



Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Pre-Application Research for IIT" – formal check										
criticon code	Project quality aspect	criticon name	position	correctable / non-correctable	evaluation method (yes/no, irrelevant)	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief criterion description	main source of information	criticon description	Instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
F1	x	The application for support has been submitted in the required form.	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	MS2014+	x	application for support	Check is made whether the application was finalized in electronic form in IS KP14+.	MS2014+ – automatic check when submitting the application; the application for support may only be submitted electronically.
F2	x	All the required fields in the application for support are filled.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	MS2014+	x	application for support	Check is made whether the data in the field correspond to the field's substantive focus.	(a) MS2014+ – automatic check of fields set as required (b) Evaluator – check of fields that are marked as required in the call / follow-up documentation, including a check of demonstration of ownership structure
F3	x	All annexes have been submitted in the required form	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	annexes to application for support	(a) a check is made whether all relevant mandatory/elective annexes specified in the Call have been submitted. (b) a check is made whether all annexes (mandatory/elective/optional) have been submitted in the form specified by the call. An assessment is made whether or not the document is empty and whether the document content corresponds to its name. (c) A check is made whether all the attachments are numbered according to IS KP14+.	(a) MS2014+ – check whether the mandatory annexes have been filled, annex numbering present in IS KP14+ (b) evaluator – check whether elective annexes have been submitted, check of their form, i.e. according to the call specification (annex format, model, basic structure / outline, etc.).
F4	x	Application for support was submitted in the language determined by the call	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support annexes to the application for support	(a) a check is made whether the application incl. all annexes has been submitted in the language determined by the call, i.e. always in Czech. (b) a check is made whether the application for support has also been submitted in English. The duty to submit EN version will be stated in the text of the call / follow-up documentation, incl. specification of the parts of / annexes to the application for support which must be submitted in English.	(a) The criterion is met if the application for support including all annexes has been submitted in Czech. The criterion is met if the application for support including all relevant annexes has also been submitted in English. (b) The criterion is not met if the application for support or some of its annexes have not been submitted in Czech and English.
F5	x	Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support – project entities annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether all the required identification data of the applicant (name of the governing body or representative(s) of the governing body and their positions) are specified in the application for support and are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered. (a) A check is made whether the application for support includes the identification data of the applicant. (b) A check is made whether the applicant's identification data are in line with the extract from the register (e.g. a register of schools and school facilities, commercial register, trade register, company register, etc.).	(a) MS2014+ – a check whether the required fields are filled out (b) MS2014+ – a check for compliance with extracts from registers (c) evaluator – check for compliance with extracts from registers if this is impossible through MS2014+
F6	x	Identification data of the partner are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the partner is registered.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support – project entities annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether all the required identification data of each of the partners (name of the governing body (bodies) or representative(s) of the governing body (bodies) and their positions) are specified in the application for support and are in accordance with the extract from the register in which the partner is registered. (a) A check is made whether the application for support includes the identification data of the partner(s). (b) A check is made whether the partners' identification data are in line with the extract from the register (e.g. a register of schools and school facilities, commercial register, trade register, company register, etc.).	(a) MS2014+ – a check whether the required fields are filled out (b) MS2014+ – a check for compliance with extracts from registers (c) evaluator – check for compliance with extracts from registers if this is impossible through MS2014+
F7	x	The application for support has been signed by the governing body of the applicant/partner.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether all the documents containing the box for signature and name/identification of the applicant/partner have been electronically signed by the governing body or representative(s) of the governing body. A check is made whether the application has been electronically signed by the governing body or an authorized person authorized by the governing body of the applicant/partner's entity, i.e. whether the signature matches the governing body / authorized person of the applicant/partner's entity. The documents can also be signed by: (1) another person authorized by a power of attorney in relation to a specific project. The applicant submits the power of attorney in electronic form in IS KP14+ (requires et. signature of the principal and agent) or original/notarised copy in electronic/signed form under the "Power of attorney" tab or key in the application for support form in IS KP14+. This power of attorney contains all the elements of a power of attorney. (2) a person authorized based on a mandate to be represented by the governing body of applicant/partner's entity to make juridical acts on behalf of the applicant's entity. The mandate is submitted in a scanned form as an original/notarised copy on the "Power of attorney" tab or button in the application for support form in IS KP14+.	(a) MS2014+ – an automatic check, the application for support cannot be submitted to the MA without a signature (b) evaluator – checks signature relevance Elements of a power of attorney: • uniquely identifies the principal – the person who grants the power of attorney • uniquely identifies the agent – the person who receives the power of attorney • specification of a juridical act or acts for which the principal authorizes the agent • the period for which the authorization is valid • date and place of signing the power of attorney • signatures of the principal and agent
F8	x	Estimated time of project implementation is in accordance with the terms of the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether the project duration (e.g. number of months) and the project period (from-to) correspond to the conditions of the call.	(a) The criterion is met if the project duration is in line with the project duration specified in the call, and simultaneously the project period is in line with the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the project duration is not in line with the project duration specified in the call, or the project period is not in line with the call.
F9	x	The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of the total eligible expenditure specified by the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support – budget annexes to application for support	A check is made whether the amount of total eligible expenditure correspond to the conditions of the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the required amount of financial support is within the minimum and maximum amount of financial support for the particular call. (b) The criterion is not met if the required amount of financial assistance is not within the minimum and maximum amount of financial support for the particular call, i.e. the claimed funds are lower or higher than the minimum or maximum limit for the call.
F10	x	The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support – budget	A check is made whether the application respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the budget is set in accordance with all fin. limits according to the conditions of the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the setting of the budget is not in accordance with any of the fin. limits in the call.
F11	x	The amount of the applicant's own funds in the funding overview is stated in accordance with the call	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support, annexes – a statutory declaration on the applicant's own funds	A check is made whether the application for support includes the applicant's own funds (if relevant for the particular type of applicant/call in accordance with the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the amount of own funds meets the conditions of the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the amount of own funds fails to meet the conditions of the call.
F12	x	Financial stability / turnover of the applicant for two consecutive (closed) accounting periods	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support annexes to the application for support	A check is made whether the annual turnover / fin. stability if the applicant's entity meets the conditions of the call / follow-up call documentation. For additional duties and conditions concerning the demonstration of annual turnover / fin. stability, see Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries – Specific Part, Chapter 5.2.1.	(a) The criterion is met if the applicant has demonstrated fin. stability / turnover in accordance with the conditions of the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the applicant has failed to demonstrate fin. stability / turnover in accordance with the conditions of the call.
F13	x	The number of applications for support is equivalent to the number set by the call.	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support	An assessment is made whether the applicant has respected the max. number of applications per applicant in the call. The max. number of applications for support in the call which can be submitted by one applicant is set by the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the number of applications for support submitted by the applicant is in accordance with the call. (b) The criterion is not met if the number of applications for support submitted by the applicant is not in accordance with the call.

Annex 3 Evaluation criteria for the Application Request for ITI – eligibility check										
criteria code	Project quality aspect	criteria name	position	correctable / non-correctable	evaluation method (yes/no, irrelevant)	Evaluator / MS2014+	brief criterion description	main source of information	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scalers
P1	efficiency	The focus of the application for support is in accordance with the activities of the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: - key activities - specific objectives - project description annexes to application for support	An assessment is made whether the project activities are consistent with the conditions of the call.  An assessment is made whether the applicant has specified all the required activities according to the text of the call. An assessment is made whether or not the application for support contains any of the excluded activities according to the text of the call and the follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the project (activities/stages) is not in conflict with the activities of the call. The method to carry out the activities is not in conflict with the conditions for the implementation of the project set in the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if it is in conflict with the activities of the call, or the manner to implement the activities is in conflict with the conditions for the implementation of the project set in the call and in accordance with the conditions in the Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries – Specific Part.
P2	efficiency	Target groups are in accordance with the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: - target groups annexes to the application for support:	A check is made whether the target groups in the application for support are in accordance with the eligible target groups in the call / follow-up documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the target groups are in accordance with the eligible target groups defined in the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the target groups are in conflict with the eligible target groups defined in the call.
P3	feasibility	The applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant defined in the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: - Project entities annexes to the application for support:	An assessment is made whether the applicant's entity meets the conditions and criteria set out in the call / follow-up documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the applicant can be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) and also meets the conditions set by the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the applicant cannot be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) or fails to meet the conditions set by the call.  ISKPI4+ is connected with the insolvency register to check insolvency of applicants.
P4	feasibility	Project partner meets the conditions for the eligibility of the partner	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: - Project entities annexes to the application for support: - Principles of partnership - Partnership agreement	An assessment is made whether the partner entity meets the conditions and criteria for eligibility and partnerships set in the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the partner can be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) and also meets the conditions set by the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the partner cannot be identified as an entity defined by the call (e.g. a research organization, legal person) or fails to meet the conditions set by the call.
P5	feasibility	The place of project implementation and impact is in compliance with the conditions of the call.	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator / MS2014+	x	application for support: - Location - Key activities - Project description	An assessment is made whether the place of project implementation and impact are in accordance with the conditions set in the call (follow-up conditions of the call).  The applicant selects the place of impact/implementation from the code list	(a) The criterion is met if the project impact is exclusively on the territory under the call and the place of implementation corresponds to the conditions of the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the project impact is not exclusively
P6	feasibility/effectiveness	Project activities are unique for applicants/partners	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: - Project description - Key activities annexes to the application for support: (MS2014+, database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI)	An assessment is made whether supporting the project does not result in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from another OP EC / OP RDI project. The content of these activities/outcomes must always be different or related. A check is made via the IS KP14+ or the database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI.  A check is made whether supporting the project does not result in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from another OP EC / OP RDI project. The content of these activities/outcomes must always be different or related. Verification will take place via checking outcomes in entities in the capacity of beneficiaries in the database of outputs from OP EC / OP RDI.	(a) The criterion is met if the project activities are unique for applicant/partners, i.e. supporting the project does not result in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from an OP EC or another OP EC / OP RDI project.  (b) The criterion is not met if the project activities are not unique for applicant/partners, i.e. supporting the project results in funding identical outputs, for which the applicant/partners have received support from an OP EC or another OP EC / OP RDI project.
P7	feasibility	Involvement of a partner has been demonstrated in accordance with the call	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support: annexes to application for support: - Principles of partnership / Partnership agreement	An assessment is made whether the conditions for the involvement of a partners are in accordance with the call / follow-up call documentation.	(a) The criterion is met if the involvement of the partner meets the conditions of the call.  (b) The criterion is not met if the partnership is not set in accordance with the conditions of the call.
P8	efficiency	The project is in line with State aid rules.	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator	x	application for support annexes to the application for support	An assessment is made: (a) whether the call allows support not constituting State aid, whether the project does not cumulatively constitute elements of State aid, if the project cumulatively constitutes elements of State aid, a check is made whether any of the exemptions allowed by the call has been applied to the project (e.g. de minimis) and whether the project respects the limits of the exemption set by the call / Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries; (b) where the call sets/allows the application of an exemption (de minimis, SGEI, GBER), whether the project respects the limits of the exemption set by the call / Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries.  The check is based on the applicant's declaration (annex to application for support), which is used to evaluate whether or not the project cumulatively constitutes State aid and whether or not any of the exemptions concerning compatible State aid will be applied to the project.  The verification is recorded in a checklist.  Different options depending on the scheme: - support not constituting State aid within the meaning of Article 107(1) TFEU (Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union). Check according to the checklist – to verify (based on the applicant's declaration) whether or not the project cumulatively constitutes State aid - de minimis support in accordance with Regulation No 1407/2013 - services of general economic interest pursuant to Decision 2012/21/EU - support in accordance with Commission Regulation (EU) No 651/2014	(a) The criterion is met if the project does not cumulatively constitute State aid.  (b) The criterion is not met if the project constitutes State aid.
P9	necessity/efficiency	The place of project impact is on the territory of the Pilsen metropolitan area / Olomouc agglomeration / Ostrava agglomeration / Hradec-Paroubice agglomeration / Ústí-Chomutov agglomeration, and is consistent with the ITI Strategy	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator of the intermediate body	x	- the ITI strategy of the Pilsen metropolitan area / Olomouc agglomeration / Ostrava agglomeration / Hradec-Paroubice agglomeration / Ústí-Chomutov agglomeration - application for support - feasibility study	An assessment is made of the impact on the territory of the region or agglomeration defined in the ITI Strategy.	YES – The impact of the project is on the territory of the respective region/agglomeration NE – The impact of the project is not on the territory of the respective region/agglomeration
P10	necessity	The application for support is consistent with the project to which an opinion was issued by the ITI Steering Committee of the Pilsen metropolitan area / Olomouc agglomeration / Ostrava agglomeration / Hradec-Paroubice agglomeration / Ústí-Chomutov agglomeration	exclusionary	correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator of the intermediate body	x	- application for support - opinion of ITI SC - project - feasibility study	An assessment is made whether the application for support is consistent with the following parameters of the project to which an opinion was issued by the SC ITI and whether it is within the scope of this opinion: applicant, project description, indicator values, and simultaneously the required amount of EU grant specified in the application for support does not exceed the amount specified in the project.  An assessment is made of the compliance of the approved project with the application for support.	YES – the application for support is consistent with the following parameters of the project to which an opinion was issued by the SC ITI and is within the scope of this opinion: applicant, project description, indicator values, and simultaneously the required amount of EU grant specified in the application for support does not exceed the amount specified in the project.  NO – the application for support is not consistent with the following parameters of the project to which an opinion was issued by the SC ITI and is not within the scope of this opinion: applicant, project description, indicator values, and simultaneously the required amount of EU grant specified in the application for support exceeds the amount specified in the project.
P11	efficiency/feasibility	The project is in accordance with the thematic focus of the ITI strategy of the Pilsen metropolitan area / Olomouc agglomeration / Ostrava agglomeration / Hradec-Paroubice agglomeration / Ústí-Chomutov agglomeration, its strategic objective and some of its specific objectives, measures and sub-measures to be financed from the OP RDE	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no/irrelevant	internal evaluator of the intermediate body	x	- the ITI strategy of the Pilsen metropolitan area / Olomouc agglomeration / Ostrava agglomeration / Hradec-Paroubice agglomeration / Ústí-Chomutov agglomeration - call of MA OP RDE - Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries of OP RDE - application for support - opinion of SC ITI	An assessment is made whether the project is in accordance with the thematic focus of the ITI strategy	YES – The project is in accordance with the thematic focus of the ITI strategy, the strategic objective and some of its specific objectives, measures and sub-measures to be financed from OP RDE.  NO – The project is not in accordance with the thematic focus of the ITI strategy, the strategic objective and some of its specific objectives, measures and sub-measures to be financed from OP RDE.
P12	efficiency/feasibility	The project is in accordance with the call of the owner of the Pilsen metropolitan area / Olomouc agglomeration / Ostrava agglomeration / Hradec-Paroubice agglomeration / Ústí-Chomutov agglomeration	exclusionary	non-correctable	yes/no	internal evaluator of the intermediate body	x	- call of the owner - call of the OP RDE - Rules for Applicants and Beneficiaries of the OP RDE - application for support - opinion of SC ITI	An assessment is made whether the project is in accordance with the call of the owner of the relevant agglomeration, particularly in relation to the following parameters: - schedule - indicators - activities - eligibility of the applicant - limits of total eligible costs set by the call	YES – the project is in accordance with the parameters of the owner's call  NO – the project is not in accordance with the parameters of the owner's call



Annex 2 Evaluation criteria for the Call "Pre-Application Research for ITI" – expert evaluation - step 1												
criticon code	Project quality aspect	criticon name	function – criteria	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – root criterion	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – root criterion	minimum score in the case of combined criteria	minimum score range of evaluators for arbitrator involvement – root criterion	Evaluator / MQ2014+	brief criticon description	main source of information	criticon description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
V1.1	feasibility	Overlap of applications for support, submitted in the calls	exclusionary	x	yes/no	x	x	Internal evaluator	An assessment is made whether or not identical applications for support have been submitted in the call for ITI projects and call outside ITI projects.	Application for support: – project entities – key activities – project description  Annexes to application for support: – feasibility study	An assessment is made whether or not identical applications for support have been submitted in the call for ITI projects and call outside ITI projects. The evaluator checks whether or not the applicant has submitted identical applications in the calls, not only in terms of the title, but also the actual content.	YES – no identical applications have been submitted in/outside an ITI call. NO – identical application have been submitted in/outside an ITI call.
V1.2	efficiency	Verification of the assessment process	exclusionary	x	yes/no/irrel evant	x	x	Internal evaluator	An assessment is made whether the evaluation process was conducted properly and correctly.	Application for support  Annexes to application for support	An assessment is made whether the evaluation process was conducted properly and correctly. An assessment is made of the overall correctness of the evaluation process, i.e. whether the formal requirements and eligibility criteria were prepared in accordance with the relevant rules and defined procedures.	YES – the formal requirements and eligibility criteria were evaluated properly and correctly. The evaluation process is in accordance with set procedures. NO – the formal requirements and eligibility criteria were not evaluated properly and correctly. The evaluation process is not in accordance with set procedures.



Code	Activity	Responsible	Start Date	End Date	Priority	Sub-activity	Activity Description	Activity Objectives	Activity Results
1	1.1	1.1.1	1.1.1.1	1.1.1.2	1.1.1.3	1.1.1.4	1.1.1.5	1.1.1.6	1.1.1.7
2	2.1	2.1.1	2.1.1.1	2.1.1.2	2.1.1.3	2.1.1.4	2.1.1.5	2.1.1.6	2.1.1.7
3	3.1	3.1.1	3.1.1.1	3.1.1.2	3.1.1.3	3.1.1.4	3.1.1.5	3.1.1.6	3.1.1.7
4	4.1	4.1.1	4.1.1.1	4.1.1.2	4.1.1.3	4.1.1.4	4.1.1.5	4.1.1.6	4.1.1.7
5	5.1	5.1.1	5.1.1.1	5.1.1.2	5.1.1.3	5.1.1.4	5.1.1.5	5.1.1.6	5.1.1.7
6	6.1	6.1.1	6.1.1.1	6.1.1.2	6.1.1.3	6.1.1.4	6.1.1.5	6.1.1.6	6.1.1.7
7	7.1	7.1.1	7.1.1.1	7.1.1.2	7.1.1.3	7.1.1.4	7.1.1.5	7.1.1.6	7.1.1.7
8	8.1	8.1.1	8.1.1.1	8.1.1.2	8.1.1.3	8.1.1.4	8.1.1.5	8.1.1.6	8.1.1.7
9	9.1	9.1.1	9.1.1.1	9.1.1.2	9.1.1.3	9.1.1.4	9.1.1.5	9.1.1.6	9.1.1.7
10	10.1	10.1.1	10.1.1.1	10.1.1.2	10.1.1.3	10.1.1.4	10.1.1.5	10.1.1.6	10.1.1.7
11	11.1	11.1.1	11.1.1.1	11.1.1.2	11.1.1.3	11.1.1.4	11.1.1.5	11.1.1.6	11.1.1.7
12	12.1	12.1.1	12.1.1.1	12.1.1.2	12.1.1.3	12.1.1.4	12.1.1.5	12.1.1.6	12.1.1.7
13	13.1	13.1.1	13.1.1.1	13.1.1.2	13.1.1.3	13.1.1.4	13.1.1.5	13.1.1.6	13.1.1.7
14	14.1	14.1.1	14.1.1.1	14.1.1.2	14.1.1.3	14.1.1.4	14.1.1.5	14.1.1.6	14.1.1.7
15	15.1	15.1.1	15.1.1.1	15.1.1.2	15.1.1.3	15.1.1.4	15.1.1.5	15.1.1.6	15.1.1.7
16	16.1	16.1.1	16.1.1.1	16.1.1.2	16.1.1.3	16.1.1.4	16.1.1.5	16.1.1.6	16.1.1.7
17	17.1	17.1.1	17.1.1.1	17.1.1.2	17.1.1.3	17.1.1.4	17.1.1.5	17.1.1.6	17.1.1.7
18	18.1	18.1.1	18.1.1.1	18.1.1.2	18.1.1.3	18.1.1.4	18.1.1.5	18.1.1.6	18.1.1.7
19	19.1	19.1.1	19.1.1.1	19.1.1.2	19.1.1.3	19.1.1.4	19.1.1.5	19.1.1.6	19.1.1.7
20	20.1	20.1.1	20.1.1.1	20.1.1.2	20.1.1.3	20.1.1.4	20.1.1.5	20.1.1.6	20.1.1.7
21	21.1	21.1.1	21.1.1.1	21.1.1.2	21.1.1.3	21.1.1.4	21.1.1.5	21.1.1.6	21.1.1.7
22	22.1	22.1.1	22.1.1.1	22.1.1.2	22.1.1.3	22.1.1.4	22.1.1.5	22.1.1.6	22.1.1.7
23	23.1	23.1.1	23.1.1.1	23.1.1.2	23.1.1.3	23.1.1.4	23.1.1.5	23.1.1.6	23.1.1.7
24	24.1	24.1.1	24.1.1.1	24.1.1.2	24.1.1.3	24.1.1.4	24.1.1.5	24.1.1.6	24.1.1.7
25	25.1	25.1.1	25.1.1.1	25.1.1.2	25.1.1.3	25.1.1.4	25.1.1.5	25.1.1.6	25.1.1.7
26	26.1	26.1.1	26.1.1.1	26.1.1.2	26.1.1.3	26.1.1.4	26.1.1.5	26.1.1.6	26.1.1.7
27	27.1	27.1.1	27.1.1.1	27.1.1.2	27.1.1.3	27.1.1.4	27.1.1.5	27.1.1.6	27.1.1.7
28	28.1	28.1.1	28.1.1.1	28.1.1.2	28.1.1.3	28.1.1.4	28.1.1.5	28.1.1.6	28.1.1.7
29	29.1	29.1.1	29.1.1.1	29.1.1.2	29.1.1.3	29.1.1.4	29.1.1.5	29.1.1.6	29.1.1.7
30	30.1	30.1.1	30.1.1.1	30.1.1.2	30.1.1.3	30.1.1.4	30.1.1.5	30.1.1.6	30.1.1.7
31	31.1	31.1.1	31.1.1.1	31.1.1.2	31.1.1.3	31.1.1.4	31.1.1.5	31.1.1.6	31.1.1.7
32	32.1	32.1.1	32.1.1.1	32.1.1.2	32.1.1.3	32.1.1.4	32.1.1.5	32.1.1.6	32.1.1.7
33	33.1	33.1.1	33.1.1.1	33.1.1.2	33.1.1.3	33.1.1.4	33.1.1.5	33.1.1.6	33.1.1.7
34	34.1	34.1.1	34.1.1.1	34.1.1.2	34.1.1.3	34.1.1.4	34.1.1.5	34.1.1.6	34.1.1.7
35	35.1	35.1.1	35.1.1.1	35.1.1.2	35.1.1.3	35.1.1.4	35.1.1.5	35.1.1.6	35.1.1.7
36	36.1	36.1.1	36.1.1.1	36.1.1.2	36.1.1.3	36.1.1.4	36.1.1.5	36.1.1.6	36.1.1.7
37	37.1	37.1.1	37.1.1.1	37.1.1.2	37.1.1.3	37.1.1.4	37.1.1.5	37.1.1.6	37.1.1.7
38	38.1	38.1.1	38.1.1.1	38.1.1.2	38.1.1.3	38.1.1.4	38.1.1.5	38.1.1.6	38.1.1.7
39	39.1	39.1.1	39.1.1.1	39.1.1.2	39.1.1.3	39.1.1.4	39.1.1.5	39.1.1.6	39.1.1.7
40	40.1	40.1.1	40.1.1.1	40.1.1.2	40.1.1.3	40.1.1.4	40.1.1.5	40.1.1.6	40.1.1.7
41	41.1	41.1.1	41.1.1.1	41.1.1.2	41.1.1.3	41.1.1.4	41.1.1.5	41.1.1.6	41.1.1.7
42	42.1	42.1.1	42.1.1.1	42.1.1.2	42.1.1.3	42.1.1.4	42.1.1.5	42.1.1.6	42.1.1.7
43	43.1	43.1.1	43.1.1.1	43.1.1.2	43.1.1.3	43.1.1.4	43.1.1.5	43.1.1.6	43.1.1.7
44	44.1	44.1.1	44.1.1.1	44.1.1.2	44.1.1.3	44.1.1.4	44.1.1.5	44.1.1.6	44.1.1.7
45	45.1	45.1.1	45.1.1.1	45.1.1.2	45.1.1.3	45.1.1.4	45.1.1.5	45.1.1.6	45.1.1.7
46	46.1	46.1.1	46.1.1.1	46.1.1.2	46.1.1.3	46.1.1.4	46.1.1.5	46.1.1.6	46.1.1.7
47	47.1	47.1.1	47.1.1.1	47.1.1.2	47.1.1.3	47.1.1.4	47.1.1.5	47.1.1.6	47.1.1.7
48	48.1	48.1.1	48.1.1.1	48.1.1.2	48.1.1.3	48.1.1.4	48.1.1.5	48.1.1.6	48.1.1.7
49	49.1	49.1.1	49.1.1.1	49.1.1.2	49.1.1.3	49.1.1.4	49.1.1.5	49.1.1.6	49.1.1.7
50	50.1	50.1.1	50.1.1.1	50.1.1.2	50.1.1.3	50.1.1.4	50.1.1.5	50.1.1.6	50.1.1.7



Annex 2 Final verification of eligibility of the Call 'Pre-Application Research for ITI' – only relevant for ITI projects													
criticon code	Project quality aspect	criticon name	function – criteria	correctable / non-correctable	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – root criterion	evaluation method (yes/no, score) – criterion	minimum score in the case of combined criteria	minimum score range of evaluators for arbitrator involvement – root criterion	Evaluator / MCoSUs*	brief criterion description	main source of information	criticon description	instructions for evaluators/sub-scales
21.1	efficiency	Final verification of expenditure eligibility	exclusionary	non-correctable	x	yes/no	x	x	internal evaluator	For each ITI project, an assessment is made of whether it is in accordance with the operational programme and meets the expenditure eligibility rules.	Application for support Annexes to application for support	For each ITI project, an assessment is made of whether it is in accordance with the operational programme and meets the expenditure eligibility rules.  The evaluator may state that the project is or is not eligible for funding or is eligible with an objection (i.e. it only meets certain conditions, e.g. the budget is modified, an ineligible item of expenditure is excluded, etc.)	The evaluator assesses compliance with the programme and expenditure eligibility: YES – the project is in compliance with the programme and the expenditure is eligible for funding. NO – the project is not in compliance with the programme and/or the expenditure is not eligible for funding.
21.2	efficiency	Verification of the assessment process	exclusionary	non-correctable	x	yes/no	x	x	internal evaluator	An assessment is made whether the substantive evaluation process was conducted properly and correctly.	Application for support Annexes to application for support	An assessment is made whether the substantive evaluation process was conducted properly and correctly. An assessment is made of the overall correctness of the substantive evaluation process, i.e. whether the opinion was prepared in accordance with the relevant rules and defined procedures.	YES – substantive evaluation process was conducted properly and correctly, the opinion has been prepared in accordance with the rules. NO – substantive evaluation process was not conducted properly and correctly, the opinion has not been prepared in accordance with the rules.