



SECTORAL OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME FOR TRANSPORT (SOPT) (2014-2020)

**GUIDELINES FOR APPLICANTS
for
CALL for OPERATION PROPOSALS**

Action 3: Accessible Transport

**Deadline for Submission of Applications:
15.02.2019**



Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	3
IMPORTANT NOTICE.....	4
1. BACKGROUND AND ABOUT THE OPERATION	5
1.1 Objectives of the Call.....	5
1.2 Types of Activities.....	6
1.3 Horizontal Issues of the SOPT.....	7
1.4 Financial Allocation	8
2. ELIGIBILITY RULES FOR THIS CALL FOR OPERATIONS PROPOSALS	8
2.1 Eligibility of Applicant and Co-Applicant(s)	8
2.2 Eligible Operations	9
2.3 Eligibility of Costs.....	10
3. HOW TO APPLY	14
3.1 Application Documents	14
3.2 Where and How to Send the Application	14
3.3 Deadline for submission of Application.....	15
3.4 Further Information on Application	15
4. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS	16
STEP 1: Opening and Administrative Checks.....	16
STEP 2: Eligibility and Compliance Checks.....	17
STEP 3: Quality and Technical Criteria.....	17
STEP 4: Additional Verifications	19
STEP 5: Notification of the Operating Structure's Decision	19
ANNEXES.....	21

ACRONYMS

ERA	: End Recipient of Assistance
ERR	: Economic Rate of Return
EU	: European Union
EUID	: Department for European Union Investments
IFI	: International Financial Institutions
ITS	: Intelligent Transport Systems
IPA	: Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance
MAAP-T	: Multi-Annual Action Programme for Turkey on Transport
MoTI	: Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
OIS	: Operation Identification Sheet
OS	: Operating Structure
PRAG	: Practical Guide to Contract Procedures for EU External Actions
SOPT	: Sectoral Operational Programme for Transport
SUMP	: Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans

IMPORTANT NOTICE

1. This is an **open call for operations** where all documents are submitted together and evaluated according to the rules set up in this Guideline document.
2. This is **not a call for grant proposals. This is an invitation to submit operations** for financial assistance where the Contracting Authority commits to procure and finance works, service and supply for the Operation Beneficiary.
3. Costs related to the preparation of these documents will be covered by the applicants and should not be involved in the operation budget.
4. Further to the evaluation of operations, specific management verifications may be exercised on site to validate assumptions of the pre-selected operations.
5. The Contracting Authority will run the procurement procedure on behalf and for the Operation Beneficiary in accordance with PRAG procedures for the EU external actions. The applicant is therefore required to include necessary timing and duration of the procurement procedure(s) of the operation considerations and assumptions.
6. Since this is not a call for grant proposal, fund allocated to the operation will not be transferred to the Operation Beneficiary's account. The Contracting Authority will make the payments to the contractors on behalf of the Operation Beneficiary's.
7. The beneficiary is required to familiarise itself with the SOPT Document available at:
Annex IV: Summary of SOPT (MAAP-T)
8. The beneficiary is advised to familiarise itself with the PRAG document (August 2018 version) available at:
http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/prag/?header_description=DEVCO+Prag+to+financial+and+contractual+procedures+applicable+to+external+actions+financed+from+the+general+budget+of+the+EU+and+from+the+11th+EDF&header_keywords=ePrag%2C+europa
9. The beneficiary shall take all necessary steps to publicise the fact that the European Union has co-financed the operation. Operations must incorporate information and communication activities designed to raise the awareness of specific or general audiences of the EU support.
10. The language of the applications will be English.

1. BACKGROUND AND ABOUT THE OPERATION

The operations under this call are funded within the framework of IPA II programme, financed from the EU budget for the years 2014-2020.

Sector Operational Programme for Transport (SOPT) is the main vehicle for channelling European Union financial support under the Instrument for Pre-Accession (IPA) to the transport sector in Turkey. The Operating Structure of the SOPT is the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure (MoTI) Department for European Union Investments (EUID).

The overall objective of the SOPT 2014-2020 is to contribute to economic and social development and EU integration through a competitive, accessible and sustainable transport system in Turkey, in line with EU standards.

The purpose of these guidelines is to support the potential operation beneficiaries of the SOPT for designing sound operations to be funded by IPA II.

1.1 Objectives of the Call

The overall objective of the SOPT is to contribute to economic and social development and EU integration through a competitive, accessible and sustainable transport system in Turkey, in line with EU standards.

Under this overall objective, there are five specific objectives:

1. to enhance the sustainability and safety of the national transport system,
2. improve the efficiency of the transport system,
3. promote a shift from individual to sustainable, accessible and inclusive modes of public transport at both national and urban levels,
4. to strengthen Turkey's integration to the EU in the field of transport, through a progressive alignment of the Turkish Transport sector with the EU Transport acquis,
5. to support MoTI in managing the SOPT in order to ensure that EU, national and donor development funding in Turkey's transport sector are used to best effect.

Specific objective 3 of the SOPT, mentioned above, has been adopted as the overall objective of this call which aims to promote a shift from individual transport to sustainable, accessible and inclusive modes of public transport at both national and urban levels.

Action 3 - Accessible and Inclusive Transport has been designed to achieve the following two specific objectives:

1. accessibility and inclusivity of public transport further developed at urban and national level,
2. progress towards sustainable urban public transport.

These objectives will be reached through dedicated activities **Accessible Transport (Activity**

3.1), and Urban Transport (Activity 3.2). The operations must be designed to contribute these activities.

Activity 3.1 - Accessible Transport

Activity 3.1 covers support to policy development, capacity building and the preparation and implementation of concrete accessible transport investments. This activity will focus on two specific objectives:

One is, to promote the co-operation of the government, local authorities and transport sector stakeholders (from service providers to business, public institutions, and citizens) in order to develop, test and establish, all over the country, a partnership- based model for the further planning and development of accessible public transport services. The enhanced dialogue between all players is to ensure that transport developments, both in an urban and inter-city context, are designed and implemented to best effect, in line with the requirements of the users. Such an approach will raise the quality of life for all citizens and also facilitate the cost-effectiveness of public investments in the sector.

The second objective of Activity 3.1 is, the preparation and implementation of specific investments in compliance with the EU requirements regarding the access of people with reduced mobility to public transport.

Activity 3.2 - Urban Transport:

The specific objective of Activity 3.2 is to support the elaboration of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans and finance the implementation of investments in cities.

Investments will cover public transport services as well as promoting the use of bicycles, e.g. through the extension of bicycle paths, raising awareness of the benefits of bicycle transport, encouraging use of bicycles as a transport mode, developing pedestrian areas, promotion of car-pooling, support to the mobility plans.

1.2 Types of Activities

Operations may be composed of one or more activities from those listed below. The list of activities is indicative. Its purpose is to provide guidance and direction for applicants.

Activity 3.1

- needs assessment studies to assess the current situation of accessibility of national and local transport networks,
- studies and conferences,
- works of partnership-based bodies at national and local level to ensure co-operation of stakeholders in preparing strategies and operations,
- trainings to employees working in the transport sector, (e.g. serving passengers with reduced mobility),
- reimbursable advisory services from IFIs (International Financial Institutions) (e.g. co-operation is envisaged with the World Bank with respect to institutional arrangements and the state of transport systems, as well as the review and benchmarking of international best practices),

- Improvements of the operational and managerial efficiency of transport systems,
- activities regarding accessible transport networks,
- awareness raising activities towards the mobility needs of people with reduced mobility,
- transfer of knowledge to the relevant departments of MoTI and related public administration institutions, in the planning and execution of accessible transport operations.
- preparation of studies, as well as networking with peers from the EU countries (and the EU itself). Study visits, exchanges of experience may be financed to allow Turkish stakeholders to gain practical insights into similar operations being undertaken in the European Union.
- conducting networking events involving national and international experts and stakeholders to facilitate the exchange of experiences with policy makers, experts, transport companies and NGOs from EU countries,
- establishment of platforms to enable cooperation among relevant government and municipality administrations and NGOs for implementing necessary actions for accessible transport networks.

Activity 3.2

- preparation of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP),
- investment studies,
- supply and works tenders to implement urban transport operations in cities,
- construction of bicycle friendly urban transport networks,
- development of pedestrian areas,
- promotion of car-pooling,
- awareness raising activities towards.

1.3 Horizontal Issues of the SOPT

Applicants should provide information if any contribution will be provided to one or more of the below horizontal issues of the SOPT during the implementation of the operations.

- equal opportunities,
- sustainable development,
- environmental protection and sustainability,
- participation of civil society,
- geographic, sectoral and thematic concentration,
- concerns of disadvantaged persons, good governance
- equal opportunities and gender mainstreaming
- Vulnerable groups and minorities

1.4 Financial Allocation

Except for revenue generating projects, **85%** of the funds available for this call shall be provided as the EU contribution. The SOPT national co-financing rate is fixed as **15%**. The co-financing amount must be ensured by the applicant. A financial analysis must be provided for revenue generating projects as an annex.

2. ELIGIBILITY RULES FOR THIS CALL FOR OPERATIONS PROPOSALS

Eligibility Rules applicable to this Call for Operation refer to the eligibility of: i) the applicant (entity submitting the application) and co-applicant(s) (if any), ii) operations and iii) costs (types of cost that may be taken into account in the calculation of the amount of assistance).

2.1 Eligibility of Applicant and Co-Applicant(s)

Only municipalities are eligible as the applicants within the scope of the Call for Operations. The applicant must be directly responsible for the preparation of the operation, its management during the implementation period and accountable for sustainability and durability after the operations completion.

Co-Applicant(s)

The applicant can apply together with co-applicant(s). However, partnership is not mandatory. If there is a co-applicant in any application, the co-applicant(s) must:

- be a legal entity established and registered in the Republic of Turkey,
- be jointly responsible for the preparation of the operation, its management during the implementation period and accountable for sustainability and durability after completion.

The following are eligible co-applicants within the scope of the Call for Operations:

- special provincial administrations,
- unions of providing services to the villages,
- universities,
- foundations, public institutions and institutes can be partners under this call.

- An applicant may submit more than one application under this Call for Operations.
- An applicant may be a partner in more than one application.
- Private companies cannot be applicant or co-applicants. They may only indirectly benefit from the operations.

Applicants are not allowed to participate in the Call for Operations if they are in any of the situations which are listed in Section 2.6.10.1.1 of the PRAG (please see <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/prag/document.do?nodeNumber=2.6.10.1.1>).

2.2 Eligible Operations

The operation will be composed of a set of activities intended to accomplish an indivisible task of precise economic and technical nature, which has clearly identified goals, budget and time-frame.

Operation Lifecycle

In the context of IPA II, there are the main phases of an operation lifespan:

- operation preparation which covers the maturity of the concept (finalisation of OIS),
- tender dossier preparation for the contracts to be implemented (after the signature of operational agreement),
- tendering and contracting,
- actual implementation of the contracts,
- sustainability period of the operations.

The operations may consist of supply, service and/or works components which will be implemented through contracts. Tendering and contracting of supplies may take 6-8 months, while this periods for service contracts -depending on the contract value and complexity- can take between 4 to 12 months.

Duration

Duration of the operation refers to the actual implementation period of the activities, which starts from the signature of the first contract and ends with the completion of the all contracts under the operation.

There is no restriction regarding duration. However, an indicative timeline must be prepared and submitted as an annex. This activity plan should be prepared in line with the Annex VI- Timeline for Tendering and Contracting.

- The selected applicants will finalise their OISs' in line with the comments provided by the Operating Structure in maximum **60** calendar days after the selection of the operations.
- The selected applicants will finalize the terms of reference(s) preparations at most **30** calendar days after the signature of the Operational Agreement.

The applicants should consider the above-mentioned details to design a realistic timeline. The timeline should cover all stages of the operation duration, including preparation, tendering, contracting and inception date.

Location

Operations must be implemented in 81 provinces of the Republic of Turkey.

Risk and Sustainability

Technical (including activities, results, target groups and final beneficiaries) and financial based risks related to the proposed operation should be considered during the preparation stage of an operation. Assumptions, institutional risk, staffing risk and the planned

mitigations and/or prevention measures to manage the risks must be defined in the operation proposal.

All developed operations must ensure sustainability in line with the objective of the operation. A “sustainability model” in order to keep the Operation “alive” and “self-sustained” during and after the implementation of the Operation, should be developed for all proposals. The sustainability model must cover the two aspects of sustainability: Institutional Sustainability and Financial Sustainability to be detailed in the OIS.

Maturity

All operations should be ready for implementation after the signing of the contract with MoTI in line with the proposed activity plan.

Additionally, all applicants and co-applicants must demonstrate that they have technical, regulatory and managerial skills to manage the operation (For detailed maturation criteria see evaluation grid and the annexes of this Guideline).

The current maturity and the expected maturity of the proposed operation should be defined in the proposal development stage.

2.3 Eligibility of Costs

The Contracting Authority will support operations via supply, service, works components through the financing.

- 1. Works Component:** The 'work' means the outcome of building or civil engineering works taken as a whole that is sufficient in itself to fulfil an economic or technical function. Works cover either the execution of any construction work or both the execution and design.

The cost estimation for works components/contracts must be based on the bill of quantity provided by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization.

Priorly initiated and uncompleted works, can not be proposed as operations!

All works contracts must be completed by supervision activities.
--

- 2. Service Component:** The service must be implemented under the service contracts which are meant for studies, technical assistance, capacity building, training, etc. and are also used for audits or communication services.
 - A study contract is a service contract concluded between a contractor and the contracting authority, which includes studies for the identification and preparation of operations, feasibility studies, economic and market studies, technical studies and audits.
 - A technical assistance contract is a service contract where the contractor is called on to play an advisory role, to manage or supervise an operation, or to provide the

expertise specified in the contract.

Supply Component: Supplies cover the purchase of products. Supply contracts are eligible only if in compliance with a service and/or supply contract.

The proposed operations may require other expenditures such as human resources of the beneficiary, operational cost such as the purchase of consumables, utilities or miscellaneous. These are ineligible costs and must be borne by the applicant and/or co-applicant or end users.

- Except for revenue generating projects, **85%** of a planned operation's budget shall be funded as the EU and National contribution, and **15 %** of the budget shall be provided as the co-finance contribution by the applicant. A financial analysis must be provided for revenue generating projects as an annex.

- These costs must be itemised in the application, detailed and the source of funding should be cited.

➤ All purchased equipment must be insured by the applicant and/or the co-applicant at their cost.

Eligible main cost items under each type of the contract financed by the Contracting Authority are listed below:

Works Component

Works contracts cover either the execution, or both the execution and design, of works or a work related to one of the activities referred to in Annex I to Directive 2004/18/EC of the European Parliament and the Council or the realisation, by whatever means, of a work corresponding to the requirements specified by the End Recipient. A 'work' means the outcome of building or civil engineering works taken as a whole that is sufficient of itself to fulfil an economic or technical function.

Below is a non-exhaustive list of works that can be financed under this Call for Operations:

- Construction of bicycle friendly urban transport network
- Development of pedestrian areas
- Car pooling

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Budget submitted together with the OIS will be subject to verifications if the application is pre- selected.

Service Component

Service component shall comprise of studies and technical assistance activities. Under the service component, following outputs directly related to the scope of OIS may be delivered (but are not limited to):

- training,
- consulting and advisory services for the managerial capacity building of an applicant and/or co-applicant(s) and final beneficiary(ies),
- consulting and advisory services for technical staff capacity building of an applicant and/or co-applicant(s) and final beneficiary(ies),
- consulting and advisory services for improving accessibility in transport services,
- consulting and advisory services for the development of sustainable urban mobility plans,
- supervision (if any works component linked to the operation),
- engineering services,
- needs assessment papers and reports,
- software development related to the operation,
- knowledge transfer services (including study visit arrangements to the EU countries).

Eligible costs of service contracts may include costs of key and non-key experts (staff of applicant and partners are not considered and paid as experts).

Evidence-based costing of service component is required.

The applicant must estimate necessary inputs by experts (based on their profiles, experience, expertise and competencies) against activities and expected outputs and planned service contract duration to justify the operation budget.

The operation budget should clearly delineate between eligible and ineligible cost and be realistic and cost effective i.e.: costs should be necessary to produce the expected outputs and result, and prices should be market-valued. The applicant is also required to specify how the ineligible expenditure necessary will be covered to manage and complete the operation.

Supply Component

Supply component covers the supply, manufacture, delivery, unloading, installation, commissioning, maintenance and after-sales service of the supplies.

All supply components must support the objective of the proposal operation as well as the objective of SOPT .

- machinery and equipment, including computer equipment and construction equipment,
- specialised vehicles,
- computer software and licences,
- subscriptions to information/data resources.

Installation cost of the above items is also eligible, including training for the users and

establishment of security and anti-theft systems in order to deter theft and crime.

Incidental expenditure

Incidental expenditure must be identified for each operation, depending on the specific activities. Some typical examples of activities that are eligible under incidental expenditure are:

- subsistence allowance of the experts when travelling as part of the implementation of the operation (note: this does not cover travel to or from the experts home base),
- travel costs (international and inter-city), from base of operations, and subsistence allowances for experts for missions undertaken as part of the contract,
- costs related to the organisation and delivery of specific events such as training, seminars,
- workshops, conferences, fairs, competitions, etc. this includes costs like renting premises and equipment; and, travel costs, accommodation and catering costs for participants,
- interpretation and translation costs,
- visibility costs in line with eu visibility requirements.

Ineligible Costs

In line with the provision of Article 15, IPA II Implementing Regulation, ineligible expenditures should not be included in the operation's budget. Therefore, the following expenditure shall not be eligible for funding under Regulation (EU) No 231/2014:

- purchase of land and existing buildings, except where duly justified by the nature of the action in the financing decision,
- other expenditures that are provided from the sectoral or financing agreements.

The following costs shall not be considered eligible under this Call for Operation:

- debts and debt service charges (interest),
- provisions for losses, debts or potential future liabilities,
- currency exchange losses,
- credits to third parties, unless otherwise specified in the special conditions;
- in kind contributions,
- salary costs of the personnel of national administrations, unless otherwise specified in the special conditions and only to the extent that they relate to the cost of activities which the relevant public authority would not carry out if the action were not undertaken,
- performance-based bonuses included in costs of staff.

Furthermore, cost of outsourced consultancy services for the preparation of the application is not eligible.

3. HOW TO APPLY

All information as to how to apply, when and what documents are submitted is provided in this section.

3.1 Application Documents

Applications must be submitted in accordance with the format of OIS (**Annex I** to these Guidelines) and instructions thereof.

The following documents must also be submitted together with the application:

Annex II : Logical Framework¹

Annex III : Financial and Operational Capacity Tables

Annex IV : Summary of SOPT (MAAP-T)

Annex V : Project (Operation) Selection Criteria

Applicants can access all the relevant documents from <http://op.udhb.gov.tr/en> web-page.

3.2 Where and How to Send the Application

The applicants should fill in an Operation Identification Sheet (OIS) (Annex I). The application package must be composed of Operation Identification Sheet Template (OIS) (Annex I), Logical Framework (Annex II), Financial and Operational Capacity Tables (Annex-III), Summary of SOPT (Annex IV: MAAP-T), Project (Operation) Selection Criteria (Annex V) and Timeline for Tendering and Contracting (Annex VI).

Applicants must apply in English.

The application package needs to be submitted in a single original set with an officially signed letter by a legal representative.

Any error or major discrepancy related to the points listed in the instructions on the OIS template may lead to the rejection of the application.

Hand-written OIS will not be accepted.

Additionally, the applications (OIS and its annexes) must be submitted to the Operating Structure in **electronic versions** (scanned version) via e-mail before the deadline.

The e-mail address for submission is: ipaproje.abdi@uab.gov.tr

Applicants shall submit their OIS to the Operating Structure in a sealed envelope by registered mail, private courier service or by hand-delivery together with a cover letter signed by a legal representative of the applicant at the latest on **15.02.2019 at 16:00 local time** to the following address:

¹ The Logical Framework must be filled out as explained in the PRAG template, titled: E3d Annex C – Logical Framework. <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/prag/document.do?isAnnexes=true>

The envelope should clearly indicate the **title of this call, the title of the proposed operation, the name and full address of the applicant.**

**T.C. Ulaştırma ve Altyapı Bakanlığı
Avrupa Birliği ve Dış İlişkiler Genel Müdürlüğü
Avrupa Birliği Yatırımları Dairesi Başkanlığı
Hakkı Turaylıç Caddesi No: 5 AYGM Binası B Blok Kat: 10 Emek, Çankaya Ankara**

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Applications submitted after the deadline will be rejected by the OS.

The electronic (scanned) version of an application must contain the same application as the paper version. In case of inconsistency, the paper version will be taken into account.

Applications sent by any other means (by fax etc.) or delivered to other addresses will be rejected.

3.3 Deadline for submission of Application

The closing date for the submission of applications is **15.02.2019 at 16:00 local time.**

The hardcopies must be delivered to the provided address as of this time.

Late delivered applications will not be accepted!

The deadline for the electronic(scanned) versions is also **15.02.2019 at 16:00 local time.**

3.4 Further Information on Application

One information session will be held during this Call for Operations Proposal. Please follow the Programme's website <http://op.udhb.gov.tr/en> for the programme of the information session. Generic information will be provided in this session. Due to the equal treatment and transparency rules there won't be operation specific discussions during the sessions.

Questions may be sent by e-mail or fax until **11.01.2019, 16:00 local time** to the address, indicating clearly the title of the Call for Operations Proposals and Topic number:

e-mail : ipaproje.abdi@uab.gov.tr

fax : + 90 (312) 2031913

No individual replies will be given to questions. In order to ensure equal treatment of applicants, all questions and replies will be grouped on a weekly base and announced on the website <http://op.udhb.gov.tr> by the Ministry period up to **18.01.2019, 16:00 local time.**

Queries sent to other e-mail address or asked telephonically will not be replied.

Other important information and notices to applicants will be issued as the need arises. It is therefore advisable to consult the above-mentioned website regularly in order to be informed of the questions, notices and answers published.

4. EVALUATION AND SELECTION PROCESS

The evaluation and selection processes are based on transparency, impartiality, equal treatment and access to information, based on general selection criteria approved by the Management Committee for the Programme.

The Selection Criteria specified in this document are set for the Sectoral Operational Programme for Transport (SOPT).

Evaluation process includes five steps and will be carried out with the use of assessors.

Detailed description of the evaluation and selection process and its steps and criteria is outlined below.

STEP 1: Opening and Administrative Checks

In this step the following aspects will be checked:

1. The paper form of the application (one set only) must be submitted to the correct location in sealed envelope with a stamp date no later than the deadline. Otherwise the application will be rejected.
2. The electronic copies of the applications must be submitted via e-mail before the deadline of submission. Otherwise the application may be rejected.
3. The standard OIS template must be used and the required annexes must be filled out. Otherwise the application may be rejected.
4. The OIS must be initialled on each page (including Annexes) and signed on the last page. Otherwise the application may be rejected.

Opening and Administrative Check Table

#	CONTROL POINTS	Control	Note Ref.
1.	The submission deadline is respected.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2.	The application is submitted in a closed envelope.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3.	The application is submitted electronically and hard-copy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4.	The standard OIS template is used as application form and completed in <u>English</u> .	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5.	The OIS and annexes are initialized and signed by the legal representative.	<input type="checkbox"/>	

If the application documents do not satisfy the above criteria, the application may be rejected on that **sole** basis and it will not be evaluated further.

The Operating Structure may request clarification from the applicant.

STEP 2: Eligibility and Compliance Checks

After opening and administrative checks, the following criteria will be assessed:

1. The application must be submitted by the **eligible applicant**. The applicant and co-applicant(s) (if any) must satisfy eligibility conditions. Otherwise the application will be rejected.
2. The budget must meet the eligibility criteria in section 2.3 of this Guideline. The applicant must clearly state that the ineligible costs -if any- will be covered by the applicant. Otherwise the application may be rejected.
3. The designed operation must comply in principle with the **overall objective** stipulated in section 1.2 of the Guideline. Otherwise the application will be rejected.
4. The designed operation must comply in principle with one or more of the **specific objectives** defined in section 1.2 of the Guideline. Otherwise the application will be rejected.
5. The proposed activities must comply in principle with the **type of activities** identified in section 1.3 of the Guideline. Otherwise the application will be rejected.

STEP 3: Quality and Technical Criteria

Assessment against quality and technical criteria will be carried out in line with the evaluation grid below.

Evaluation grid includes 4 main headings. The applicant may score max 100 points.

SCORE TABLE

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Weight (Works)	Weight (Services)	Total weights
1. Relevance	1.MAPT relevance	25%	25%	25%
2. Impact	2.Economic impact	10%	0%	25%
	3.Knowledge transfer impact	0%	10%	
	4.Environmental impact	5%	5%	
	5.Safety impact	5%	5%	
	6.Synergies with other operations	5%	5%	
3. Risk and sustainability	7.Institutional and staffing risk	10%	10%	30%
	8.Financial sustainability	10%	10%	
	9.Risk identification and mitigation	10%	10%	
4. Maturity	10.Current maturity of operation	10%	10%	20%
	11.Expected maturity of operation	10%	10%	

In order to be pre-selected and included into “long list” the application must score:

1. If the score is less than **18 points for Risk and Sustainability Criteria (section 3)**, the application will be rejected.
2. Only the OIS with a score of a minimum of 60 points out of 100 will be shortlisted. The pre-selected OIS will be developed further in consultation with the OS.

This step will be concluded by drawing up a ranking list of the pre-selected applications, ranked according to their score. The highest scoring applications will be provisionally selected until they all match the available scope for this Call for Operations.

The Operating Structure reserves the right to modify the above-mentioned thresholds.

STEP 4: Additional Verifications

The following aspects will be verified in this step, with a site visit where necessary:

1. The applicant and/or co-applicant must submit legal entity establishment documents,
2. The infrastructure and facilities to be provided by the applicant must be physically/legally/ practically suitable for the implementation of the activities,
3. The applicant does not fall under one of the exclusion criteria as described in PRAG section 2.6.10.1.1. For that the Operating Structure will request the pre-selected applicant to provide relevant documentary evidence (statement from tax administration, social security administration, criminal records of board members, etc.),
4. The designed operation must be mature and ready for implementation within the deadline stipulated in section 4, Step 5 of the Guideline,
5. The timetable of activities must be accurate and realistic (including procurement modalities managed by the Contracting Authority),
6. The budget must fully meet cost eligibility criteria set in section 2.3. The essential costs must be included in the budget; these costs must be realistic and necessary to implement the activities,
7. The applicant and co-applicants (if any) must have sufficient and competent staff to manage the operation (verification of CVs and availability of those individuals),
8. Any other issues arising from the qualitative and technical assessment of applications.

During additional verifications a need to amend the application may arise. In such case, a revised application form must be submitted.

The Operating Structure may also impose modifications or reductions to address eligibility of costs, calculation errors or inaccuracies. If the applicant disagrees to cover the revised budget after corrections, the application will be rejected.

A significant increase to the amount of financial assistance as a result of these corrections will not be possible and the applicant will have to cover the balance. It is therefore in the applicant's interest to provide a realistic and cost-effective budget, including own contribution to manage the operation.

Any rejected application may be replaced by the next best placed application on the reserve list that falls within the available budget for this Call for Operations and will be subject to additional verification process as described above.

STEP 5: Notification of the Operating Structure's Decision

After the completion of additional verifications, the Operating Structure will issue final notification on the selection/rejection of financial assistance (after the revised application submission, where relevant). The applicant will be informed in writing on the decision and, if rejected, the reasons for the negative decision.

The applications who successfully pass Step 4 of the evaluation, will be included in the shortlist. Then the Operating Structure will sign a protocol with the applicants to be awarded.

ANNEXES

Annex I	:	Operation Identification Sheet Template
Annex II	:	Logical Framework
Annex III	:	Financial and Operational Capacity Tables
Annex IV	:	Summary of SOPT (MAAP-T)
Annex V	:	Project (Operation) Selection Criteria

ANNEX I – OPERATION IDENTIFICATION SHEET TEMPLATE

Title of the Operation:

Operating structure:

Body Responsible for the Implementation of the Operation:

Compatibility and coherence with the Operational Programme:

4.1 Title of the programme:

4.2 Title of the action:

4.3 End recipient of assistance:

Description of the Operation:

5.1 Contribution to the achievement of the Operational Programme: *Describe the operation, its background, how the operation contributes to the achievement of the objectives of the Operational Programme linked with the appropriate measure.*

5.2 Overall Objective: *Explain in one sentence*

5.3 Operation Purpose: *Explain in one sentence*

5.4 Indicative location(s):

5.5 Duration: *Duration of the operation cannot exceed the final date of eligibility of expenditure set in the Financing Agreement*

5.6 Target group(s):

5.7 Results with measurable indicators:

5.8 Indicative activities: *Please provide detailed explanation for each activity and an overall timetable showing the indicative implementation durations*

Implementation arrangements: *Please provide detailed chronogram for preparatory stages, tendering, contracting and starting of operations.*

6.1 Institutional framework: *institutional arrangements foreseen for the implementation of the operation, e.g. operation coordination unit, steering committee, regional and/or provincial authorities, technical assistance team*

6.2 Proposed monitoring structure and methodology: *who will be responsible for monitoring of the operation, how will the operation be monitored, what will be the workflow and reporting lines?*

6.3 Required procedures and contracts for the implementation of the operation and their sequencing: *list the type of procedures (call for proposals, direct implementation by national institutions without prior call for proposals, direct agreements with international organisations, etc) and the corresponding contracts (grant contracts, contribution agreements with international organisations, services, supplies, works, etc) for the proposed activities, together with their sequencing*

Risks and assumptions:

Expected impact of the operation on the target group and multiplier/spill over effects:

Sustainability:

Equal opportunity, minorities and vulnerable groups (where relevant):

Requested financing from the European Commission: *The Union contribution shall not exceed the ceiling of 85% of the eligible expenditure.*

Co-financing: *Please identify expected total contribution by source.*

Budget breakdown: indicative, per operation component if applicable, including estimated total cost, public expenditure, IPA contribution, national public contribution and private contribution

Cash flow requirements by source of funding:

Revenue generating operations (Article 9 of the General Conditions of the Financing Agreement) (if applicable):

If the project is expected to generate revenues through tariffs or charges borne by users, please give details of charges (types and level of charges, principle on the basis of which the charges have been established).

Following questions should also be addressed:

Do the charges cover the operational costs and depreciation of the project?

Do the charges differ between the various users of the infrastructure?

Are the charges proportional:

- To the use of the project/real consumption?

- To the pollution generated by users?

If no tariffs or charges are proposed, how will operating and maintenance costs be covered?

Environmental Impact Assessment (if applicable)

Has development consent already been given to this project?

If yes, on which date?

If no, when was the formal request for the development consent introduced and by which date is the final decision expected?

Specify the competent authority or authorities, which has or have given or will give the development consent.

Results of the consultations with the public concerned².

Is the project likely to have significant negative effects on sites included or intended to be included in sites of nature conservation importance / Natura 2000 network?

²

The information provided should cover the following:

- the concerned public which has been consulted,
- the places where the information has been consulted,
- the time which has been given to the public to express its opinion,
- the way in which the public has been informed (for example, by bill-posting within a certain radius, publication in local newspapers, organisations of exhibitions with plans, drawings, tables, graphs, models, etc.),
- the way the public has been consulted (for example, by written submissions, by public enquiry, etc.)
- the way in which the concerns of the public have been taken into account.

ANNEX II - LOGICAL FRAMEWORK

LOGFRAME PLANNING MATRIX		Programme Name and Number: Sectoral Operational Programme for Transport (SOPT)		<i>Name of the proposal</i>
		Contracting Period Expires:		Disbursement Period Expires:
		Total Budget: EUR		IPA Budget: EUR.....
Overall Objective	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification		Assumptions
Operation Purpose	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification		Assumptions
"	Objectively Verifiable Indicators	Sources of Verification		Assumptions
Activities		Means		
		Fees	EUR	
		Incidentals	EUR	

ANNEX III – FINANCIAL, OPERATIONAL and HUMAN RESOURCE CAPACITY

Please provide the following information³, if applicable, on the basis of the profit and loss account and balance sheet of your organisation. Amounts in EUR.

Financial Capacity

Year	Turnover or equivalent	Net earnings or equivalent	Total balance sheet or budget	Shareholder equity or equivalent	Medium and long-term debt	Short-term debt (<1 year)
N1						
N-1						
N-2						

Project Experience

Please provide a detailed description of actions managed by your organisation over the past three years.

This information will be used to assess whether you have sufficient and stable experience of managing actions in the same area and of a comparable scale to the one for which an Operation is being requested:

Project title:		Area:			
Location of the action	Cost of the action (EUR)	Lead manager or partner	Donors to the action (name)	Amount contributed (by donor)	Dates (dd/mm/ yyyy to dd/ mm/ ,
...
Objectives and results of the action					

³ Financial Capacity and Project Experience Tables must be filled out for applicant and each co-applicant.

Human Resources

Each of the applicants and co-applicants (if any) should separately provide the following table of human resources.

Human Resource Capacity of the Applicant	Overall Number of Staff	Number of staff will be assigned to the Operation	How many staff have adequate English skills?
Permanent staff			
Other staff ⁴			
Total			

Human Resource Capacity of the Co-Applicant -1	Overall Number of Staff	Number of staff will be assigned to the Operation	How many staff have adequate English skills?
Permanent staff			
Other staff ²			
Total			

Human Resource Capacity of the Co-Applicant - 2	Overall Number of Staff	Number of staff will be assigned to the Operation	How many staff have adequate English skills?
Permanent staff			
Other staff ²			
Total			

Please filled out the Human Resource Capacity table for each co-applicant.

Please attach a brief resume of the critical project staff that will take place in the implementation of the operation (Maximum 5 persons. Please use the format attached below).

⁴ Part time or on contract basis

CURRICULUM VITAE

(To be filled by the staff assigned)

Proposed role in the project:

Family name:

First names:

Date of birth:

Nationality:

Civil status:

Education:

Institution (Date from - Date to)	Degree(s) or Diploma(s) obtained:

Language skills: Indicate competence on a scale of 1 to 5 (1 - excellent; 5 - basic)

Language	Reading	Speaking	Writing

Membership of professional bodies:

Other skills: (e.g. Computer literacy, etc.)

Present position:

Years within the firm:

Key qualifications: (Relevant to the project)

Specific experience in the region:

Country	Date from - Date to

Professional experience

Date from - Date to	Location	Company& reference person (name & contact details)	Position	Description

Other relevant information (e.g., Publications)

ANNEX IV – SUMMARY OF SOPT

PROGRAMME STRATEGY – ACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES

Action 3 – Accessible and Inclusive Transport

Aim

Promote a shift from individual to sustainable, accessible and inclusive modes of public transport at both national and urban levels

EU Legislation

Alignment with the EU acquis is specifically addressed by Action 4. Key elements of the Acquis concerned by this action include:

Communication From the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, **Action Plan on Urban Mobility**

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/tr0027_en.htm)

Green Paper, Towards a new culture for urban mobility

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/l24484_en.htm)

(<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2007:0551:FIN:EN:PDF>)

Communication From the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council, **Strengthening passenger rights within the European Union**

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/l24124_en.htm)

Regulation (EU) No 1177/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 November 2010 concerning the rights of passengers when travelling by sea and inland waterway and amending Regulation (EC) No 2006/2004

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/tr0049_en.htm)

Regulation (EU) No 181/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 concerning the rights of passengers in bus and coach transport

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/tr0050_en.htm)

Regulation (EC) No 1107/2006 of the Parliament and of the Council of 5 July 2006 concerning the rights of disabled persons and persons with reduced mobility when travelling by air

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/l24132_en.htm)

Regulation (EC) No 261/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 February 2004 establishing common rules on compensation and assistance to passengers in the event of denied boarding and of cancellation or long delay of flights, and repealing Regulation (EEC) No 295/91 (Text with EEA relevance)

(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/transport/mobility_and_passenger_rights/l24173_en.htm)

European Disability Strategy 2010-2020

(http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/disabilities/disability-strategy/index_en.htm)

Communication From the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions - **Equal opportunities for people with disabilities: A European Action Plan**

Plan(http://europa.eu/legislation_summaries/employment_and_social_policy/disability_and_old_age/c11414_en.htm)

White Paper European transport policy for 2010: time to decide

(http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/strategies/doc/2001_white_paper/lb_com_2001_0370_en.pdf)

Specific objective

To improve the accessibility of transport services, increase capacity and effectiveness of urban public transport; reduce congestion and emissions created by transport in urban areas

Rationale

Large parts of the population in Turkey, especially those of older age, socially disadvantaged or people with reduced mobility are restricted in their free movement by the inadequacy of accessible transport services. About 12.3% of the total population (8.4 million people) are reported to suffer from chronic diseases and disabilities.

The urban transport sector is also facing particular challenges in Turkey which is a highly urbanised country. 72% of the population lives in cities, and this proportion has been growing by 10% over the last two decades. The urban transport system is facing problems created by growing demands of rapid urbanization. The congestion in larger Turkish cities has created an unsustainable situation, as well.

Responding to those needs, this action will contribute to the creation of a modern, inclusive and accessible transport system, which is an urgent task. It will also promote integrated policies which are able to grasp the full complexity of urban transport systems and the needs of citizens from different social groups.

The **Action directly contributes to eliminating weaknesses** presented in the **SWOT analysis**, i.e.

Severe modal imbalance in freight and passenger transport at urban levels

- Unit costs in road transport still lower than in sustainable modes – impeding modal shift
- Incomplete legal framework and insufficient institutional capacities in some sub-sectors
- Congestion due to high concentration of population and employment in urban centers
- Physical constraints and low density deterring accessibility to local public transport

threatening to further deepen due to threats in the SWOT analysis, i.e.

Increasing urbanisation

Congestion – leading to economic and social losses

Adverse effects of pollution on public health

Measures to be financed by SOPT will increase the attractiveness and accessibility of public transport services for all citizens, with regard to cities and national transport networks. The promotion of transport by bicycles as an integral part of the urban transport system will also be supported. The transport of people with reduced mobility will be a specific priority, as part of larger urban transport projects, or specifically targeted operations.

The problems faced in urban transport and accessibility issues have also caused the civil society to mobilize and petition their demands to national government and municipality administrations. High awareness level of civil society can be a good opportunity for transport policy makers if dialogue between them can be achieved smoothly and effectively.

SOPT will aim at supporting the mobilisation of the public institutions to strengthen their services and improve the coordination between stakeholders and policy making bodies. Considering that, Action 3 has been designed to achieve the following two results, each of them delivered through a dedicated activity:

R1 – Accessibility and inclusivity of public transport further developed at urban and national level;
R2 – Progress towards sustainable urban mobility plans and public transport.

Description

Activity 3.1 covers support to policy development, **capacity building and the preparation and implementation of concrete accessible transport investments**. The activity will focus on two specific areas:

- One, to promote the **co-operation** of the government, local authorities and transport sector stakeholders (from service providers to business, public institutions, and citizens) in order to develop, test and establish, all over the country, a partnership-based model for the further planning and development of accessible public transport services.

The enhanced dialogue between all players is to ensure that transport developments, both in an urban and inter-city context, are designed and implemented to best effect, in line with the requirements of the users. Such an approach will raise the quality of life for all citizens and also facilitate the cost-effectiveness of public investments in the sector.

- The **preparation and implementation of specific investments** in compliance with the EU requirements regarding the access of people with reduced mobility to public transport.

Activity 3.2 will **support the elaboration of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans and finance the implementation of investments in cities**. Investments will cover public transport services as well as promoting the use of bicycles, e.g. through the extension of bicycle paths, raising awareness of the benefits of bicycle transport, encouraging use of bicycles as a transport mode, developing pedestrian areas, promotion of car-pooling, support to the mobility plans, construction of light rail links in cities.

The proposed Transport Master Plan Project provided a Sustainable Urban Transport Guideline for cities. In this regard, the interventions which are planned to be implemented within this Programme towards urban transport will be designed in accordance with the outputs of this ongoing project. Sequencing will be arranged accordingly.

In conducting measures towards urban transport and improving accessibility, collaboration will be set up with IFIs (especially with WB) and other related organisations which have experience in these fields in order to mobilise their funds and technical expertise in addition to funds provided by this Programme.

Investments will include the remodelling of existing infrastructures, or the construction of new facilities.

Where justified, the procurement or adaptation of rolling stock is eligible under both 3.1 and 3.2. (for example with respect to environmental aspects and the transport requirements of people with reduced mobility will also be financed).

Delivery

As regards Activity 3.1, IPA will finance technical assistance, studies and conferences, as well as the work of partnership-based bodies at national and local level to ensure the co-operation of stakeholders in preparing the strategies and projects. The scope of this action will also include training to employees working in the transport sector, for example with respect to serving

passengers with reduced mobility. Reimbursable advisory services from IFIs will also be financed. For example, co-operation is envisaged with the World Bank with respect to institutional arrangements and the state of transport systems, as well as the review and benchmarking of international best practices. Technical and institutional support can be provided to improve the operational and managerial efficiency of transport systems.

In Activity 3.2, apart from investment studies, supplies and infrastructure are envisaged to implement urban transport projects in cities (through grants). The selection of projects to be prepared and implemented will be based on the expected impact of the investments being prepared (e.g. size of affected population, expected reduction in congestion). Again, co-operation will be sought with IFIs, such as the World Bank which has developed Sustainable Cities Initiative.

Activity 3.1 – Accessible Transport

Specific objective

To further develop the **accessibility and inclusivity of public transport** at urban and national levels

Rationale

Promoting accessibility of transport modes is one of the main priorities not only of Turkey but also of the EU. People with reduced mobility cannot become active members of the society if they cannot access transport networks easily. Societies which neglect this fact have to face with moral, ethical and economic consequences of their actions.

For developing transport services in line with the needs of all, partnership between policymakers, transport service providers and citizens is very important. A good partnership process can ensure that needs are assessed comprehensively and accurately, and that – through dialogue – a good compromise between needs and possibilities is reached. As a result, all stakeholders can be satisfied with and support new development projects.

SOPT will co-operate with the parallel planned ESEI project, also financed by the EU, aimed at creating a platform for co-ordinating public policies for accessible transport at national and urban levels.

The **Activity directly contributes to eliminating weaknesses** presented in the **SWOT analysis**, i.e.

Severe modal imbalance in freight and passenger transport at urban levels

- Incomplete legal framework and insufficient institutional capacities in some sub-sectors
- Physical constraints and low density deterring accessibility to local public transport

threatening to further deepen due to threats in the SWOT analysis, i.e.

Increasing urbanisation

Congestion – leading to economic and social losses

The objectives to be pursued in the area of accessible transport were also debated in detail at a partnership event, organised with the EU support, on 25-26 February 2013. At the workshop, participants urged to strengthen the co-ordination of stakeholders involved in urban transport, and also the co-ordination of government departments active in the area. Complaints were raised because of the lack of awareness of the needs of people with reduced mobility. The enforcement of

legal relevant rules (e.g. inspections) also needs to be stepped up. Last but not least, financial resources for this policy area should be increased, and their use better prioritised.

Description

Activity 3.1 will, first of all, support the transfer of knowledge to the relevant departments of MoTI and related public administration institutions, in the planning and execution of accessible transport projects.

Thereby, the main focus will be on soft measures, including – but not limited to – the preparation of studies, as well as networking with peers from the EU countries (and the EU itself). Study visits, exchanges of experience may be financed to allow Turkish stakeholders to gain practical insights into similar projects being undertaken in the European Union.

Law on People with Disabilities (no: 5378) states that urban transport vehicles and infrastructure have to be restructured according to the needs of people with reduced mobility. Ministry of Family and Social Policies published a Regulation in order to monitor and inspect the relevant authorities about the requirements of the Law in 2013. According to the Regulation, a commission will inspect the infrastructure and vehicles of urban transport systems.

Eligible interventions (summary of the types of operations)

The activity will start with a needs assessment study which will help to assess the current situation of accessibility of national and local transport networks. Furthermore, this study will be beneficial for selecting cities where an IPA-financed accessible urban transport project should be prepared and implemented.

The activity will be accompanied by networking events involving national and international experts and stakeholders to facilitate the exchange of experiences with policy makers, experts, transport companies and NGOs from EU countries.

This Activity will also contribute to the successful establishment of a platform which enables cooperation among relevant government and municipality administrations and NGOs for implementing necessary actions for accessible transport networks.

Awareness raising towards the mobility needs of people with reduced mobility will also be financed.

The details of the implementation of a part of this activity through a direct grant with Embarq Turkey are defined indicatively in the ANNEX I.

Selection criteria

support to the accessibility level of transport modes
support to the training of public employees in transport sector about needs of people with reduced mobility
expected impact on the accessibility level of transport modes
technical capacity regarding implementation
size of investment for implementation

Final beneficiaries

The indicative list of final beneficiaries is as follows:

Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
Ministry of Family, Labour and Social Services,
Municipalities.

Activity 3.2 –Urban Transport

Specific objective

- To create the basic conditions to progress towards a sustainable urban public transport

Rationale

The general imbalance of transport modes in Turkey towards road transport also applies to the urban context, which negatively affects the welfare of citizens. Increased pollution and congestion also lead to negative effects on the environment, and they cause economic losses.

The Activity directly contributes to **eliminating weaknesses** presented in the SWOT analysis, ie. Severe modal imbalance in freight and passenger transport at urban levels

- Incomplete legal framework and insufficient institutional capacities in some sub-sectors
- Congestion due to high concentration of population and employment in urban centers
- Physical constraints and low density deterring accessibility to local public transport

threatening to further deepen due to threats in the SWOT analysis, i.e.

Increasing urbanisation

Congestion – leading to economic and social losses

Adverse effects of pollution on public health

Turkey, which imports most of its oil for transport, needs urgent and innovative solutions, especially in large urban areas where a great deal of time and energy are spent on congested road traffic. Therefore, improving other modes of transport in urban areas and integrating various modes in public transport are major problems in Turkey.

Almost half of all car trips are over distances of shorter than 5 kilometres in the EU countries.⁵ This reflects that bicycle, as a carbon free mode of transport, has a great potential if appropriate infrastructure is built and necessary legislative acts are adopted.

Description

Activity 3.2 will be dedicated to the practical preparation and execution of inclusive transport investments in different cities. These investments will include the creation of new small to medium scale infrastructure, preferably in a complex approach to modernising city transport with alternative approaches.

This Activity will assist municipalities in elaborating Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans through technical assistance.

⁵http://ec.europa.eu/transport/themes/urban/urban_mobility/urban_mobility_actions/cycling_en.htm, 10.05.2014

As a result of these interventions, negative environmental impact from urban transport is expected to decrease.

Eligible interventions (summary of the types of operations)

- Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans
- Construction of bicycle friendly urban transport network
- Development of pedestrian areas
- Promotion of car pooling
- Raising awareness

Modalities on the cooperation with international organisations as direct grant award under this activity are defined indicatively in the ANNEX I.

Selection criteria

- Technical capacity regarding implementation,
- size of investment for implementation
- increasing the share of public transport in urban areas
- increasing the share of bicycle transport in urban areas

Final beneficiaries

The indicative list of final beneficiaries is as follows:

- Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure
- Municipalities

Overview Table

Action Title	Accessible Transport
Specific Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve the accessibility of transport services for all, increase capacity and effectiveness of urban public transport; reduce congestion and emissions created by transport in urban areas
Action Results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • R1 – Accessibility of public transport further developed at urban and national level • R2 – Progress towards sustainable urban mobility plans and public transport
Activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Activity 3.1 –Accessible Transport • Activity 3.2 –Urban Transport
Indicative List of Major Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under this action, no major projects are foreseen at this stage.
Implementation Arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management by Department for European Union Investments (EUID), DG DG for European Union Affairs and Foreign Relations (DG EUFR), MoTI • Delivery through service and works contracts, as well as grants

Targets and indicators

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Baseline (year)</i>	<i>Last available (year)</i>	<i>Milestone 2017</i>	<i>Target 2020</i>	<i>Source of information</i>
Share of users of public transport in the population (in selected metropolitan/urban areas)	N.A.	N.A.	N.A. (project will not be finalised at this year)	+5%	National Statistics TURKSTAT MoTI Municipalities
Number of Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans developed in cities	N.A.	N.A.	N.A. (project will not be finalised at this year)	6	MoTI Municipalities
Number of preliminary studies and tender dossier prepared for public transport infrastructure projects	N.A.	N.A.	N.A. (project will not be finalised at this year)	1	MoTI Municipalities

ANNEX V – PROJECT (OPERATION) SELECTION CRITERIA

Introduction

1.1 Background and objective

The objective of Project Prioritisation is to define the priority of operational proposals submitted. The approach provides the Operating Structure (OS) of the Multiannual Action Programme for Turkey on Transport (MAPT), as well as potential end-recipients, with an objective and consistent view on the quality of the operations to be financed under the MAPT.

Selection of Operations under the Multiannual Action Programme for Turkey on Transport

1.2 Relevant framework for selection criteria

According to Article 16 of the FWA, IPA II assistance shall be provided based on strategy papers, established for the duration of the Union's Multi-annual Financial Framework by the Commission in partnership with the IPA II beneficiary. That assistance shall be implemented through programmes and measures as referred to in Articles 2 and 3 of the Common Implementing Regulation. Implementation shall, as a rule, take the form of annual or multi-annual, country specific or multi-country programmes, as well as cross-border co-operation programmes established in accordance with the strategy papers and drawn up by the IPA II beneficiary and/or the Commission, as appropriate, and adopted by the Commission.

In accordance to this article, the Selection Criteria specified in this document are set for the Multiannual Action Programme for Turkey on Transport (MAPT)⁶.

The selection criteria defined in this document is in line with the Article 62 of the FWA. To that aim, it refers to the implementation principles for multi-annual action programmes with split commitments implemented under indirect management by the Ministry of Transport, Maritime Affairs and Communications (MoTMAC) of the Republic of Turkey.

Article 62 defines 'activity' as a component of an action, which can be clearly identified by its costs and EU contribution, as well as, type of financing (e.g. procurement, grant, etc.) selected by the operating structures of the programmes concerned, or under their responsibility, that contributes to the objectives of an action. In the context of financial instruments, an activity is constituted by the financial contributions from a programme to financial instruments and the subsequent financial support provided by those financial instruments.

An activity can be implemented through many operations.

⁶

This document is also referred to as the Transport Sectoral Operational Programme (SOPT).

1.3 Eligibility Criteria in the MAPT

Selection criteria for operations are defined under each activity in the MAPT. These selection criteria determine whether an Operation is *eligible for funding under MAPT*. It should be noted that additional, elaborate information on eligibility of Operations or interventions is available in the MAPT. One is kindly referred to take note of the description of eligible interventions. The selection criteria stated under each activity in the MAPT (2014-2020) are presented below.

Action 1 – Sustainable and Safe Transport

Activity 1.1 – Improving and Modernising Railway Infrastructure

Selection criteria:

Location (is it on the European interest project and/or among the priority projects listed in the TEN-T Document and/or on the indicative TEN-T Rail Network Maps of Turkey annexed to the new TEN-T Regulation)

Maturity level of the project

Added value of the investment (increasing freight transport by rail, increase or promotion of sustainable transport, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution, etc.)

All necessary preparation studies and assessments completed, permits available (at financing decision)

Financing structure of the project is complete for all components and whole amounts

Activity 1.2 – Improving Transport Safety

Selection criteria:

Measures prioritised by the Road Traffic Safety Strategy and Action plan will receive priority.

In the first half of the planning period, preference will be given to soft measures – e.g. capacity building – with a catalytic effect

Based on successful institution building and policy development, equipment purchases and small-scale works are also envisaged. These will be selected on the basis of their

- Potential contribution to decrease the number of accidents, incidents and casualties;
- Contribution to the safety culture, awareness, coordination and harmonisation with the international legislation
- Demonstration effects, etc.

Activity 1.3 – Environmental and Climate Change-related Measures

Selection criteria:

Measures prioritised by the NCCAP will receive priority.

Priority will be given to soft measures – e.g. capacity building – with a catalytic effect

Based on successful institution building, equipment purchases and small-scale works are also envisaged. These will be selected on the basis of their contribution to preventing / reducing pollution, including GHG emissions, from transport

Activity 1.4 – Promoting Inter-modality and Modal Shift

Selection criteria:

Proximity and connection of the operation to East-West transport corridors, to Europe and networks decided in the TEN-T Document, in high traffic density and heavily populated areas

Location facilitating shift to alternative transport modes

Contribution to international and national trade

Contribution to more sustainable urban transport by shifting freight volume to periphery transport links.

Action 2 –Efficient Transport

Activity 2.1 – Supporting the ITS Strategy and Other ITS Measures

Selection criteria:

Focusing on state-of-the-art technologies and better planning,
Contribution to reduce congestion,
Reducing voyage time,
Ensuring user friendly ITS systems.

Activity 2.2 – Supporting Research and Innovation in Transport

Selection criteria:

Quality of research and development activities,
Collaboration with other institutions such as universities, NGOs etc.

Action 3 – Accessible and Inclusive Transport

Activity 3.1 – Accessible Transport

Selection criteria:

Support to the accessibility level of transport modes
Support to the training of public employees in transport sector about needs of people with reduced mobility
Expected impact on the accessibility level of transport modes
Technical capacity regarding implementation
Size of investment for implementation
Support to accessibility level of urban mobility

Activity 3.2 – Urban Transport

Selection criteria:

Technical capacity regarding implementation
Size of investment for implementation
Increasing the share of public transport in urban areas
Increasing the share of bicycle transport in urban areas
Sustainable urban mobility plan for cities

Action 4 – Acquis Alignment and EU integration

Activity 4.1 – Legislative alignment & capacity building to implement the Acquis

Selection criteria:

Corresponding legislation in the acquis
Need for intervention reflected in the Progress Reports
Available co-financing from the national budget
National Instrument for Pre-Accession Assistance Coordinator (NIPAC) consultation completed

Activity 4.2 – Supporting Policy dialogue and technical cooperation

Selection criteria:

Intervention supports the priorities of High Level Dialogue
Intervention facilitates the cooperation activities with related EU Agencies

Action 5 – Technical Assistance

Activity 5.1 – Supporting the Operating Structure

Selection criteria:

Relevance of the operations and their added value for the smooth implementation of the SOP
Preparation for transition to OPSYS

Activity 5.2 – Project Pipeline Development

Selection criteria:

Investment projects related to the implementation of the MAPT will receive special priority
In addition, projects for elaboration will be selected in line with the applicable national sector and sub-sector strategies, with particular reference to Turkey's integration agenda and commitments under Chapters 14 and 21
Preparation of IPA III priority areas and project pipelines

Operation Identification Sheets (OIS) will be assessed based on above-mentioned criteria, determining the *eligibility for IPA II funding*.

1.4 Prioritisation Criteria in the MAPT

The OISs, after found eligible, can be *prioritised* based on a multi-criteria analysis (MCA) approach, which is presented in this document.

As presented in Section 3.1, four main criteria re defined, i.e. (i) relevance; (ii) impacts; (iii) risks and sustainability; and (iv) maturity.

As maturity is a dynamic criterion, which changes in time, a two-step prioritisation process is developed:

First ranking, which is based on the first three criteria, i.e. (i) relevance; (ii) impacts; (iii) risks and sustainability.

Second ranking, which is based on all four defined criteria, including maturity.

As such, the prioritisation process is a dynamic one; it is envisaged that the second ranking will be done on a periodic basis, i.e. every six months. This will facilitate the disbursement process and related pressure on the Operating Structure.

Operation Prioritisation - criteria and sub-criteria

1.5 General outline

Four criteria are proposed for inclusion in the MCA framework for prioritisation of projects within the MAPT 2014-2020. The four criteria, with their sub-criteria, are presented in the figure below.

Relevance: 1 - MAPT Relevance	Impacts: 2 - Economic impacts 3 – Knowledge transfer impact 4 - Environmental impact 5 - Safety impact 6 – Synergies with other operations
Risks and sustainability: 7 - Institutional and staffing risk 8 - Financial sustainability 9 - Risk identification and mitigation	Maturity: 10 - Current maturity of operation 11 – Expected maturity of operations

In the next sections, the four criteria are presented. Where required, sub-criteria are adjusted for works and services projects.

1.6 Relevance

Relevance describes how well a proposed operation will address a real problem and, based on this, the extent to which an operation addresses the relevant policies as outlined in the MAPT and EU development policies.

MAPT relevance

Definition

The MAPT defines actions, which are further detailed in activities. This sub-criterion concentrates on whether the operation can be linked to the defined MAPT activities. In addition, this sub-criterion considers the extent to which a project can be linked to IPA II policy priorities. These two elements (link to defined MAPT activities; link to IPA II policy priorities) are further elaborated below.

Rationale

Link to defined MAPT activities

An operation should include at least one activity, as this is an eligibility criterion. The rationale is that if an operation addresses more than one MAPT activity, the MAPT relevance increases.

Out of the five MAPT actions, the first four are considered relevant for this sub-criterion⁷. Under these four actions the following activities are defined in the MAPT:

1. Improving and modernising railway infrastructure
- Environmental and Climate-Change related matters
- Improving Transport Safety
- Promoting intermodality and modal shift
- Supporting ITS strategy and other ITS measures
- Supporting research and innovation in transport
- Accessible transport
- Urban transport – including improving Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans (SUMP)
- Legislative alignment and capacity building to implementation of the acquis
- Supporting policy dialogue and technical cooperation

Link to IPA II policy priorities

The goal in the IPA II period is to align national policies with EU policies through a sectoral programming approach. To this end, five policy areas have been identified for the management of funds in 2014-2020 programming period⁸:

1. Reforms in preparation for Union membership and Capacity Building
2. Regional Development
3. Employment, Social Policies and Human Resources Development
4. Agriculture and Rural Development
5. Regional and Territorial Cooperation

Scoring

Link to defined MAPT activities

It is proposed that operation proposals be scored according to the extent to which the operation addresses the defined ten (10) activities, as laid out in the next table:

⁷ The last action is specifically dedicated to supporting MoTMC in managing the MAPT.

⁸ See: EU-Turkey Financial Cooperation. <https://rekabetcisektorler.sanayi.gov.tr/en/eu-turkey-financial-cooperation>.

Score intervals	Points	Remarks
One activity	1	The operation is expected to fit into at least one category, as that is part of the eligibility check in the pre-screening process
Two activities	2	If an operation, besides its “own” activity can be linked to one additional activity.
More than two activities	3	If an operation, besides its “own” activity can be linked to more than one additional activity.

Link to IPA II policy priorities

Operations are scored according to the extent that the five policy areas are addressed, as laid out to the table below.

Score intervals	Points
No link to other policy areas	0
Link to one or two policy areas	1
Link to more than two policy areas	2

Combined score

Link to other Operational Programmes				
Link to defined MAPT activities		Link to no OPs (0)	Link to one OP (1)	Link to more than one OP (2)
	No activity (0)	0	1	2
	One activity (1)	1	2	3
	Two activities (2)	2	3	4
	More than two activities (3)	3	4	5

1.7 Impact

The second criterion, impact, describes how and to which degree the operation is expected to solve the “problem” and help achievement the overall objective⁹. Impact sub-criteria are described below, including the basis for scoring in each case.

Economic impact (works operations only)

Definition

Economic impact is the change in welfare attributable to an operation. Economic impact is normally assessed using Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA), which entails the estimation of all (or the most important) costs and benefits of an operation or all viable alternatives. The operation’s overall performance is measured by indicators, namely Economic Net Present Value (ENPV), expressed in monetary terms, and the Economic Rate of Return (ERR), allowing comparability and ranking for competing operations or alternatives.

⁹ Overall objectives are broader, long term changes (directly and indirectly, intended or unintended) in the environment of the project and will not be totally resolved by one project alone.

Rationale

Economic impact, as expressed in ERR and based on CBA, provides an indication of the contribution of the operation to society and as such is a strong overall impact indicator. As stated above, this sub-criterion only applies to works operations. Indeed, CBA is (in most cases) a mandatory step in determining the feasibility of a works operation. CBA is not normally estimated for operations that includes services, grants and twinning and consequently, results of CBA in terms of ENPV or ERR are not available.

It should be noted that, apparently, no CBA results are available for some works projects in Turkey. If no CBA results are available, two approaches can be followed: (i) soft rating or no rating¹⁰.

Scoring

The economic impact of the operation that includes works projects is scored in terms of the Economic Rate of Return (ERR). This indicator should be available for all projects with a feasibility study. The discount rate applied in IPA projects is used as the minimum score for a project, after which intervals of ERR scoring are defined.

Score intervals	Points	Remarks
ERR < 5%	0	Operation scores lower than the economic discount rate applied (see Guide to Cost-Benefit Analysis of Investment Projects) ¹¹ , thus making this project not feasible
5% < ERR < 8%	2	Positive outcome of the CBA in the given range
8% < ERR < 10%	3	Positive outcome of the CBA in the given range
10% < ERR < 15%	4	Positive outcome of the CBA in the given range
ERR > 15%	5	Positive outcome of the CBA in the given range

It should be noted that, apparently, no CBA results are available for some works projects in Turkey. This may relate to project maturity (but this is covered by a separate criterion). In any case, if no CBA results are available, two approaches can be followed:

1. *Soft rating*: with this option scores are based on a combination of information provided in the OIS (Section 8, expected impact) and impact that can typically be realised through the type of operation that is proposed. With a soft rating the table below can be used.
2. *No rating*: with this option, economic impact is not rated at all. No score is filled in and the overall project scoring will be adjusted to exclude economic impact.

Score intervals	Points
No or low economic impact : the operation has no or low impact on mobility in terms of solving a capacity problem and thus creating reduced travel times and reduced transport costs. No or low impacts are created in terms of (regional) GDP or employment.	0
Some economic impact : the operation has some impact on mobility in terms of solving a capacity problem and thus creating reduced travel times and reduced transport costs. In addition, some impacts are created in terms of (regional) GDP or employment.	1

¹⁰ Details available in the main document of the Operation Prioritization Methodology

¹¹ European Commission, Guide to Cost-Benefit Analysis of Investment Projects Economic appraisal tool for Cohesion Policy 2014-2020 (2014)

Score intervals	Points
Medium economic impact: the operation has substantial impact on mobility in terms of solving a capacity problem and thus creating reduced travel times and reduced transport costs. Substantial impacts are created in terms of (regional) GDP or employment.	3
High economic impact: the operation has high impact on mobility in terms of solving a capacity problem and thus creating reduced travel times and reduced transport costs. High impacts are created in terms of (regional) GDP or employment.	5

Knowledge transfer impact (operations with services, grants and twinning only)

Definition

Knowledge transfer impact applies to services, grants or twinning operations/projects (e.g. training, studies etc.) and is the equivalent of economic impact (above) for works operations. Knowledge transfer or capacity development relates knowledge of the institution to the theme or subject of the OIS.

Rationale

Most of the services, grants and twinning operations proposed for funding (to date) under the MAPT are technical assistance projects aimed at filling some knowledge gap, either through a study, training, or preparation of a grant application. Thus, it is important to rank operations according to their ability to transfer knowledge.

Scoring

Operations that solve an existing knowledge problem and do not increase capacity in the recipient organisation can be useful from the perspective of solving the problem, but will score low in terms of knowledge created. On the other hand, operations that solve an existing knowledge problem and include a lot of elements that transfer knowledge to the recipient organisation will score high on knowledge created.

Score intervals - capacity and/or knowledge created	Points
No capacity and/or knowledge is created by the operation: The outputs of the operation do not target any form of knowledge and/or capacity development [for example a study report, terms of reference, legislative proposal, (master)plan, etc.] and will be produced by an external service provider <i>without any form of training/ knowledge transfer</i> to the end-recipient.	0
Capacity and/or knowledge created is very limited: The outputs of the operation do not target any form of knowledge and/or capacity development [for example a study report, terms of reference, legislative proposal, (master)plan, etc.], however <i>some training of or knowledge transfer to the end-recipient is likely to occur</i> because some involvement of the end-recipient is foreseen in the preparation of the outputs and 1-2 short trainings/workshops are foreseen.	1
Capacity and/or knowledge created is limited: The outputs of the operation include a knowledge and/or capacity development component, but it is not the main output of the operation. Typically, an external service provider combines outputs like master planning, database development, etc. with the production of guidelines, a study tour or training sessions. Participation of the end-recipient in the production of the outputs is however limited.	2

Score intervals - capacity and/or knowledge created	Points
Capacity and/or knowledge created is high: <i>Knowledge and/or capacity development is the main output of the operation, such as training projects, study visits or the preparation of guidelines and at least a basic training needs assessment (TNA) has been conducted. The focus is only on one of these components (either a training or a workshop or a visit, etc.). The operations are usually based on short term external inputs (a “one-off” event, limited repetition of training etc.).</i>	4
Capacity and/or knowledge created is very high – <i>Knowledge and/or capacity development is the main output of the operation. A detailed training needs assessment (TNA) has been conducted. Several knowledge/ capacity development activities will be conducted over a longer period of time. This may include capacity building elements, such as trainings, workshops, study visits, as well as activities aimed at building sustainable capacity, such as on-the-job training, train-the-trainers programmes, etc. As a minimum the end-recipient is actively participating in the operation, if not the main driver of the knowledge and/or capacity development.</i>	5

Environmental impact

Definition

Environmental impact includes a range of impacts of an operation on the environment, including: emissions (e.g. Greenhouse Gasses - GHG); biodiversity; flora and fauna; water; soils and material assets; landscape; cultural heritage; and, population and human health (including local air quality and noise). The potential impact on Sensitive Sites (incl. Natura 2000, mountain areas, marine and other protected areas, cultural heritage sites etc.) could be considered as an additional factor.

Rationale

Given the fact that the transport sector is a strong contributor to environmental impact, and environment is considered one of the transport externalities, the sub-criterion is justified.

Scoring

Operations are scored according to the extent at which the results of the operation contribute to the environmental performance. This is done in the following range:

Negative: the operation has an adverse effect on the environment.

Neutral: the operation has no effect on the environment

Some impact: the operation has elements included that contribute to a better environmental performance by addressing: emissions (GHG); biodiversity; flora and fauna; water; soils and material assets; landscape; cultural heritage; population and human health (including local air quality and noise); and, the impact on Sensitive Sites (including Natura 2000, mountain areas, marine and other protected areas, cultural heritage sites). This includes operations that promote modal shift and/or green transport solutions (cleaner engines, reduced fuel consumption, etc.).

High impact: the operation is specifically designed towards improving environmental performance. The main objective is improving environmental performance by specifically addressing the above-mentioned aspects.

These scores are presented in the following table.

Score intervals	Points	Remarks
Negative	-2	The operation has an adverse effect on the environment
Neutral	0	The operation has no effect on the environment
Some impact	2	The operation contributes to improved environmental performance by addressing some elements that have a positive environmental impact. This could include many aspects, for example creating a modal shift (from road to more environmentally friendly modes of transport); reducing the demand for transport (traffic reduction or avoidance); or developing new and innovative mobility concepts. The main purpose of the operation is not improved environmental performance, yet the operation has a clear positive effect on environmental performance
High impact	5	The operation strongly contributes to an improved environmental impact. The main objective of the operation is improved environmental performance and therefore responds to the description of the environmental and climate-change-related measures – i.e. part of activity 1.2 of the MAPT. Measured prioritised in the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) and/or operations addressing soft measures with a catalytic effect (in terms of environmental impact) will receive priority.

Safety impact

Definition

Safety impact, is the extent to which the operation is affecting safety in transport in terms of accidents and, consequently, the number of people killed or injured and property / equipment damaged. It should be noted that the safety impact applies to all transport sub-modes (air, maritime, rail, road).

Rationale

Given the number of people killed and injured in transport and the fact that safety is considered one of the transport externalities, the sub-criterion is justified.

Scoring

Operations are scored according to their impact on safety in the following range:

Negative: the operation has an adverse effect on safety.

Neutral: the operation has no effect on safety

Some impact: the operation has safety elements included and is expected to contribute to a reduction in accidents and people killed and injured.

High impact: the operation is specifically designed towards improving safety in transport and is expected to strongly contribute to a reduction of accidents and people killed and injured.

These scores are presented in the following table.

Score intervals	Points	Remarks
Negative	-2	The operation has an adverse effect on safety
Neutral	0	The operation has no effect on safety
Some impact	2	The operation contributes to a reduction in accidents and people killed and injured
High impact	5	The operation strongly contributes to a reduction in accidents and people killed and injured (which is the main objective of the operation – i.e. part of activity 1.3).

Synergies with other operations

Definition

Synergies with other projects focus on how well or not an operation works together with other operations or initiatives.

Rationale

Synergy is included as a sub-criterion to indicate whether an operation is connected to other operations, with possible positive or negative impacts. Synergy can be defined on two levels:

1. Connection to operations prepared and/or developed under *IPA I or IPA II Programme*.
2. Connection to operations prepared and/or developed with *national financial sources*.

Scoring

Operation proposals, which will build up on operations prepared and/or developed under IPA I or IPA II or national funds shall be preferred over proposals, which are not related to any of such operations.

The scores are presented in the following table.

Score intervals	Points	Remarks
Negative coherent	-2	Operation is inconsistent with or negatively affects projects under IPA I or IPA II and/or nationally funded operations.
Neutral	0	No link to operation under IPA I or IPA II and/or nationally funded operation.
Positive coherent to IPA I project(s) OR nationally funded project(s).	2	Positive coherent to IPA I or IPA II operation(s) OR nationally funded operation(s)
Positive coherent to IPA I project(s) AND nationally funded project(s).	5	Positive coherent to IPA I or IPA II project(s) AND nationally funded operation(s).

1.8 Risk and sustainability

Operation proposals will also be evaluated against the risk and sustainability core criterion in order to assess the extent key issues that affect operation risk and sustainability may jeopardise the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the operation - in both the short and long term - thus leading to unsatisfactory results.

Institutional and staffing risk

Definition

This sub-criterion combines two elements. First, the *institutional risk*, i.e. the extent to which the end-recipient has been clearly identified, responsibilities have been clearly assigned and the proposed project is supported (or opposed) by the end-recipient. Second, the *staffing risk* refers to the availability of sufficient and qualified staff to implement the operation.

Rationale

In case there is no end-recipient support (as relevant) the chances of successful and sustainable operation implementation will be very slim, whatever the merits of the operation. In addition, there should be a clear division of responsibilities for operation development and implementation amongst the parties involved.

In order to ensure efficient, effective and sustainable operation implementation it is crucial that sufficiently trained and experienced staff is in place in the end-recipient.

Scoring

A qualitative assessment of this sub-criterion can be done at two levels:

Institutional risk: the extent to which:

- The end-recipient is a clearly identified entity with an established legal basis.
- The responsibilities for operation development and implementation are clearly defined and understood by the relevant parties (especially where there are a number of end-recipients).
- Actions are taken to prepare for the implementation of the operation.

Based on the above aspects an operation is either scored low, medium or high on institutional risk (meaning that if an operation scores well on the above aspects, the risk is low, and vice versa).

Staffing risk: the extent to which sufficiently trained and experienced staff is in place in the end-recipient. If there is sufficient qualified staff is available, the staffing risk is low. If there are serious concerns related to availability of sufficient and qualified staff, the staffing risk is high. When there are some concerns, staffing risk is considered medium.

The consequent scores are included in the table below, resulting in overall scores for this sub-criterion.

	Staffing risk			
		High (0)	Medium (1)	Low (2)
Institutional risk	High (0)	0	1	2
	Medium (1)	1	2	3
	Low (3)	3	4	5

Financial sustainability

Definition

Financial sustainability focuses on the financial means that are needed after the operation has been completed. For *works and supply contracts*, financial sustainability concentrates on annual operation and maintenance costs (O&M costs), which includes depreciation costs, staff costs, cost of

equipment and materials, etc. For *services contracts*, financial sustainability concentrates on the work that is needed after the implementation of the operation. This is high in case of development of a database, which needs to be updated and is low in case of a law that is being (re)drafted, as that is an activity not requiring maintenance or follow-up work¹².

Rationale

The ability to provide sufficient funds to maintain and operate throughout the project lifetime (also after completion of the operation) will impact its effectiveness and sustainability.

Scoring

In the case of *works and supply contract*, annual O&M costs can be best assessed based on data from the (pre) feasibility study. If annual O&M costs are high, then the operation will receive a low score. In order to be able to compare between projects, the percentage of average O&M costs compared to total investment costs is taken as an indicator for financial sustainability, as presented in the table below.

Score intervals	Euro	Points
% O&M cost/total investment costs	>12%	1
% O&M cost/total investment costs	8%-12%	2
% O&M cost/total investment costs	5%-8%	3
% O&M cost/total investment costs	2%-5%	4
% O&M cost/total investment costs	0 – 2%	5

In case of *service contracts*, the O&M costs of the operations relate to the level of staff input or other resources required to maintain the result(s) of the operation. Based on the MAPT, typical service operations have been identified and an indication of staff and/or resources required for maintaining the result(s) of the operation. As an example, developing a database will require a lot of staff input after the project has been completed (data updates, new software, etc), thus scoring low on financial sustainability. At the other end of the spectrum, preparing a Terms of Reference or a funding application is a one-off affair, which would not require any additional work once the operation is completed, hence scoring high on financial sustainability. One is kindly invited to review the character of the operation against the prototypes of operations included in the table and score the operation accordingly.

Level of Staff Inputs Required: score intervals per project type	Points
Database development, communication & PR	1
Training projects	2
Preparation of (master)plans, strategies	3
Drafting guidelines	4
Draft laws, reform, studies, ToRs, funding applications	5

¹²

For works and supply contracts, financial sustainability concentrates on annual operation and maintenance costs (O&M costs), depreciation, staff costs, cost of equipment and materials etc. As these elements are incorporated in the criterion on economic impact, through cost-benefit analysis, no financial sustainability criterion is included for works projects.

Risk identification and mitigation

Definition

Risk identification relates to the appropriateness of the risk analysis, involving the identification of adverse events that the project may face, affecting the efficiency and/or effectiveness of the operation, the causes of these adverse events as well as their probability and the severity of the consequences on the operation. Risk mitigation refers to actions foreseen to prevent risks from taking place or reduce the impact of the risks.

Rationale

The successful implementation of an operation depends on a sound estimate of potential and real risks, which might occur at any stage of implementation. Risks that have not been appropriately identified are more difficult to 'manage' by means of mitigation and/or prevention measures.

Scoring

A qualitative assessment of this sub-criterion can be done at two levels:

Risk identification: the level of detail and accuracy of the risk analysis included in the OISs and whether risks have been assessed realistically: Scores are to be based on the table below.

Score intervals	Points
No or only limited risk identification has taken place in the description of the OIS.	0
Risks are partially assessed. There are limitations in the identification of risks and/or the assessment of probability and impact of the risks	1
Most risks, including their probability and impact are properly assessed in the OIS	3

Risk mitigation: the extent to which risk mitigating measures are incorporated in the operation. Scores are to be based on the table below.

Score intervals	Points
No risk mitigating measures are included in the OIS	0
Risk mitigating measures are only partially included in the OIS.	1
A mature risk mitigating procedure is included in the OIS, for example in the form of a risk mitigating action plan.	2

The consequent scores are included in the table below, resulting in overall scores for this sub-criterion.

	Risk mitigation			
		Low (0)	Medium (1)	High (2)
Risk identification	Low (0)	0	1	2
	Medium (1)	1	2	3
	High (3)	3	4	5

1.9 Maturity

The maturity criterion assesses the extent to which an operation is ready for implementation. In some cases, operation proposals might be at an early stage in their identification and only consist of a project idea, whilst other operation proposals will be more mature and have progressed through

the identification and formulation phase and are (almost) ready for procurement and implementation. All other things being equal, projects that are more mature will be given a higher priority. As indicated in Section 2.3, maturity is a dynamic criterion that changes in time. Therefore, project maturity is assessed at two levels:

Current maturity of operation (now, at exercise date)

Expected maturity of operation (future, at next round of prioritisation or close to implementation)

These two levels of maturity of operation are described below.

Current maturity of operation

Definition

The current maturity of the operation is defined by the level of development of the operation proposal and the level of preparation for implementation that has already been undertaken *at this stage*, i.e. exercise date.

Rationale

In preparing the list of priority operations, it is important to consider whether operations can be classified as 'realistic and mature'. All other things being equal, more mature projects can be implemented sooner and should therefore be given priority when being selected for implementation.

Scoring

All operations need to be properly developed through the stages of operation identification and formulation in order to ensure the relevance and feasibility of the operation idea and to establish a realistic operation delivery schedule.

Calls for proposal under the MAPT, either by open call or 'invitation', are likely to generate proposals for operations that are either at the conceptual stage or are more developed and mature. In order to assess project maturity in a practical manner an assessment can be made of the extent to which key documents have been developed and/or authorisations (e.g. permits) have been obtained.

For operations which includes works projects the level of maturity could be related to the assessment of progress with preparation of a conceptual idea, prefeasibility study, feasibility study, EIA and permits and tender documents.

For operations which includes service, grants and twinning projects (e.g. technical assistance and studies) a similar assessment can be made, examining whether operation identification and formulation includes: conceptual idea; detailed description of the intervention actions based on a needs assessment (pre-feasibility study); and, preparation of tender documents.

For operations which include supply contracts the score intervals of either the works or service contracts can be used depending. For large equipment, such as machinery, it could be possible to use the score intervals for works contracts. For other kind of supplies the use of the score intervals for service contracts might be more practical to use.

Scores are presented in the following table.

Score intervals	Points
For services:	
Only a conceptual idea has been formulated, no detailed needs assessment has been carried out yet and/ or no detailed operation description or justification for any proposed option has been provided yet	1
A written project concept paper exists providing a description of the planned operation and of the intended outcomes of the operation, but some gaps still remain. There are no or limited details (such as a needs assessment) provided that prove the relevance of the project. The description is also still unclear about the costs, timing of activities and level of stakeholder involvement in the project.	2
A full and detailed description of the planned operation specific operation exists. The justification for the operation is based on a needs assessment demonstrating the operation's relevance. The description is however still unclear about the costs, timing of activities and level of stakeholder involvement in the project.	3
A full and detailed description of the planned operation specific operation exists. The justification for the operation is based on a needs assessment demonstrating the operation's relevance. The description is still only unclear about just one of the following: the costs, timing of activities and level of stakeholder involvement in the project (e.g. 2/3 are clear)	4
All information for ToR / ToR and budget prepared	5
For works:	
A <i>conceptual idea</i> has been formulated, no detailed needs assessment and/ or no detail operation description and/or justification for any proposed option has been provided yet	1
A <i>prefeasibility</i> has been executed including preliminary design, costs estimates, cost benefit analysis and an assessment of environmental impacts	2
A <i>feasibility study</i> has been executed providing the detailed design, surveys, costs estimates, cost benefit analysis and assessment of environmental impacts.	3
<i>EIA and other assessments</i> (e.g. Habitat, Water Framework Directive) are ideally <i>finished</i> or at least sufficiently advanced (i.e. consultations with the public and other authorities finished) and development consent is expected without outstanding environmental issues. Planning, land acquisition and expropriation procedures are well advanced and can be completed in sufficient time for the start of works.	4
<i>Final design has been completed and the EIA has been updated</i> ; full cost estimates have also been prepared	5

Expected maturity of operation

Definition

The expected maturity of the operation is defined by the level of development of the operation proposal and the level of preparation for implementation that has already been undertaken *in the future*, i.e. at the next round of prioritisation or near implementation.

Rationale

The rationale for expected impact is similar as for current impact. Also here, more mature projects can be implemented sooner and should therefore be given priority when being selected for implementation.

Scoring

All operations need to be properly developed through the stages of operation identification and formulation. As this criterion focuses on a moment which is close to implementation, the operation needs to be more mature. Therefore, the scores, as presented in the following table, are adjusted accordingly (as compared to the criterion expected impact).

Score intervals	Points
For services:	
Only a conceptual idea has been formulated, no detailed needs assessment has been carried out yet and/ or no detailed operation description or justification for any proposed option has been provided yet	0
A written project concept paper exists providing a description of the planned operation and of the intended outcomes of the operation, but some gaps still remain. There are no or limited details (such as a needs assessment) provided that prove the relevance of the project. The description is also still unclear about the costs, timing of activities and level of stakeholder involvement in the project.	0
A full and detailed description of the planned operation specific operation exists. The justification for the operation is based on a needs assessment demonstrating the operation's relevance. The description is however still unclear about the costs, timing of activities and level of stakeholder involvement in the project.	1
A full and detailed description of the planned operation specific operation exists. The justification for the operation is based on a needs assessment demonstrating the operation's relevance. The description is still only unclear about just one of the following: the costs, timing of activities and level of stakeholder involvement in the project (e.g. 2/3 are clear)	3
All information for ToR / ToR and budget prepared	5
For works:	
A <i>conceptual idea</i> has been formulated, no detailed needs assessment and/ or no detail operation description and/or justification for any proposed option has been provided yet	0
A <i>prefeasibility</i> has been executed including preliminary design, costs estimates, cost benefit analysis and an assessment of environmental impacts	0
A <i>feasibility study</i> has been executed providing the detailed design, surveys, costs estimates, cost benefit analysis and assessment of environmental impacts.	1
<i>EIA and other assessments</i> (e.g. Habitat, Water Framework Directive) are ideally <i>finished</i> or at least sufficiently advanced (i.e. consultations with the public and other authorities finished) and development consent is expected without outstanding environmental issues. Planning, land acquisition and expropriation procedures are well advanced and can be completed in sufficient time for the start of works.	3
<i>Final design has been completed and the EIA has been updated</i> ; full cost estimates have also been prepared	5

Operation Prioritisation - weights

1.10 Overview of criteria and weights

An overview of the criteria and sub-criteria, together with weights applied, is presented in the table below.

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Weight (Works)	Weight (Services)	Total weights
1. Relevance	1.MAPT relevance	25%	25%	25%
2. Impact	2.Economic impact	10%	0%	25%
	3.Knowledge transfer impact	0%	10%	
	4.Environmental impact	5%	5%	
	5.Safety impact	5%	5%	
	6.Synergies with other operations	5%	5%	
3. Risk and sustainability	7.Institutional and staffing risk	10%	10%	30%
	8.Financial sustainability	10%	10%	
	9.Risk identification and mitigation	10%	10%	
4. Maturity	10.Current maturity of operation	10%	10%	20%
	11.Expected maturity of operation	10%	10%	