

First call for proposals**Assessment grid of the project proposal submitted in the framework of
Priority Axis No 2, Specific Objective 2.4****No 134 - SMARTMOBAIR – Smart Mobility in Adriatic Ionian Region Urban Areas****Summary of the project proposal (as from section A.1 of the application form –
copied and pasted)**

The SMARTMOBAIR project addresses the common challenge of traffic congestion and air pollution in the Adriatic-Ionian region, hindering the achievement of climate neutrality goals. Through a transnational approach, the project aims to enhance sustainable and smart urban mobility by strengthening territorial collaboration to support the deployment of intelligent transport system solutions in 6 pilot territories and foster their uptake in other Adriatic Ionian cities and territories. The main barriers to a large-scale deployment of intelligent transport technologies and systems and the launch of new smart mobility services lie on a lack of knowledge and understanding of the new technologies and the implications of their introduction both on the mobility system and on the mobility management systems. Another issue is that these technologies have been usually studied and tested in contexts quite different from the Adriatic Ionian Region (AIR) and their introduction in this area requires a process of adaptation and testing.

The overall objective is to overcome these barriers and establish a joint approach for identification, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of ICT solutions able to respond to specific territorial mobility needs. This will lead to the development and implementation of coordinated actions tailored to specific territorial peculiarities, resulting in enhanced urban mobility. The project aims to jointly test and validate the effectiveness of 6 intelligent transport system solutions in addressing mobility challenges, introducing clean and smart mobility services, and improving traffic flow management in functional urban areas.

The main outputs of the project include enhanced collaboration and coordination among 16 organizations (SMARTMOBAIR cooperation network) and validated intelligent transport system solutions (SMARTMOBAIR smart mobility pilot actions). These outputs will benefit the partner territories, contributing to improved infrastructure use, deployment of new mobility services, and smart management of traffic flows, at the same time improving existing mobility-related plans and strategies. Expertise in new technologies deployment will be acquired, fostering policy learning and transferability of project results. The main beneficiaries of these results will be primarily cities and mobility service providers, but other beneficiaries will be also provincial and regional authorities, companies operating in the ICT and mobility sectors and the benefits will impact the population at large.

SMARTMOBAIR capitalizes and builds up on the results of several previous projects related to urban mobility and intelligent transport systems as well as on sound methodologies already successfully implemented to disseminate and achieve project results capitalization. The project adopts a transnational approach to fully leverage the opportunities offered by innovative intelligent transport

system solutions. This approach allows for sharing experiences, knowledge, and best practices among partners, optimizing the impact on both the involved cities and the wider Adriatic-Ionian region. The project recognizes that traffic congestion and air pollution are interconnected challenges that transcend administrative boundaries, requiring a collaborative and coordinated effort.

What sets the SMARTMOBAIR project apart is its focus on the implementation and validation of smart mobility and ITS solutions in pilot territories through the design of a monitoring and evaluation framework for better exploitation of ICT technologies and evidence-based data, promoting the adoption of a data-driven mobility decision-making process.

Last but not least, by introducing new smart mobility services and enhancing traffic flow management, the project aims to make a significant change in the current situation. It contributes to the implementation of the European Green Deal and the EUSAIR Strategy, promoting sustainable urban mobility and facilitating the transition towards zero carbon emissions.

Project initial total eligible budget (in EUR)	<i>Out of which: INTERREG Funds</i>
EUR 1,716,282.00	EUR 1,458,839.70

Partners involved:

Project partner No	Partner name	Abbreviation	Total INTERREG budget	Total budget	Country
1	Area Science Park	AREA	214,744.00	252,640.00	Italia (IT)
2	Azienda Provinciale Trasporti S.p.A.	APT	109,264.95	128,547.00	Italia (IT)
3	Municipality of Koper	MOK	104,958.00	123,480.00	Slovenija (SI)
4	CIVINET CY-EL SECRETARIAT NPO	CIVINET	192,227.50	226,150.00	Elláda (EL)
5	Municipality of Rethymno	RETHYMNO	106,632.50	125,450.00	Elláda (EL)
6	Innovation Center of the Faculty of Mechanical Engineering Belgrade – ICMF	ICMF	146,404.00	172,240.00	Serbia (RS)
7	City of Nis	CoN	103,721.25	122,025.00	Serbia (RS)
8	Sarajevo Economic Region Development Agency SERDA	SERDA	150,450.00	177,000.00	Bosnia and Herzegovina (BA)
9	Municipality of Novo Sarajevo	NSARAJ	102,637.50	120,750.00	Bosnia and Herzegovina (BA)
10	Albanian Institute of Transport	AIT	128,137.50	150,750.00	Shqipëria (AL)
	REGIONAL COUNCIL OF SHKODRA	RCSH	99,662.50	117,250.00	Shqipëria (AL)
	Albanian Institute of Transport		1,458,839.70	1,716,282.00	

Overview of the overall final score:

		Attributed scores Assessor 1	Attributed scores Assessor 2	Attributed scores Average – Final score
Strategic criteria	Minimum score: 36/60	45/60	46/60	45,5/60
Operational criteria	Minimum score: 30/50	34/50	30/50	32/50
	TOTAL	79/110	76/110	77,5/110

Quality assessment grid Assessor 1

Operational criteria

	STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT	
	Relevance	
1.a	<p>Is the need for the proposed project well justified, reasonable and well explained: does the proposal address a common territorial challenge of the Programme or a joint territorial asset?</p> <p>Is the project proposal relevant in relation to the targeted programme specific objective and the expected result?</p>	
	<p><i>Please use “-”, “+”, or “±” in each sentence to highlight positive/negative/neutral statements. Symbols must be consistent with the provided statements</i></p> <p><i>+The Adriatic-Ionian region has an need for creative smart mobility solutions, as SMARTMOBAIR makes evident. By concentrating on sustainable urban mobility, a crucial issue for the development and environmental effect of the region, it coincides with common territorial challenges. The goals of the project align with the demands of the region, especially when it comes to improving sustainable transportation and urban planning.</i></p> <p><i>+The proposal is relevant to the programme's specific objectives. It aims to improve sustainable urban mobility, which directly contributes to the overarching goals of the ADRION Programme in fostering sustainable and integrated regional development. The project's focus on smart mobility solutions and integration with local urban planning ensures its alignment with the expected results of the programme.</i></p>	4
1.b	<p>Does the project proposal clearly contribute to the relevant policy framework at different levels?</p> <p>Does the project clearly and consistently contribute to specified EUSAIR macro-regional strategy objectives and actions?</p> <p>Is the proposal of relevance to the territory of the programme: will the programme area benefit?</p> <p>Is the project relevant for the territorial needs in IPA participating countries to ensure the transfer of knowledge and build capacity in the implementation of EU policies and practices?</p>	

	<p>+SMARTMOBAIR exhibits a high degree of congruence with a number of policy frameworks, including strategies and policies of the European Union, namely those concerning urban mobility, environmental sustainability, and regional development. For instance: European Green Deal Strategy, Regional and National Level Policy. The project's importance at many policy levels is reinforced by its methodology and techniques, which align with the EUSAIR macro-regional plan.</p> <p>+The project is in line with the goals of EUSAIR, especially with Pillar 2: 'Connecting the region' on enhancing connectivity and multimodality within the region, regard to promoting intelligent and sustainable transportation systems in the Adriatic-Ionian region. It immediately supports EUSAIR's plan for a more connected and ecologically conscious area with its focus on cutting-edge mobility solutions and environmental sustainability.</p> <p>+ SMARTMOBAIR is relevant to the territory of the ADRION Programme, the focus on improving urban mobility and reducing environmental impact through smart solutions addresses specific territorial challenges and needs, ensuring broad benefits across the programme area.</p> <p>-Regarding the transfer of knowledge and build capacity in the implementation of EU policies and practices there is not an explicit mention in the application form. This suggests that while the project may encompass various elements related to sustainable urban mobility and smart transportation solutions, it does not directly indicate how it plans to facilitate the dissemination of knowledge or enhance the capabilities of stakeholders.</p>	3
1.c	<p>How does the proposal contribute to the respect of horizontal principles?</p> <p>How does the project position itself with regard to the pre-defined environmental topics and the “do not significant harm” principle?</p>	
	<p>+SMARTMOBAIR advocates non-discrimination and sustainable development as horizontal values. Because of its actions and outcomes, it upholds the "do no significant harm" concept and promotes sustainable development, especially in metropolitan settings. Through its conception and execution, the project advances equity and inclusivity.</p>	4
1.d	<p>Does the proposal build on existing practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposal demonstrate new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/programme area/participating countries? - Does the proposal adapt and implement already developed solutions? - Does the proposal introduce a completely approach? <p>Is the proposal making use of synergies with other projects or initiatives?</p>	

	<p>+The project demonstrates innovation in proposing new solutions for urban mobility, going beyond existing practices in the region. It effectively adapts and implements developed solutions while introducing novel approaches. This blend of innovation and adaptation is key to the project's potential success.</p> <p>+ SMARTMOBAIR efficiently makes use of alliances with ongoing and previous EU and other projects LOCATIONS (Interreg MED), AdriGov Adriatic Governance Operational Plan (IPA Adriatic), SMILE (ADRION). It ensures increased value and resource efficiency by building on existing knowledge and avoiding duplication of effort.</p>	4
	Intervention logic	
2.a	Is the proposal's intervention logic (i.e., project specific objectives, outputs and expected results) clearly defined and consistent?	
	<i>+SMARTMOBAIR's specific objectives, outputs, and expected results are coherently defined and consistent throughout the project. The logical framework shows a strong connection between activities, outputs, and results, as well as a clear grasp of the procedures necessary to attain the desired goals.</i>	4
2.b	<p>Are project outputs and results that contribute to Programme indicators realistic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it possible to achieve them with the given resources – i.e., time, partners, budget -? - Is it possible to reach them with the chosen approach? - Are they realistic based on the quantification provided)? 	
	<i>±The project's outputs and results contributing to the Programme indicators appear to be realistically achievable given the resources, time, partners, and budget provided. The approach chosen for achieving these results is well thought out and appears feasible based on the quantification provided. However, some activities foreseen within WP2 Testing smart mobility & ITS solutions in Adriatic-Ionian territories are going to be implementing in the final months and it could affect the project's ability to meet its final objectives within the planned timeframe.</i>	3
2.c	Do the project main outputs clearly link to the programme output and results indicators? Do the project main outputs clearly link to programme specific objectives and the project specific objectives?	
	<i>+The main outputs of the project are well-connected to the programme output and results indicators. This alignment suggests a strong understanding of the programme's objectives and a strategic approach to ensuring that the project contributes effectively to the overall goals of the programme.</i>	5

2.d	Does the project proposal clearly conceptualise the ownership/durability, long lasting effects and transferability of outputs and results? Is financial, institutional, political sustainability ensured?	
	<i>±SMARTMOBAIR demonstrates a robust conceptualization of the ownership, durability, long-lasting effects, and transferability of outputs and results. The project outlines clear strategies for ensuring the sustainability and continuation of benefits beyond the project's lifespan, however the project does not clearly outline how the project will ensure ongoing financial support beyond the initial funding period. Moreover, the absence of evidence regarding political sustainability does not ensure a lasting impact of the project results</i>	3
	Partnership	
3.a	Is the partnership composition, including Associated Partners, relevant and strategic for the proposed project? Is it balanced with respect to the participating countries, the addressed sectors and levels? Is it consistent in size and composition with the proposed activities?	
	<i>+The partnership composition, including associated partners, appears to be relevant and strategic for the proposed project. The consortium includes a diverse range of organizations from various sectors, which aligns well with the project's multi-disciplinary approach to addressing sustainable and smart urban mobility.</i> <i>+The project presents a balanced partnership in terms of participating countries and the addressed sectors. It includes partners from different geographical areas within the Adriatic-Ionian region, ensuring a broad representation of territorial challenges and solutions. The sectors addressed, including urban mobility, technology, and environmental sustainability, are well-represented among the partners.</i> <i>+The size and composition of the partnership are consistent with the proposed activities. Each partner brings specific expertise and resources that contribute to the overall objectives of the project, ensuring a comprehensive approach to tackling the identified challenges.</i>	4
3.b	Does the lead partner have sufficient experience in the thematic field concerned and is it competent enough having the capacity to manage a complex transnational cooperation project under ETC? Do all project partners have competence and proven experience, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?	
	<i>+The lead partner has demonstrated sufficient experience in the thematic field of sustainable urban mobility and smart transportation solutions. They possess the necessary competence and capacity to manage a complex transnational cooperation project, as evidenced by their background in similar projects and their proposed role in SMARTMOBAIR.</i>	4

	<i>+All project partners exhibit the required competence and proven experience to implement the project effectively. Their qualifications, as well as their financial and human resources, align with the project's needs. Each partner's role is clearly defined, with a focus on leveraging their specific strengths and experiences.</i>	
	Cooperation character	
4.a	Does the partnership reflect the transnational cooperation approach? Does the transnational co-operation have a significant added value for the partners and the territories involved?	
	<i>+SMARTMOBAIR exhibits a strong and effective transnational cooperation approach, with clearly defined roles and responsibilities among partners, a robust project management structure, and a dynamic communication strategy. These elements are crucial for the successful implementation and impact of the project.</i>	4
4.b	Do all partners play a defined role in the partnership, in line with the compulsory and optional ways of co-operation described? Are tasks and roles for each project partner clearly defined? Is the distribution of tasks and responsibilities of project partners appropriate?	
	<i>+ The project involves joint development, implementation, staffing, and financing, with clear coordination led by the Lead Partner (LP). This structure indicates that all partners have defined roles which align with the necessary cooperative approach for a transnational project</i> <i>+ The tasks and roles of each project partner are clearly defined. The project management structure, including the Steering Committee (SC), the Technical Committee (TC), and Work Package Leaders (WPLs), specifies the responsibilities and contributions of each partner. This clarity supports effective coordination and implementation of the project's objectives</i> <i>+The distribution of tasks and responsibilities among the project partners appears to be appropriate and well-organized. Each partner is assigned roles based on their expertise and capacity, ensuring a balanced contribution to the project. The LP, AREA, oversees the overall administrative, financial, and technical management, while other partners are responsible for specific work packages, tasks, and thematic areas.</i>	4

	OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT	
	Workplan	

5.a	Is the overall approach suitable to obtain the planned outputs and results?	
	<i>±The effectiveness of the overall approach in achieving the planned outputs and results is contingent on several factors including the adequacy of resources and risk management strategies. However, some activities foreseen within WP2 Testing smart mobility & ITS solutions in Adriatic-Ionian territories are not well described and are going to be implementing in the final months and it could affect the project's ability to meet its final objectives within the planned timeframe.</i>	3
5.b	Are the work plan and timing of activities, deliverables and outputs realistic, consistent and transparent? Are the proposed financial and human resources appropriate to implement the project?	
	<i>±The work plan and timing of activities, deliverables, and outputs are laid out with clear objectives and deliverables, including specific periods for delivery which indicates a structured and transparent approach. However, a significant number of activities and deliverables, such as the action plans for upscaling of pilot actions (D.2.5.1), the SMARTMOBAIR result booklet (D.2.6.1), the final video (D.2.6.2), and the scientific publication (D.2.6.3), are scheduled for completion in Period 6 (Months 31-36). This concentration of deliverables towards the end of the project presents a risk if there are delays or if the earlier phases of the project take longer than expected.</i>	3
5.c	Will the target groups, the partners, and the stakeholders benefit from the co-operation?	
	<i>+ Given the multifaceted nature of the challenges addressed and the involvement of various levels of governance and stakeholders, the benefits to target groups, partners, and stakeholders appear to be significant and multifaceted. The project's emphasis on smart and transnational approaches, capacity building, and innovative solutions suggests a robust framework for addressing the identified challenges.</i>	4
	Management	
6.a	Does the management approach show good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation? Is the proposed project management structure effective? Are the internal communication and management structures appropriate to ensure a smooth co-operation within the partnership? To which extent the need for engaging external expertise is justified (with specific reflection on partnership expertise)?	
	<i>+ Overall, the management approach of the SMARTMOBAIR project demonstrates good potential for effective coordination, risk mitigation, and internal communication. The project has set up a structured and layered management system that is likely to support a sound project management environment.</i>	4

Communication		
7.a	<p>Are communication activities planned in the work plan and are they relevant for achieving communication objectives? Are the communication activities and deliverables appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p> <p>Will the proposed communication activities lead to sufficient visibility of the project among relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p>	
	<p><i>+Overall, the communication activities are well-planned and appear appropriate for reaching the relevant target groups and stakeholders. The activities should lead to sufficient visibility of the project among these groups, provided they are executed as planned and adapt to any arising opportunities or challenges during the project's lifecycle.</i></p>	4
7.b	<p>Are the capitalization activities foreseen in the workplan? If, yes, are these activities ensuring that the project outputs and results are effectively disseminated and used?</p>	
	<p><i>+The project does indeed foresee capitalization activities. CIVINET, as one of the project partners, will be responsible for leading the final capitalization event where cities of the ADRION area will be invited to sign a common declaration and disseminate project results in their areas. Additionally, CIVINET will lead activities that have the scope of maximizing project visibility and the dissemination of results for each work package.</i></p>	4
Budget		
8.a	<p>To which extent the presented budget is transparent and include sufficient details per partner and per cost category?</p> <p>Is the application of simplified cost options (SCOs) appropriate and in line with the programme rules?</p>	
	<p><i>±The budget for the SMARTMOBAIR project appears to be transparent and provides details per partner and per cost category. However, more details are required in order to be properly evaluated.</i></p>	3
8.b	<p><i>To which extent resources planned by the project partners are adequate (in terms of quantity and quality) and reflects market prices?</i></p>	
	<p><i>-Since partnership has not provided any standard rates or benchmarks, it cannot be evaluated whether the cost allocations reflect market prices.</i></p>	1
8.c	<p>To which extent project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and project outputs?</p> <p>Is distribution of budget per period in line with workplan?</p>	

	<i>± In overall, the project budget seems to be proportional to the work plan and project outputs however, setting a target of around 700.000€ during the first project life, is an ambitious goal for the initial phase of the project. As the first year of a project often involves setting up structures and initiating activities.</i>	3
8.d	<p>Is the financial allocation per cost category in line with the programme rules?</p> <p>To which extent the budget allocated to staff and external expertise is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic?</p> <p>To which extent the budget allocated to pilot actions and equipment (if applicable) is realistic and in line with the project content?</p>	
	<i>- While the overall budget structure appears to align with d the project content, the lack of detailed descriptions limits a comprehensive assessment of the realism of the costs. It is advisable for the partnership to provide more detailed justifications and descriptions, especially for external expertise services and equipment costs, to ensure full transparency.</i>	2

Quality assessment grid Assessor 2

	STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT	
	Relevance	
1.a	<p>Is the need for the proposed project well justified, reasonable and well explained: does the proposal address a common territorial challenge of the Programme or a joint territorial asset?</p> <p>Is the project proposal relevant in relation to the targeted programme specific objective and the expected result?</p>	4
	<p>+ The need and challenges that the project tries to tackle is connected with the programme SO 2.4 “Supporting sustainable multimodal urban mobility” and the expected result.</p> <p>+The common territorial challenge is the tackling of the traffic congestion and air pollution that is made harder due to the fact that road transport is the main transportation means in the area, most of the IPA Adrion coastal areas face high peaks of congestion and pollution during tourist season and in relation to commuting needs within functional urban areas.</p> <p>+/-The needs are well justified and well explained although the solutions that will be adopted are limited in some of the partners. Due to the fact that the pilot actions are smart mobility the budget of the project could cover a bigger number of applications.</p> <p>+The proposal is full in line with the specific objective 2.4 as well as the expected results with 16 organizations to be cooperated as well as a number of pilot actions to be implemented validated intelligent transport system solutions.</p>	
1.b	<p>Does the project proposal clearly contribute to the relevant policy framework at different levels?</p> <p>Does the project clearly and consistently contribute to specified EUSAIR macro-regional strategy objectives and actions?</p> <p>Is the proposal of relevance to the territory of the programme: will the programme area benefit?</p>	3

	Is the project relevant for the territorial needs in IPA participating countries to ensure the transfer of knowledge and build capacity in the implementation of EU policies and practices?	
	<p>+ The project clearly is linked with EYSAIR macroregional strategy and the pillar 2 . Moreover it mentions the contribution in the European Green Deal Strategy explaining how the project contributes.</p> <p>+It is clear that all the project area will benefit from the implementation of the outputs</p> <p>-National policies and strategies are not taken into consideration</p> <p>-There are no references for the transfer of knowledge and build capacity in the implementation of EU policies and practices for the IPA countries</p>	
1.c	<p>How does the proposal contribute to the respect of horizontal principles?</p> <p>How does the project position itself with regard to the pre-defined environmental topics and the “do not significant harm” principle?</p>	5
	<p>+The project has positive effect to the horizontal principles such as:</p> <p>Sustainable development, Equal Opportunities and non-discrimination, Equality between men and women. In all the cases is explained the measures that will be taken in order it will ensure the respect of the horizontal principles</p>	
1.d	<p>Does the proposal build on existing practices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does the proposal demonstrate new solutions that go beyond the existing practice in the sector/programme area/participating countries? - Does the proposal adapt and implement already developed solutions? - Does the proposal introduce a completely approach? <p>Is the proposal making use of synergies with other projects or initiatives?</p>	3
	<p>+/-The project presents a detailed list of past and presents projects that their outputs will be used. However no in all the cases explain how these synergies will be built.</p> <p>+All the partners are experienced in EU relevant projects.</p> <p>+/-The project will capitalize and build up on several technical deliverables, accrued experience and related knowledge and lessons learned all partners had the opportunity to develop in the framework</p>	

	of previous projects related to smart mobility and ITS solutions from Interreg Adrion and Interreg MED programmes. However there are general references.	
	Intervention logic	
2.a	Is the proposal's intervention logic (i.e., project specific objectives, outputs and expected results) clearly defined and consistent?	4
	<p>+The intervention logic of the project is fully concrete , analytical and the outputs and the results are realistic.</p> <p>+The main outputs are clearly described</p> <p>infrastructural improvement through the installation of equipment, the installation of new software, the development of safe walking/cycling maps ,the creation of the Sustainable Transnational Mobility Plan; the creation of Local Mobility Plans, the delivery of the Project communication Strategy</p> <p>+The project is conceived for the benefit of territorial context in 6 Countries by involving and addressing organizations, NGOs, and other local citizens' communities; local public authorities, as well as the general public and tourists.</p> <p>-The only negative issue is the result indicators that includes only 10 organizations and 5 solutions although the partners are 16 and the pilot actions are 6.</p>	
2.b	<p>Are project outputs and results that contribute to Programme indicators realistic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is it possible to achieve them with the given resources – i.e., time, partners, budget -? - Is it possible to reach them with the chosen approach? - Are they realistic based on the quantification provided)? 	3
	<p>+The project main outputs and results are consistent with the linked to the selected Programme output and result indicators.</p> <p>-Due to the fact that the capacity building of the staff of some partners are not mentioned as well as the necessary licenses are not referred we cannot evaluate the smooth activation of the project.</p> <p>- The result indicator RCR84_2.4: Organisations cooperating across borders after project completion is 10 although the partners are 16 with the associated partners</p>	

	<p>- The result indicator RCR104_2.4: Solutions taken up or up-scaled is 5 although pilot actions are 6 organisations The budget is overestimated for some of the deliverables and partners (I will further explain to the budget criteria)</p> <p>-The pilot actions will be started on 5th period. It is very late.</p>	
2.c	<p>Do the project main outputs clearly link to the programme output and results indicators? Do the project main outputs clearly link to programme specific objectives and the project specific objectives?</p>	5
	<p>+Yes the chosen output and result indicators are fully linked with those that described in the programme specific objective</p>	
2.d	<p>Does the project proposal clearly conceptualise the ownership/durability, long lasting effects and transferability of outputs and results? Is financial, institutional, political sustainability ensured?</p>	2
	<p>-For ensuring sustainability and durability there are only general references. What is missing is the official commitments of the partnership. Therefore the sustainability is under risk.</p> <p>+/- The tranferability of project outputs and results to other organizations, regions and countries will be ensured by the dissemination activities carried out with the project as well as with the final capitalization event. There are no specific references that could ensure it</p>	
	Partnership	
3.a	<p>Is the partnership composition, including Associated Partners, relevant and strategic for the proposed project?</p> <p>Is it balanced with respect to the participating countries, the addressed sectors and levels?</p> <p>Is it consistent in size and composition with the proposed activities?</p>	4
	<p>+The partnership consists of 11 partners 6 from ERDF and 5 IPA and 6 in total countries. This means the geographical area that cover is big and the participating countries is in balanceed.</p> <p>+The composition seems to be balanced in terms of the countries participation.</p>	

	<p>+The partnership consists of institutional and technical partners and their outputs/tasks are defined and are relevant with their competences.</p> <p>-However, there are not references for all the partners for their capacity (human/financial).</p>	
3.b	<p>Does the lead partner have sufficient experience in the thematic field concerned and is it competent enough having the capacity to manage a complex transnational cooperation project under ETC?</p> <p>Do all project partners have competence and proven experience, as well as the necessary capacity to implement the project (financial, human resources, etc.)?</p>	4
	<p>+Indeed for all the partners mentioned their experience in EU projects. For the LP is proved the experience in the field of the management.</p> <p>+/-As far as the human resources and their capacity (the permanent staff that will be involved) there are no references almost for all the partners</p> <p>+The most of them are experienced in transnational programmes.</p> <p>-The roles and tasks of the partners are defined. However, there are not references for their capacity (human/financial) .</p>	
	Cooperation character	
4.a	<p>Does the partnership reflect the transnational cooperation approach?</p> <p>Does the transnational co-operation have a significant added value for the partners and the territories involved?</p>	5
	<p>+Indeed the partnership clearly demonstrate the transnational cooperation approach of the problem explaining how the CO2 emissions is a transnational problem and how the adoption of ITS solutions can support the transition to a carbon free and smart mobility that can make the cities healthier and more accessible.</p> <p>+A common new methodology will be implemented embodied in shared guidelines that are the result of a comparative analysis of the different legislative, economic and physical context of the IPA Adriatic programme countries.</p> <p>+The benefit of all the partners is ensured and very well analyzed.</p> <p>+The added value of the implementation of the project will be big due to the high number of countries that participate and due to the impact to several categories of population (local public authorities, general public etc)</p>	

4.b	<p>Do all partners play a defined role in the partnership, in line with the compulsory and optional ways of co-operation described?</p> <p>Are tasks and roles for each project partner clearly defined? Is the distribution of tasks and responsibilities of project partners appropriate?</p>	4
	<p>+The ways of cooperation are clearly described and consistent.</p> <p>+The project is designed in close cooperation of all project partners. During the preparation and in the future in the implementation. preparation, partners have jointly planned and developed project activities.</p> <p>+Joint development</p> <p>+Joint implementation,</p> <p>+Joint financing</p> <p>+The distribution of tasks and budget between partners are directly linked with the activities and work packages</p> <p>+ Joint staffing</p> <p>-All the ways of cooperation are fully explained however it is referred that the LP together with PP4 and PP6 are responsible for coordinating project management. It is no normal that the LP is not the one and only competed for the management</p>	

	OPERATIONAL ASSESSMENT	
	Workplan	
5.a	Is the overall approach suitable to obtain the planned outputs and results?	3
	<p>The work plan is built on 2 work packages:</p> <p>WP1 - Enabling the uptake of smart mobility & ITS solutions in Adriatic-Ionian territories</p> <p>WP2 - Testing smart mobility & ITS solutions in Adriatic-Ionian territories</p> <p>+All the deliverables are clearly organized and distributed in the PP's .</p> <p>+The intervention logic of the project are in full alignment</p>	

5.b	Are the work plan and timing of activities, deliverables and outputs realistic, consistent and transparent? Are the proposed financial and human resources appropriate to implement the project?	3
	<p>+Project's work plan and timing of activities follow a logic sequence and seem to be realistic in order to achieve the foreseen activities and outputs.</p> <p>-The only doubt is that the pilot actions will be started on 5th period. There are no references for the technical requirements of the mobile pilot solutions and the technical licences that demanded for the on time activation of the project.</p> <p>+Partner's tasks were assigned according to their competences and skills in the topics addressed by the project. There are not any inconsistencies concerning partners role.</p> <p>-All the partners were involved in projects have the capacity to address the identified goals. However not all give us the information of their capacity in terms of human resources</p>	
5.c	Will the target groups, the partners, and the stakeholders benefit from the co-operation?	4
	<p>+All the PP's play a defined role in the partnership and receive benefit from the implementation of the project.</p> <p>+The project allows to all beneficiaries a kind of target to experience, shape and learn from the process and offer them the awareness raising for the use and benefits of sustainable transport and healthier cities.</p>	
Management		
6.a	<p>Does the management approach show good potential to secure a sound project management, coordination and risk mitigation?</p> <p>Is the proposed project management structure effective? Are the internal communication and management structures appropriate to ensure a smooth co-operation within the partnership?</p> <p>To which extent the need for engaging external expertise is justified (with specific reflection on partnership expertise)?</p>	3
	<p>+Management procedures are clearly described analytically and the internal communication among the partners is also ensured in a cooperative way.</p> <p>+A steering committee will be set up and their work plan will be based in the definition of a monitoring plan and relative set of indicators, quarterly report highlighting the progress of the work and any</p>	

	<p>indications for corrective measures, verification of the harmonization of project documents and materials and their internal coherence, final report with description of the learned lesson, recommendations for the future and finally the preparation of the draft final document (Memorandum of Understanding) signed by the partnership.</p> <p>-The budget dedicated to the staff and the external expertise for LP, PP4 , PP6 is huge. Moreover, it is not clear which activities will be implemented by their own resources and which from the external experts.</p>	
	Communication	
7.a	<p>Are communication activities planned in the work plan and are they relevant for achieving communication objectives? Are the communication activities and deliverables appropriate to reach the relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p> <p>Will the proposed communication activities lead to sufficient visibility of the project among relevant target groups and stakeholders?</p>	3
	<p>+The communication activities are linked to the foreseen outputs of the projects.</p> <p>+ The partner PP4-CIVINET has taken on the role of communication in the project considering its extensive experience in the field of communication, through its networks, actions and projects both at National and European level.</p> <p>+To achieve the project's objectives, all partners will be invited to contribute by providing feedback, by sharing the communication material in their area of action and by producing the necessary material themselves, such as interviews, videos of the pilot actions, articles, etc.</p> <p>- The project communication is not concentrated in 1 wp but in both Work Packages</p> <p>-The reference for the time schedule of the communication strategy is missing</p>	
7.b	<p>Are the capitalization activities foreseen in the workplan? If, yes, are these activities ensuring that the project outputs and results are effectively disseminated and used?</p>	4
	+A final capitalization event is foreseen.	
	Budget	
8.a	<p>To which extent the presented budget is transparent and include sufficient details per partner and per cost category?</p> <p>Is the application of simplified cost options (SCOs) appropriate and in line with the programme rules?</p>	3

	<p>-The budget of equipment and external expertise is not analysed. Therefore, we couldn't evaluate how realistic it is.</p> <p>-Also the budget of PP4,6,10 is overestimated</p> <p>+The simplified cost is appropriate and in line with the program rules.</p> <p>-The budget for the equipment didn't analysed in quantities and unit rates in some cases and seems a little bit overestimated</p> <p>-The budget of external expertise for the LP and PP3 is unjustified and overestimated</p>	
8.b	To which extent resources planned by the project partners are adequate (in terms of quantity and quality) and reflects market prices?	2
	-The budget for the equipment didn't analysed in quantities and unit rates in some cases and seems a little bit overestimated	
8.c	To which extent project budget is proportionate to the proposed work plan and project outputs? Is distribution of budget per period in line with workplan?	3
	<p>+In general the budget could be consider as good value for money taking into account the number of partners and the number of the outputs</p> <p>+/-The distributed budget is coherent among partners and it is in line with the work plan (work packages), apart from PP4 that is competence only for communication activities</p>	
8.d	<p>Is the financial allocation per cost category in line with the programme rules?</p> <p>To which extent the budget allocated to staff and external expertise is in line with the project content and the costs are realistic?</p> <p>To which extent the budget allocated to pilot actions and equipment (if applicable) is realistic and in line with the project content?</p>	2
	<p>-The staff cost is not realistic.</p> <p>-The external is not realistic due to the lack of analysis.</p> <p>- The budget for the equipment didn't analysed in quantities and unit rates in some cases and seems a little bit overestimated</p>	

State Aid check

The project proposal is State Aid relevant	NO
List of State Aid relevant activities and involved project partner	

Anti-fraud checks:

--

Double funding checks:

NO

Is the selected operations directly affected by a reasoned opinion by the Commission in respect of an infringement within the scope of Article 258 TFEU?

--

The project proposal is:

Approved	
Approved under conditions	X
Rejected	

Conditions for improvement

The main outputs of the project include enhanced collaboration and coordination among 16 organizations (SMARTMOBAIR cooperation network) and validated intelligent transport system solutions (SMARTMOBAIR smart mobility pilot actions). These outputs will benefit the partner territories, contributing to improved infrastructure use, deployment of new mobility services, and smart management of traffic flows, at the same time improving existing mobility-related plans and strategies. Expertise in new technologies deployment will be acquired, fostering policy learning and transferability of project results. The main beneficiaries of these results will be primarily cities and mobility service providers, but other beneficiaries will be also provincial and regional authorities, companies operating in the ICT and mobility sectors and the benefits will impact the population at large.

The conditions for improvement are:

- Work plan should be revised as significant activities are concentrated in the final months of the project's lifespan.
- The partnership should provide more detailed justifications for budget allocations, especially for external expertise services and equipment costs and if that's the case, there might be a budget cut.
- The project should explicitly address how it plans to facilitate knowledge dissemination and capacity building among stakeholders. This aspect is currently not sufficiently detailed in the application form.
- The target of around 700,000€ in the first year does not appear realistic, please revised the distribution of the budget across different periods of the project;
- The lack of comprehensive details about the budget allocation and the unjustified escalation in the budget for Project PP4 suggest implementing a reduction of 20% in the overall project budget.
- The associated partner No.4 Municipality of Staranzano (IT) has not signed the related declaration, therefore, the partner has been excluded from the project partnership. The budget of the project partner No.2 Azienda Provinciale Trasporti S.p.A. (IT) willing to support the expenditure of the associated partner No 1, should be reduced accordingly.

Proposed revised budget

Project initial total eligible budget (in EUR)	Project revised eligible budget (in EUR)	<i>Out of which: INTERREG (in EUR)</i>	Difference (in EUR and %)
1.716.282,00	1.373.025,60	1.167.071,76	343.256,4 20%

Date: 15.12.2023