

ANNEX III

EVALUATION FORM

**RESETTING 1st OPEN CALL FOR TOURISM SMES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Proposal N.  |  |
| Action Plan title:  |  |
|  |  |
| **Award Criterion 1** Score: (Minimum threshold is 3 out 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 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:**  |
|  |
|  |
| **Scoring options:** **0: The proposal fails** to address the criterion under examination or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information; **1 Poor**: The criterion is addressed in an inadequate manner, or there are serious inherent weaknesses; **2 Fair:** While the proposal broadly addresses the criterion, there are significant weaknesses; **3 Good:** The proposal addresses the criterion well, although improvements would be necessary; **4 Very good:** The proposal addresses the criterion very well, although certain improvements are still possible; **5 Excellent:** The proposal successfully addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question. Any shortcomings are minor. |

**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**  |  |