

Annex 4 - BAAA Applications Assessment Form

Community-Led Pilot Action Call: BAAC-01

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Scoring:

The scoring range depends on the maximum points for each criterion. Criteria with max 5 points:

- 0 The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 1 **Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 2 **Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 3 **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 4 **Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 5 **Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Half marks (0,5) are allowed, no decimals

Thresholds & weighting:

The minimum quality threshold for the individual criteria is normally 3/5. The overall quality threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores, is 9 points.

Scores are NOT weighted.

1. Evaluation

AWARD CRITERIA	
<p>1. Excellence (0-5)</p> <p>Relevance to the Mission objectives; Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the objectives clear and feasible within the proposed timeline?</i> • <i>Do they align with the Mission Ocean Objectives?</i> • <i>Does the project include an appropriately integrated gender and diversity strategy?</i> • <i>Does the project include measures for engaging early career professionals in a meaningful way?</i> 	
<p>Comments:</p>	
0/4000 characters	
<p>Score 1 (0-5) Threshold: 3/5</p>	

<p>2. Impact (0-5)</p> <p>Impact KPI definition; Community engagement and empowerment; Sustainability;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the impact KPI's defined realistic, measurable, and aligned with the stated goals of the project?</i> • <i>Is the impact monitoring strategy clear and realistic?</i> • <i>To what extent does the project address the needs or challenges of the local/regional community (ies)?</i> 	
<p>Comments:</p>	
0/4000 characters	

Score 2 (0-5):
Threshold: 3/5

3. Implementation (0-5)

Structure; Workplan; Milestones and Deliverables; Quality and risk management; Budget Breakdown;

- *Does the consortium include the necessary competences/expertise to address the challenges?*
- *Is the workplan sound and adequate to reach the stated objectives?*
- *Does the project include appropriate milestones and deliverables?*
- *Are the risk identification and mitigation measures appropriate?*
- *Does the budget align with the proposed plan and stated objectives?*
- *Does the project offer “value for money” for the proposed actions?*

Comments:

0/4000 characters

Score 3 (0-5):
Threshold: 3/5

Total score
Overall threshold: 9/15

2. Comments

OVERALL COMMENTS
[Comment box]

Ethical Issues Identified (if any) and how these issues affect the assessment.
<i>The applicant has been asked to fill in a question on Ethics and Compliance under the Excellence section. Serious <u>unresolved</u> ethical concerns should lead to low scores and/or recommendation for rejection.</i>
[Comment box]

I recommend this proposal to be referred for ethics review.

3. DECLARATIONS

DECLARATIONS	
<p>I confirm that I have performed the evaluation to the best of my abilities, with thoroughness</p> <p>and respect for the standards of professional ethics required for this function.</p> <p>I confirm that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interests regarding the evaluation of this proposal.</p>	
Evaluator 1	[insert date and signature]
Evaluator 2	[insert date and signature]
Evaluator 3	[insert date and signature]

Transition Agenda Call 1 – BAAT-01

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Scoring:

The scoring range depends on the maximum points for each criterion. Criteria with max 5 points:

- 1 The proposal fails to address the criterion or cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.
- 6 **Poor.** The criterion is inadequately addressed, or there are serious inherent weaknesses.
- 7 **Fair.** The proposal broadly addresses the criterion, but there are significant weaknesses.
- 8 **Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion well, but a number of shortcomings are present.
- 9 **Very Good.** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, but a small number of shortcomings are present.
- 10 **Excellent.** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.

Half marks (0,5) are allowed

Thresholds & weighting:

The minimum quality threshold for the individual criteria is normally 3/5. The overall quality threshold, applying to the sum of the 3 individual scores, is 9 points.

Scores are NOT weighted.

1. Evaluation

AWARD CRITERIA	
<p>1. Excellence (0-5)</p> <p>Relevance to the Mission objectives; Clarity and pertinence of the objectives;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the objectives clear and feasible within the proposed timeline?</i> • <i>Do they align with the Mission Ocean Objectives?</i> • <i>Does the project include an appropriately integrated gender and diversity strategy?</i> • <i>Does the project include measures for engaging early career professionals in a meaningful way?</i> 	
<p>Comments:</p>	
0/4000 characters	
<p>Score 1 (0-5) Threshold: 3/5</p>	

<p>2. Impact (0-5)</p> <p>Impact KPI definition; Community engagement and empowerment; Sustainability;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Are the impact KPI's defined realistic, measurable and aligned with the stated goals of the project?</i> • <i>Is the impact monitoring strategy clear and realistic?</i> • <i>To what extent does the project address the needs or challenges of the local/regional community (ies)?</i> • <i>Are the sustainability measures outlined adequate and credible?</i> 	
<p>Comments:</p>	
0/4000 characters	

Score 2 (0-5):
Threshold: 3/5

3. Implementation (0-5)

Structure; Workplan; Milestones and Deliverables; Quality and risk management; Budget Breakdown;

- *Does the consortium (or applicant in case of application by a single entity) include the necessary competences/expertise to address the challenges?*
- *Is the workplan sound and adequate to reach the stated objectives?*
- *Are the pathways to secure adoption of the agenda adequately outlined and credible?*
- *Does the project include appropriate milestones and deliverables?*
- *Are the identified risks and mitigation measures appropriate?*
- *Does the budget align with the proposed plan and stated objectives?*
- *Does the project offer “value for money” for the proposed actions?*

Comments:

0/4000 characters

Score 3 (0-5):
Threshold: 3/5

4

Total score
Overall threshold: 9/15

2. Comments

OVERALL COMMENTS
[Comment box]

Ethical Issues Identified (if any) and how these issues affect the assessment.
<i>The applicant has been asked to fill in a question on Ethics and Compliance under the Excellence section. Serious <u>unresolved</u> ethical concerns should lead to low scores and/or recommendation for rejection.</i>
[Comment box]

I recommend this proposal to be referred for ethics review.

3. DECLARATIONS

DECLARATIONS	
I confirm that I have performed the evaluation to the best of my abilities, with thoroughness and respect for the standards of professional ethics required for this function.	
I confirm that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interests regarding the evaluation of this proposal.	
Evaluator 1	[insert date and signature]
Evaluator 2	[insert date and signature]
Evaluator 3	[insert date and signature]



BLUEACTIONAA
EMPOWERING COMMUNITY-LED ACTION
IN THE ATLANTIC & ARCTIC



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation programme under **Grant Agreement 101215504**