



ANNEX 2

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE SELECTION OF THE PROGRAMME COMPONENT

The professional evaluation of proposals under this scheme will be based on the evaluation criteria listed below. Evaluators will provide a short narrative justification for each of the key evaluation criteria to support the sub-scores given within each criterion.

Each proposal will be evaluated by two experts.

The selection of experts with the appropriate competencies will be made randomly and anonymously by the Programme Operator from a database of experts set up by the partner organisation (assignment of an application number to the evaluator number). Each application will be assessed separately by 2 different professional evaluators.

Eligibility criteria for the application:

	Maximum score available	Minimum score to be achieved*
Professional evaluator 1:	198	65
Professional evaluator 2:	198	65
* The minimum score for each evaluation criterion must be reached, otherwise the application will be rejected.		

The evaluation experts will assess the proposals according to the following criteria:



Evaluation criteria	Assessment, scoring methodology	Maximum score	Minimum number of points required for support	Short, textual justification
1 General aspects				
1.1 Assessment of the organisation applying for support	Eligibility requires a minimum of 7 points	15	7	Short, textual justification
1.1.1 Financial stability of the organisation applying for support for the implementation of the planned programme component, based on the documents submitted	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.1.2 Financial and management evaluation of the human resources planned by the applicant organisation during the implementation of the planned programme component (e.g. the realistic number of staff planned, the professional competence of external experts, etc.)	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.1.3 The applicant organisation has the appropriate licences and permits to carry out the programme component or is in the process of	Yes: 3 points No: 0 point	3	3	



	obtaining the necessary permits ¹ , or the person authorised to represent the applicant has declared that the activities supported under the programme component do not require a permit, if the application does not include activities subject to a permit (see Declaration of the existence of permits, Annex 6)				
1.1.4	Evaluation of the adequacy of human resources planned for the technical implementation of the planned programme component (e.g. realistic staffing levels, professional competence of external experts, etc.)	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.1.5	Assessment of the applicant organisation's professional competence based on previous references .	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.2	Civil partner evaluation for Activity „C”²	Eligibility requires a minimum of 4 points	12	4	Short, textual justification

¹ The Beneficiary may conclude a Grant Contract only after having obtained the valid authorisations required for the implementation of the Programme Component, as provided for in Section 3.5/'E' of the main text of the Call for Proposals

² In the case of several NGO partners, all the NGO partner organisations are evaluated by the evaluators.

If none of the partners reaches the minimum score required, the application will not be eligible!

In the case of multiple NGO partners, a partner whose score does not reach the minimum required score will not be eligible for funding.

The total number of points for the evaluation of the application will be calculated on the basis of the points of the NGO partner with the highest score.



Name and score of the highest scoring NGO partner:				
1.2.1	Assessment of the human resources planned by the NGO partner for the implementation of the programme component from the financial, management and administrative point of view (realistic staffing levels, professional competence of external experts, etc.)	on a scale of 0-3	3	1
1.2.2	The mandatory NGO partner has the necessary staff to carry out the planned eligible activity(ies) „C” or can provide them by the time the Grant Contract is signed on the basis of the application documents submitted.	on a scale of 0-3	3	1
1.2.3	Feasibility and realism of the estimated budget for the planned NGO activity(ies) in the planned programme component.	on a scale of 0-3	3	1
1.2.4	The added value of the obligatory NGO partner's activity(ies) for the programme component, based on the documents submitted (activity description, budget, etc.).	on a scale of 0-3	3	1
1.3	Achieving the objectives of the Cooperation Programme and	Eligibility requires a minimum of 2 points	14	2
		Short, textual justification		



implementing its horizontal principles				
1.3.1 The planned activities of the programme component will contribute to strengthening the social participation of the people living in the area concerned:	<i>If the statement is true for the submitted application, you will be awarded 1 point. Eligibility requires a minimum of 1 point.</i>	5	1	
- equally, regardless of gender, age, health, affiliation, etc.	1 point	1	-	
- to compensate for the disadvantages of at least one identifiable social group.	1 point	1	-	
- ad hoc, short-term events and activities (occasional, lasting up to 5 days).	1 point	1	-	
- by organising a series of synergistic, ad hoc events and activities with a specific objective, and by developing closer cooperation with the population, capable of activating at least one specific group of the population for a maximum of 12 consecutive months from the date of the decision to support the component.	1 point	1	-	
- can mobilise at least one specific group of the population by organising a series of synergistic, ad hoc events or activities with a specific objective, for a continuous period of 12 months from the date of the	1 point	1	-	



decision to support the component.				
1.3.2 It will contribute to the sustainable development of the area concerned:	<i>If the statement is true for the submitted application, you will be awarded 1 point. Eligibility requires a minimum of 1 point.</i>	4	1	
- improve opportunities for long-term economic growth.	1 point	1	-	
- the long-term, safe and efficient operation of the regional water utility service.	1 point	1	-	
- for energy reduction.	1 point	1	-	
- raise the environmental awareness of people in the area concerned.	1 point	1	-	
1.3.3 It will contribute to raising the level of social security in the area concerned:	<i>If the part of the statement after the letter is true for the submitted application, the score assigned to the letter is awarded.</i>	5	-	
In implementing the programme component, it is planned to use local labour from the area concerned: a) not planned, b) up to 10 persons on ad hoc	a: 0 point b: 1 point c: 2 points d: 3 points e: 4 points	5	-	



<p>assignments for a maximum of 90 days,</p> <p>c) over 10 persons, on a case-by-case basis, for a maximum of 90 days,</p> <p>d) up to 10 persons on a contract for more than half the planned implementation period,</p> <p>e) over 10 persons, under a contract of assignment for a period longer than half of the planned implementation period,</p> <p>f) more than 5 persons employed on a full-time contract for the entire duration of the programme component</p>	f: 5 points			
1.4 Assessing and managing the financial and management risks of the planned programme component	Eligibility requires a minimum of 4 points	12	4	Short, textual justification
1.4.1 Identification of financial and management risk factors is relevant and complete, quantification of the impact of risks without measures is adequate	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.4.2 Description of the financial and management risk mitigation measures is relevant, quantification of the impact of risks with measures in place is adequate	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.4.3 The identification of professional, technical risk factors for development is relevant and complete, and the quantification of the impact of	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	



risks without measures is adequate				
1.4.4 Description of the professional, technical risk mitigation measures for the development is relevant, quantification of the impact of the risks with the measures in place is adequate	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.5 Indicators³	Eligibility requires a minimum of 11 points	30	11	Short, textual justification
1.5.1 Reproducibility of the calculation of the indicators undertaken	on a scale of 0-10	10	5	
1.5.2 Accuracy of the textual description of the expected results and outputs	on a scale of 0-10	10	5	
1.5.3 Number of optional indicators	1-2 pc 3-5 pc over 5 pc	3 6 10	1 2 3	
2 Time, financial and geographical planning of the planned activities A, B, C of the programme component⁴				

³ See Annex 3.

⁴ In case of multiple eligible activities, the cost-effectiveness/simple variation analysis must be assessed for all planned activities! A textual justification must be provided for the evaluation of all planned activities!

In the case of an activity that cannot be evaluated from a cost-effectiveness point of view, the evaluator should check whether, without funding the activity that does not fulfil evaluation criterion 2.1.1, the other financial conditions of the call for proposals, e.g. the minimum amount of the grant application submitted (200 Mft), are fulfilled without the activity(ies) that failed the evaluation. If not, the application will not be eligible.

If, in addition to the activity(ies) not fulfilling the cost-effectiveness criterion 2.1.1, the evaluator determines the eligibility of the proposal, the evaluator must also assess whether the other objectives and indicators of the proposal can be met by the remaining (cost-effective) activities, in relation to the technical and technical aspects of the other planned drinking water treatment activities.



2.1 Timing and financial planning of planned activities A, B, C		Eligibility requires a minimum of 6 points	12	6	Short, textual justification
2.1.1	The simplified analysis of alternatives ⁵ for the planned activity meets the cost-effectiveness standards.	Yes: 3 points No: 0 point	3	3	
2.1.2	The time schedule is realistic and reasonable (taking into account the sequencing of the phases) and the time required for the implementation of the eligible activity in the planned programme component.	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
2.1.3	The feasibility and realistic nature of the estimated budget for the eligible professional activity under the proposed programme component.	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
2.1.4	Application, presentation, analysis of cost-effectiveness indicators (for all costs related to a given development (e.g. design, implementation, operation and maintenance costs))	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
2.2 Geographical location(s) and technical feasibility of the proposed activity of the programme component		Eligibility requires a minimum of 7 points	23	7	Short, textual justification
2.2.1	The location(s) of the proposed activity is (are) in one of the 3 target regions of the Cooperation Programme (Northern Hungary, Northern Great Plain, Southern Transdanubia).	Yes: 10 points No: 2 points	10	2	

⁵ See Annex 1. Appendix 1.



2.2.2	The location(s) of the planned activity is (are) included in the list of "Catch-up settlements" ⁶ within the 3 target regions of the Cooperation Programme (Northern Hungary, Northern Great Plain, Southern Transdanubia).	Yes: 5 points No: 1 point	5	1	
2.2.3	The location of the proposed activity is technically grounded in the light of the submitted site plan(s) and the proposed activity.	on a scale of 0-4	4	2	
2.2.4	Number of people targeted by water quality improvements in the municipality(ies) concerned, based on data published by the Ministry of Interior in January 2024 ⁷	2000-3000 persons 3001-4000 persons over 4001 persons	2 3 4	2 3 4	
3 Professional/technical evaluation of the planned activities A, B of the programme component					
Name and score of the highest scoring professional/technical activity:					
3.1 Technical content of each eligible activity of the programme component⁸	Eligibility requires a minimum of 16 points	64	16	Short, textual justification	

⁶ Based on the development programme necessary to reduce the economic disparities between certain regions of Hungary and on the Government Decision 1057/2021 (19.II.) on the extension of the long-term programme of "Catch-up Settlements": <https://njt.hu/jogszabaly/2021-1057-30-22>

⁷ https://www.nyilvantarto.hu/letoltes/statisztikak/kozerdeku_lakossag_2024.xlsx

⁸ In the case of multiple eligible A, B activities, the evaluators will carry out an evaluation of all activities. The total score of the evaluation of the proposal will be calculated on the basis of the score of the highest evaluated activity.

However, if a proposed activity does not reach the minimum score required for eligibility, the activity will not be awarded a grant.



3.1.1 The proposal documentation and the technical description and information content of the proposed activity comply with the instructions for filling in the documents and are technically grounded on the basis of the technical design documentation provided.	on a scale of 1-8	8	2	
3.1.2 The validity of the technical and technological solutions proposed for the implementation of the planned activity and the technical design documentation submitted are technically sound.		8	2	
3.1.3 The adequacy of the technical and technological solutions proposed for the implementation of the planned activity, with a detailed description of the new equipment (technical parameters).		8	2	
3.1.4 The feasibility and realistic nature of the proposed time schedule and work plan for the planned activity, i.e. an assessment of the extent to which the content and time schedule are in line with the planned objectives.		8	2	
3.1.5 Comparison of alternative solutions and investment options for drinking water networks.		8	2	
3.1.6 In carrying out the planned activity, the planned procurement/execution will involve the use of materials and equipment meeting the technical requirements.		8	2	



3.1.7 Quality assurance of the implementation of the planned activity (existence of a responsible technical inspector, use of standards).		8	2	
3.1.8 The technical solution used is in line with the Best Available Technique (BAT) for the technology concerned or with the EU's BREF.		8	2	
3.2 Environmental impact of the eligible activity	Eligibility requires a minimum of 8 points	16	8	Short, textual justification
3.2.1 Environmental impact of the eligible activity	on a scale of 1-4	4	2	
3.2.2 Specific procedures and measures envisaged to reduce the negative impact on the environment of the eligible activity (e.g. waste management, noise and water protection, nature protection, etc.)	on a scale of 1-4	4	2	
3.2.3. Energy efficiency measures in the design and operation of infrastructure. The use of modern technologies and green energy sources to help increase sustainability and minimise environmental impacts.	on a scale of 1-4	4	2	
3.2.4 Assessment and evaluation of any environmental risks related to the location of the proposed activity that may limit or otherwise affect the proposed activity.	on a scale of 1-4	4	2	



TOTAL SCORE AVAILABLE:

198

Evaluation criteria for the professional partner organisation

1. Assessment of the applicant organisation's professional partner organisation in the implementation of eligible activities A, B of the programme component⁹	Eligibility requires a minimum of 7 points	15	7	Short, textual justification
Name(s) and score(s) of the assessed professional partner(s): 1. 2. 3.				
1.1 Financial stability of the professional partner organisation based on the documents submitted.	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.2 Evaluation of the human resources planned by the professional partner organisation during the implementation of the planned programme component from a financial and management point of	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	

⁹ The evaluation of the professional partner organisation(s) will be carried out by the evaluators in the same way as for the applicant organisation, but the scores obtained will not be included in the total scores of the evaluation of the proposal. However, if the score achieved by the partner organisation(s) does not reach the minimum score required, the partner organisation will not be eligible for a grant!



view (e.g. the realistic number of planned staff, the professional competence, competence, training of specialists, external experts, etc.)				
1.3 The professional partner organisation has the appropriate licences and authorisations to carry out the planned activity.	Yes: 3 points No: 0 point	3	1	
1.4 Assessment of the adequacy of the human resources planned for the technical implementation of the planned activity to be carried out by the professional partner organisation (e.g. realistic staffing levels, professional competence of external experts, etc.)	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	
1.5 Evaluation of the professional competence of the professional partner organisation based on the presentation of previous references .	on a scale of 0-3	3	1	



Other assessment of compliance with cost limits:

	Qualified	Not qualified	Not relevant*
I. Compliance with all the grant limits set out in point 8 of the Call for Proposals			
II. If network reconstruction is chosen as a complementary activity, the amount of the complementary activity shall not exceed 20% of the total eligible costs of the programme component			
III. Installation of automated monitoring systems on modern, efficient systems, if the complementary activity is selected, up to a maximum of 5% of the total eligible costs of the programme component			

*The answer option Not relevant can only be given in rows II and III.