

Draft Selection Criteria of CAP SP

There shall be 3 main routes of selection criteria depending on the nature of the proposal, which are:

1. Selection of the Local Action Groups supported via COOP-Leader. Operations with the highest total score are prioritised.

2. Investments clearly targeting environmental purposes or carried out in connection with restoration activities, specifically:
 - 2.1 RD On-Farm Non-Productive Investments
 - 2.1.1 Establishing, restoring, or re-instating rural infrastructure
 - 2.1.2 Support for planting of trees and ancillary works
 - 2.2 RD Off-Farm Non-Productive Investments and Afforestation
 - 2.2.1 Support for investments improving the resilience and environmental value of forest ecosystems.
 - 2.2.2 Reconstruction and upgrading of rubble walls by Public entities
 - 2.2.3 Rehabilitation of valleys around the Maltese Islands
 - 2.2.4 Support for planting of trees and ancillary works (not on agricultural parcels)

3. Interventions in line with Article 79 (1) of Regulation (EU) 2115/2021, where operations with the highest total score are prioritised.
 - 3.1 Investments going beyond route 2, specifically:
 - 3.1.1 On-farm Productive Investments
 - 3.1.2 Off-Farm Productive Investments (Including Processing)
 - 3.1.3 Off-Farm Investments Infrastructure
 - 3.2 setting-up of young farmers,
 - 3.3 cooperation (with the exclusion of LEADER)
 - 3.4 knowledge exchange and dissemination of information.

1. Selection Criteria of Local Action Groups supported via COOP-Leader

Selection criteria		
Criterion	Marks (max)	Sub-criteria
1. Degree of engagement with local stakeholders	10	Points awarded according to the extent to which the potential LAG has engaged and consulted with the local stakeholders in its territory during the formulation of the proposed LDS.
	10	Points awarded according to the targeted involvement of local community actors in the implementation of the proposed interventions in the LDS.
2. Identification and development of local priorities	30	Points awarded according to the extent to which local priorities have been developed in the submitted local development strategy (LDS), and the evidence presented as a basis for the formulation of the LDS
3. Action planning to begin implementation	10	Points awarded according to whether the LDS demonstrates realistic action planning with respect to its implementation.
	10	Points awarded according to the capacity of the proposed LAG to implement the LDS, in terms of organisational set-up, relevant experience, and skills.
4. Relevance of Cooperation Activities	30	Points awarded according to the relevance of the proposed activities towards the overall LDS.
Total Score:	100	<i>Proposals with the highest total score are prioritised.</i>
Pass mark:	50%	

2. Investments clearly targeting environmental purposes or carried out in connection with restoration activities.

In line with Article 79 (1) of Regulation (EU) 2015/2021, there shall be no selection criteria where investments are clearly targeting environmental purposes or carried out in connection with restoration activities.

In cases where applications need to be prioritised in view of budgetary limitations, priority will be given to:

- operations within a Natura 2000 area.
- If further prioritisation would be required, then the next criterion would be proximity to Natura 2000 areas.

3.A Interventions in line with Article 79 (1) of Regulation (EU) 2115/2021 which are investments, setting-up of young farmers, cooperation, knowledge exchange and information for the Selection of Operations over EUR50,000 in project eligible costs, specifically:

- a. Investments going beyond route 2, namely:
 - i. On-farm Productive Investments
 - ii. Off-Farm Productive Investments (Including Processing)
 - iii. Off-Farm Investments Infrastructure
- b. setting-up of young farmers,
- c. cooperation (with the exclusion of LEADER)
- d. knowledge exchange and dissemination of information.

The Assessment and Selection of operations shall be undertaken by a Project Selection Committee.

A project must achieve 50% of the marks to be considered for funding. Projects will be ranked according to marks and funds allocated to those projects which obtain the highest marks.

In cases of over-demand for funding, other projects which obtain the pass mark, but which are not funded will be placed on a reserve list according to marks obtained.

Selection criteria		
Criterion	Marks (max)	Sub-criteria
The proposed project addresses the Needs as expressed in the specific objectives	15	<p>The assessment is carried out on the level of Needs deemed to be addressed by the project proposal in relation to the Specific Objective under which the intervention is taking place, within the spirit of the CAP SP.</p> <p>≤ 2 Needs addressed: 5 Marks > 2 ≤ 4 Needs addressed: 10 Marks > 4 Needs addressed: 15 Marks</p>
Contribution of the project towards the Farm to Fork Strategy	15	<p>Evidence that the project proposal is deemed to contribute towards the Farm to Fork Strategy, including, <i>inter alia</i>, the below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensuring Sustainable Food Production • Ensuring Food Security • Stimulating sustainable food processing, wholesale, retail, hospitality and food services practices • Promoting sustainable food consumption and facilitating shift to healthy, sustainable diets • Reducing food loss and waste • Combating food fraud along the food supply chain • Research, innovation, technology and investments • Advisory services, data and knowledge sharing, and skills <p>≤ 2 actions addressed: 5 Marks > 2 ≤ 4 actions addressed: 10 Marks > 4 actions addressed: 15 Marks</p>
Potential of the project to enhance/result in (the adoption of) innovation/ use of state-of-the-art technology in the sector/ partnership	5	<p>The assessment is carried out on the level of potential contribution of the project to enhance/result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (the adoption of) innovation/ use of state-of-the-art technology in the sector • Partnership with other actors

Contribution towards Results	15	<p>Where the Intervention is related to: RD COOP EIP and RD KNOW</p> <p>< 10% contribution towards R1/R2/R28 – 2 marks ≥10% contribution towards R1/R2/R28 – 5 marks</p> <p>For other interventions:</p> <p>Where the operation contributes towards a result indicator that is a simple unique count at operational level, the level of contribution towards the programme result indicator will be considered on a qualitative merit by the project selection committee maintaining a similar logic to the above.</p> <hr/> <p>Under the intervention RD KNOWLEDGE, the following sub-criteria will also be taken into account (total 10 marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) quality of the project proposals to deliver training, advice, demonstration or information actions, and farm exchanges/visits (b) competencies of the training provider, where applicable; (c) the level of integration of advisors in the actions, where applicable. <hr/> <p>For Cooperation- EIP OGs: the following sub-criteria will also be taken into account (total 10 marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - developing innovative solutions focusing on farmers' needs while also tackling the interactions across the whole supply chain where useful; - bringing together partners with complementary knowledge such as farmers, advisors, researchers, enterprises or non-governmental organisations in a targeted combination as best suited to achieve the project objectives; - co-deciding and co-creating all along the project; and - integrating advisors as much as possible.
Readiness ¹	5	<p>Risk associated with the implementation and timeline of the project as proposed by the Applicant</p> <p>Sub-Criteria 1 Planning Permit Approved / No Permits Required – 3 Marks Planning Permit Pending Decision – 1 Mark Planning Permit Application (if required) not Submitted – 0 Marks</p> <p>Sub-Criteria 2</p>

¹ Only expenditure which has been incurred after an application has been submitted to the competent authority shall be considered eligible

		Risks Identified and Mitigated in the Proposal are justified – 2 Marks
Cost-Effectiveness	10	Points awarded according to evidenced added value and effectiveness, also taking into consideration the indicative costs proposed. The consideration should be proportionate to the level of funding offered.
Quality of operation proposal	15	<p>General presentation and overall coherence between different sections of the proposal. The consideration should be proportionate to the level of funding offered.</p> <p>Clarity – 5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not well-defined. Central ideas are not focused to support the intended outcomes. Description appears disconnected (0 marks). ○ The central purpose of the proposal is identified. Ideas are generally focused in a way that supports the descired outcomes (3 marks). ○ The central purpose of the proposal is clear and supporting ideas are well-focused. Details are relevant and enrich the proposal (5 marks). <p>Sequence – 5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information and ideas are poorly sequenced. The audience has difficulty following the thread of thought. (0 marks) ○ Information and ideas are presented in a logical sequence which is followed by the reader with little or no difficulty (3 marks). ○ Information and ideas are presented in a logical sequence which flows naturally and is engaging to the audience (5 marks) <p>Description – 5 marks</p> <p>Adequate description of the purpose of the proposal (as may also be guided through the application process). The consideration shall be proportionate to the level of funding being requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Description is poor and provides no undertanding to the audience of the activities to be implemented to achieve the intended outcomes (0 marks) ● Description is adequately presented that the reader can follow with little or no difficulty (3 marks) ● Description is well detailed and is engaging to the audience (5 marks)

Sustainability	20	<p>The application will be assessed in relation to potential impact on National Policies/Plans directly linked to the CAP SP and to the effective integration of the horizontal priorities being Environmental Considerations, Climate Change mitigation and Equal Opportunities. The consideration should be proportionate to the level of funding being requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidenced plans towards facilitating increased participation of women, young farmers², other minorities, and ensuring Equal Opportunities – 5 Marks • 1 action from the below = 5 marks; 2 actions = 10marks, 3+ actions = 15 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - actions that reduce ammonia emissions - actions that promote animal welfare (<i>interalia</i> proposals that achieve housing systems, and in particular alternative systems for laying hens, free farrowing for sows as well as extended time in group housing for sows and calves (beyond the minimum time required by the EU legislation). - actions that promote circular economy - actions that target the use of anti-microbials - Shift towards organic farming - Adoption/facilitating the adoption of agricultural practices which are deemed as contributing towards enhanced sustainability - Investments in Renewable Energy and Energy Efficient Systems - reduction of nutrient losses, while ensuring no deterioration in soil fertility - make efficient use of existing legitimate buildings, structures and infrastructure, so as to avoid new development pressures scattered in the countryside; - restore already degraded land, natural habitats and landscapes where reasonably possible as well as prevent adverse environmental impacts that may arise from indirect and consequential implications of development, such as impacts associated with widening of rural roads, infrastructure, rural tourism, etc; and - improve/restore specific aspects of the environment, including the protection and conservation of the natural/rural environment, including site topography, natural physical features, valleys and watercourses, cliffs/escarpments, old rubble walls, traditional terraced fields, mature trees (e.g. carobs), areas of garrigue(xaghri), maquis or mosaic landscapes (made up of a mix of patches of arable land and patches of garrigue/maquis, and/or characterised by non trivial rock outcrops, etc.).
<p>Total Score: Pass mark:</p>	<p>100 50%</p>	<p><i>Operations with the highest total score are prioritised.</i></p>

² Under 41 years of age at the time of application

3.B. Interventions in line with Article 79 (1) of Regulation (EU) 2015/2021 which are investments, setting-up of young farmers, cooperation, knowledge exchange and information for the Selection of Operations under EUR50,000 in project eligible costs, specifically:

Selection criteria		
Criterion	Marks (max)	Sub-criteria
The proposed project addresses the Needs as expressed in the specific objectives	15	<p>The assessment is carried out on the level of Needs deemed to be addressed by the project proposal in relation to the Specific Objective under which the intervention is taking place, within the spirit of the CAP SP.</p> <p>≤ 2 Needs addressed: 5 Marks > 2 ≤ 4 Needs addressed: 10 Marks > 4 Needs address: 15 Marks</p>
Contribution towards results	15	<p>Where the Intervention is related to: RD COOP EIP and RD KNOW</p> <p>< 10% contribution towards R1/R2/R28 – 2 marks ≥10% contribution towards R1/R2/R28 – 5 marks</p> <p>For other interventions:</p> <p>Where the operation contributes towards a result indicator that is a simple unique count at operational level, the level of contribution towards the programme result indicator will be considered on a qualitative merit by the project selection committee maintaining a similar logic to the above.</p>
		<p>Under the intervention RD KNOWLEDGE, the following sub-criteria will also be taken into account (total 10 marks):</p> <p>(d) quality of the project proposals to deliver training, advice, demonstration or information actions, and farm exchanges/visits (e) competencies of the training provider, where applicable; (f) the level of integration of advisors in the actions, where applicable.</p>
		<p>For Cooperation- EIP OGs: the following sub-criteria will also be taken into account (total 10 marks):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - developing innovative solutions focusing on farmers' needs while also tackling the interactions across the whole supply chain where useful; - bringing together partners with complementary knowledge such as farmers, advisors, researchers, enterprises or non-governmental organisations in a targeted combination as best suited to achieve the project objectives; - co-deciding and co-creating all along the project; and - integrating advisors as much as possible.

Readiness ³	5	<p>Risk associated with the implementation and timeline of the project as proposed by the Applicant</p> <p>Sub-Criteria 1 Planning Permit Approved / No Permits Required – 3 Marks Planning Permit Pending Decision – 1 Mark Planning Permit Application (if required) not Submitted – 0 Marks</p> <p>Sub-Criteria 2 Risks Identified and Mitigated in the Proposal are justified – 2 Marks</p>
Quality of operation proposal	15	<p>General presentation and overall coherence between different sections of the proposal. The consideration should be proportionate to the level of funding offered.</p> <p>Clarity – 5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The proposal is not well-defined. Central ideas are not focused to support the intended outcomes. Description appears disconnected (0 marks). ○ The central purpose of the proposal is identified. Ideas are generally focused in a way that supports the descired outcomes (3 marks). ○ The central purpose of the proposal is clear and supporting ideas are well-focused. Details are relevant and enrich the proposal (5 marks). <p>Sequence – 5 marks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Information and ideas are poorly sequenced. The audience has difficulty following the thread of thought. (0 marks) ○ Information and ideas are presented in a logical sequence which is followed by the reader with little or no difficulty (3 marks). ○ Information and ideas are presented in a logical sequence which flows naturally and is engaging to the audience (5 marks) <p>Description – 5 marks</p> <p>Adequate description of the purpose of the proposal (as may also be guided through the application process). The consideration shall be proportionate to the level of funding being requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Description is poor and provides no undertanding to the audience of the intended outcomes (0 marks) • Description is adequately presented that the reader can follow with little or no difficulty (3 marks) • Description is well detailed and is engaging to the audience (5 marks)

³ Only expenditure which has been incurred after an application has been submitted to the competent authority shall be considered eligible

Sustainability	20	<p>The application will be assessed in relation to potential impact on National Policies/Plans directly linked to the CAP SP and to the effective integration of the horizontal priorities being Environmental Considerations, Climate Change mitigation and Equal Opportunities. The consideration should be proportionate to the level of funding being requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidenced plans towards facilitating increased participation of women, young farmers⁴, other minorities, and ensuring Equal Opportunities – 5 Marks • 1 action from the below = 5 marks; 2 actions = 10marks, 3+ actions = 15 marks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - actions that reduce ammonia emissions - actions that promote animal welfare (<i>interalia</i> proposals that achieve housing systems, and in particular alternative systems for laying hens, free farrowing for sows as well as extended time in group housing for sows and calves (beyond the minimum time required by the EU legislation). - actions that promote circular economy - actions that target the use of anti-microbials - Shift towards organic farming - Adoption/facilitating the adoption of agricultural practices which are deemed as contributing towards enhanced sustainability - Investments in Renewable Energy and Energy Efficient Systems - reduction of nutrient losses, while ensuring no deterioration in soil fertility - make efficient use of existing legitimate buildings, structures and infrastructure, so as to avoid new development pressures scattered in the countryside; - restore already degraded land, natural habitats and landscapes where reasonably possible as well as prevent adverse environmental impacts that may arise from indirect and consequential implications of development, such as impacts associated with widening of rural roads, infrastructure, rural tourism, etc; and - improve/restore specific aspects of the environment, including the protection and conservation of the natural/rural environment, including site topography, natural physical features, valleys and watercourses, cliffs/escarpments, old rubble walls, traditional terraced fields, mature trees (e.g. carobs), areas of garrigue(xaghri), maquis or mosaic landscapes (made up of a mix of patches of arable land and patches of garrigue/maquis, and/or characterised by non trivial rock outcrops, etc.).
Total Score: Pass mark	70 50%	<i>Operations with the highest total score are prioritised.</i>

⁴ Under 41 years of age at the time of application