



ANNEX III

EVALUATION FORM



This project has received funding from the COSME Programme (EISMEA)
under grant agreement No.101038190



RESETTING 1st OPEN CALL FOR TOURISM SMES

Proposal N.	
Action Plan title:	
Award Criterion 1 Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out of 5)	Enterprise viability: Does the action plan demonstrates a discernible competitive advantage Is it financially and commercially viable, and does it possess the management and financial resources to absorb project intervention?
Award Criterion 2 Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out of 5)	Does the action plan clearly demonstrate that: a) reflects the management strategy and vision, b) the expected outputs bring further expansion of the business?
Award Criterion 3 Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out of 5)	Does the action plan take into consideration cross-cutting issues: demonstrates the impact in developing sustainable tourism (alignment with SDGs), local development, addressing youth employment and/or gender issues?
Award Criterion 4 Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out of 5)	Is there any Innovative approach in the action plan: does it demonstrate what aspects of the digitalization process will add value to their current business model?





Award Criterion 5 Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out of 5)	Which is the level of current technical skills to implement new projects/ideas: In case the SME does not have them, then what actions/ideas are proposed within the action plan to offset this lack of skills internally?
Award Criterion 6 Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out of 5)	Is there any attainment of label/certification demonstrating proof of being committed towards responsible/ethical/fair/ tourism of the SMEs?
Remarks:	

<p>Scoring options:</p> <p>0: The proposal fails to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information;</p> <p>1 Poor: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses;</p> <p>2 Fair: While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses;</p> <p>3 Good: The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary;</p> <p>4 Very good: The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible;</p> <p>5 Excellent: The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor.</p>

I declare that, to the best of my knowledge, I have no direct or indirect conflict of interest in the evaluation of this proposal.

The evaluator,

Name –	
Surname	
Signature	
Date	

