10 Completed project will fit within one or more of the eligible measures</p>	0 - 10
3.	<p>Geographical coverage is eligible Is the project located within a small fishing community? Is it within an area of low population density or an area where fishing activity is in decline?</p> <p>0 Not within an appropriate geographical area 1 - 5 No, however Community within appropriate area may benefit from completed project 6 - 10 Project is within appropriate geographical area</p>	0 - 10
4.	<p>Project activity is eligible To what extent does the project involve fisheries community activity or fisheries community benefit?</p> <p>0 no fisheries community involvement or benefit 1 - 5 Some community involvement or benefit 6 - 10 significant fisheries community activity or benefit</p>	0 - 10
5.	<p>Project timescale appropriate Is the timescale given within the project application appropriate. Will the project be completed and all monies drawn down by 31 December 2015?</p> <p>0 Timescale not appropriate, project will not be completed by 31 December 2015 1 - 3 Timescale may be achievable</p>	0 - 10

	<p>4 - 7 Timescale tight, will need careful monitoring to ensure completion date is achieved</p> <p>8 - 10 Project timescale is appropriate and should be achievable</p>	
6.	<p>Grant rate requested is appropriate</p> <p>0 Grant rate requested is not appropriate</p> <p>1 - 5 Grant rate requested is at an appropriate level</p> <p>6 - 10 Grant rate requested is below maximum available</p>	0 - 10
7.	<p>Costs are accurate</p> <p>To what extent are the projected costs for the project stages and the completed project accurate?</p> <p>0 Costs are not accurate</p> <p>1 - 3 some projected costs are not accurate</p> <p>4 - 6 Projected costs seem to be accurate</p> <p>7 - 10 All projected costs are reasonable and accurate</p>	0 - 10
8.	<p>Costs are eligible</p> <p>Are the projected costs for the project eligible for grant funding under EFF Axis 4?</p> <p>0 None of the costs are eligible</p> <p>1 - 5 Some of the costs are eligible</p> <p>6 - 10 Most or all of the costs are eligible</p>	0 - 10
9.	<p>Value for Money</p> <p>To what extent does the project represent value for money when compared with the anticipated quantified outputs/impacts.</p> <p>0 Project represents extremely poor value for money</p> <p>1 - 3 Project represents poor value for money</p> <p>4 - 6 Project represents good value for money</p> <p>7 - 10 Project represents extremely good value for money in relation to outputs and impacts anticipated</p>	0 - 10
10.	<p>Equal Opportunities</p> <p>To what extent does the project actively promote the full and equal participation of individuals and social groups in the local economy (all members of the community and visitors).</p> <p>0 Project meets minimum legal requirements only</p> <p>1 - 3 Limited evidence of equal opportunities consideration built into project design</p> <p>4 - 6 Evidence of equal opportunities considerations built into project design and clear monitoring mechanisms</p> <p>7 - 10 Significant evidence of positive action to combat discrimination and promote inclusion of disadvantaged individuals and/or groups with quantified targets</p>	0 - 10
11.	<p>Signatory is appropriate</p> <p>The person who has signed the declaration is appropriate . has authority to sign on behalf of the project.</p> <p>0 Signatory is not appropriate</p> <p>10 Signatory is appropriate</p>	0 - 10