

# Evaluation

**Christopher North**

**Head of Unit, T3 – Air, Waterborne Transport,  
Logistics, Innovation & Co-modality**

**TEN-T EA Project Management Workshop  
3 December 2008**



# Presentation Structure

- The Proposal Evaluation Process
- Experience with the 2008 Call
- Problems and Remarks
- Thoughts and Advice



# Proposal Evaluation Process

## Evaluation Approach - 3 Stages

- 1. Eligibility** (TEN-T EA from 2009)
- 2. Evaluation** (TEN-T EA from 2009)
  - External evaluation
  - Preparation for the Internal Selection
- 3. Selection** (DG TREN)



# Proposal Evaluation Process: Requirements & Criteria

- Formal Requirements
  - On time
  - Respect the application procedure
  - Right forms (properly completed)
  - Signed by the applicant
  - Approved by the Member State



# Proposal Evaluation Process: Requirements & Criteria

- Eligibility Criteria
  - **for Applicants:** One or (jointly) several Member States, public or private body, international body, joint undertaking
  - **for Projects:** Project of Common Interest, related to a Priority Project (MAP), cross border – agreement of all States involved
  - **Compliance with Community Legislation:** Environment, state aids, public procurement, interoperability
  - **Non-cumulation of EU funding**



# Proposal Evaluation Process: Requirements & Criteria

- **Selection Criteria** (basically private organisations only)
  - Financial Capacity
    - Financial accounts for last year
  - Technical Capacity
    - Attested evidence of technical and operational capacity in the domain



# Proposal Evaluation Process

- Award Criteria
  - Maturity
  - Relevance
  - Potential impacts
  - Quality of Action



# Award Criteria: Maturity

- Soundness of the financial package
- Need to overcome financial obstacles
- Technical and financial readiness
- Political commitment
- Procurement procedures well advanced
- Administrative procedures completed (public consultations, building permits, EIA, etc)
- Risks/factors of uncertainty





# Award Criteria: Relevance

- Continuity and interoperability of the network and optimisation of capacity
- Improved service quality, safety and security
- Internal market, cohesion, Lisbon Agenda
- Rebalancing of transport modes for sustainability
- Need to cross natural barriers
- Stimulative effect of Community support
  - Compare with “need to overcome financial obstacles” (maturity)



# Award Criteria: Potential Impacts

- Socio-economic effects
- Environmental consequences
- Internal market, cohesion, Lisbon Agenda (already in 'Relevance'!)
- Improved service quality, safety and security (not in Call text – but in evaluation form under “Relevance”!)
- Rebalancing of transport modes for sustainability (not in Call text – but in evaluation form under “Relevance”!)



# Award Criteria: Quality of Action

- Coherence between objectives and proposed activities
- Planning sufficient to achieve objectives
- Technically consistent
- Provision of the necessary financial resources  
(Soundness of Financial Package again!) for launching or gathering public/private funds



# 2008 Call Experience

- €185 million available
- 124 proposals received, requesting €765 million
- 75 proposals suitable for funding (external evaluation) for €489 million
- 63 proposals selected for funding, for €186 million support



# 2008 Call Experience: Annual Projects

- €140 million available
- 105 proposals received, requesting €602 million
- 59 proposals suitable for funding (external evaluation) requesting €396 million
- 49 proposals selected for funding, for €139 million support



# 2008 Call Experience: MAP

- €45 million available
- 19 proposals received, requesting €163 million
- 16 proposals suitable for funding (external evaluation) for €93 million
- 14 proposals selected for funding, for €46 million support



# Problems + Recommendations

- Proposals often contain insufficient information to make proper judgement on compliance with criteria
- Our experience: External evaluators give “benefit of the doubt” .... probably too many proposals ranked “suitable for funding”

☑ **Agency Response:** More rigorous application of criteria in External Evaluation to “weed out” proposals of insufficient quality



# Additional Criteria

- 2008 Work Programme: foresees the possibility of additional (mode specific) criteria detailed in the Call text
  - Not followed up in 2008 Call
- Motorways of the Sea: poor success rate indicates that additional guidance and criteria would have helped!

☒ **Agency Response:** Provide additional guidance (and criteria?) in the Call text for specific modes, where necessary





# Eligibility Criteria

Generally, no Proposals are eliminated at this stage...

- ...but many Proposals provide insufficient evidence of compliance with Community legislation (particularly environmental and standardisation)
- ... more Proposals should be eliminated at this stage as 'ineligible'

☒ **Agency Advice:** Take these aspects seriously and provide the right data & certificates with the proposal



# Selection Criteria

- Only problem for ‘non-public’ organisations
  - Requested on application form, but easily overlooked

☒ **Agency Advice:** Private companies (or public bodies operating under private law) should ensure that the “Financial” and “Technical” Capacity are demonstrated ...future Agency-provided “checklist” for applicants?



# Award Criteria: General

- Individual Award criteria from the TEN-T Regulation could be 're-grouped' for better clarity and to avoid 'duplications'
  - Relevance: TEN-T benefits at system level, need for TEN-T support + macro-economic benefits at EU level
  - Maturity: project is "Ready to go!"
  - Potential impact: micro-economic benefits, environmental impact and sustainability
  - Quality: objectives, activities, resources, management



# Award Criteria: Relevance

- **TEN-T Relevance**

- Impact on network continuity & interoperability & capacity optimisation
- Compliance with Community standards (sustainability, intermodality)
- Stimulative effect of Community support (PPP, etc)

- **EU Dimension**

- Internal Market, Cohesion, Lisbon Agenda

☒ **Agency Advice:**

- Clearly state expected network benefits at the European level
- Confirm compliance with Community standards (where applicable)
- Make the case for why Community support is necessary
- Specify expected benefits in terms of macro-economics, jobs, social integration...being on a Priority Corridor is not sufficient in itself!



# Award Criteria: Maturity

- Technical and financial readiness (soundness of the package)
- Political commitment
- Procurement procedures well advanced
- Administrative procedures completed (public consultations, building permits, EIA etc)
- Risks/factors of uncertainty

## ☒ **Agency Advice:**

- Works projects: fairly straightforward to demonstrate
- Studies: Maturity is generally low, but should demonstrate how it contributes to the subsequent “Implementation Project”



# Award Criteria: Potential Impact

## Quantitative benefits

- Micro-economic
- Environmental consequences
- Improved service quality, safety and security
- Rebalancing of transport modes for sustainability

### ☒ **Agency Advice:**

- Be specific
- Give figures (CBA, fuel saving, emissions etc)
- Quantify the expected benefits

Priority will be given to more environmentally sustainable modes of transport



# Award Criteria: Quality of Proposal

- Coherence between objectives and proposed activities (technical AND financial consistency)
- Planning sufficient to achieve objectives

☑ **Agency Advice:** Include a comprehensive description of the objectives and the way to achieve them + a sound project management process and plan



# Thoughts + Advice

- Annual Call
  - 105 proposals for €600 million
  - 49 selected 😊, but only for €139 million ☹️
  - +/- 50% of requested support to 2010 only
  - Can reapply in 2010...BUT no guarantees

## What option is better for you?

1. Fewer projects – full funding?
2. More projects – lower % support (stimulating effect?)
3. More projects – full % support - shorter duration (longer term sustainability for beneficiaries?)
4. Upper and/or lower thresholds?





# Evaluation of the 2009 Call

- Transparency:
  - Clear 2009 Work Programme
  - Call text providing additional clarification where necessary
  - Rationalisation of the award criteria into more 'logical' groups for Guide for Applicants, Guide for Evaluators & Evaluation forms
  - Appointment of external observers
  - Timely feedback to applicants (positive and negative)

**Better evaluation process = better Proposals  
= easier negotiations = earlier Decisions!**



# Final Advice

- Read the work programme and Call text properly!
- Study the Criteria, particularly the Award criteria
- Re-read your proposal and ask yourself:
  - Is it clear?
  - Does it cover all the points?
  - Does it make the case for why it should receive EC funding?
- Provide more detail!
  - Objectives
  - Added-value at European level
  - Realistic planning
  - Reliable financial data
  - Solid project management process
  - Correct Certificates (Environment – Interoperability ERTMS etc)

**IMPROVE THE OVERALL QUALITY!**



# Feedback/Questions?



# Thank you!



**TENT-AGENCY@ec.europa.eu**  
**ec.europa.eu/tentea**

