

## Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

### Final Report of the Selection Process

#### Call #3 – Projects to ‘Enhance sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves’<sup>1</sup>

The Call was published on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2019 and closed on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2020.

There were seven eligible applications, with a total project amount of 15.342.677,15 €.

The maximum grant amount of financing for each project is 2.200.000,00 €, and the applications submitted totaled 6,97 times the funding available.

As established in point 13.2 of the Call, after the technical evaluation of the applications accepted, the Secretary General for the Environment made the project classification list available to the Selection Committee and the European Economic Area Financial Mechanism Committee.

The following table shows the ranking list in descending order of points given to each application, with the recommendation for funding shaded in green.

The legal status of each entity, either project promoter or partner, was assessed pursuant to Article 25.º of Commission Regulation (EU) n.º 651/2014, of 16 June, declaring certain categories of aid compatible with the internal market, in application of Articles 107 and 108 of the Treaty (GBER). In this Call, the application of this regulation did not change the funding rate, as described on the table below.

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://www.eeagrants.gov.pt/media/2913/environment-programme\\_call3\\_-biosphere-reserves\\_18032020\\_final.pdf](https://www.eeagrants.gov.pt/media/2913/environment-programme_call3_-biosphere-reserves_18032020_final.pdf)

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

## Ordered List

Application number	Name of the Project	Overall Score	Project Promotor	Application of GBER rules <sup>(1)</sup>	Project grant rate	PROJECT FINANCING by the Environment Programme
		(0-100 points)				
09/Call #3	Reservas da Biosfera: territórios sustentáveis, comunidades resilientes	80,15	<b>Quatenaire Portugal SA</b>  <i>Small and Medium Enterprise (SME)</i>	<p><i>Under the proposal issued by Dra. Teresa Barros, a legal expert at SGA and a member of the Selection Committee, this application fulfills the requirements for inclusion in "Fundamental research" as well as in "Experimental development2, including activities that correspond to the examples mentioned in that opinion for both the categories.</i></p> <p><i>In this way, article 25, n.º 2. a) and n.º 5. a) are applied, with the attribution of 100 points. Article 25, n.º. 2 c) Experimental development and n.º 5 c) can also be applied with the allocation of 25 points, cumulatively to n.º 6. a) (10 points) and b) (15 points), for a total of 50 points. However, in the absence of a better opinion, it is proposed to apply Article 25, n.º 2. a) Fundamental research and n.º 5. a) with the attribution of 100 points.</i></p>	100%	2 198 666,46 €
07/Call #3	Fomento de modelos de desenvolvimento sustentável nas Reservas da Biosfera portuguesas	73,75	<b>ICETA - Instituto de Ciências, Tecnologias e Agroambiente da Universidade do Porto</b>  <i>University</i>	na	100%	2 191 405,00 €
10/Call #3	Reservas da Biosfera de Portugal: Um Ativo	67,29	<b>Instituto Politécnico de Leiria</b>	na	100%	2 196 713,37 €

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application number	Name of the Project	Overall Score	Project Promotor	Application of GBER rules <sup>(1)</sup>	Project grant rate	PROJECT FINANCING by the Environment Programme
		(0-100 points)				
	para a Humanidade / Portuguese Biosphere Reserves: An Asset for Humanity		Universidade University			
08/Call #3	BIOSPHERE.PT-TRANSFORMATIVE ACTION TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY TRANSITIONS IN PORTUGUESE BIOSPHERE RESERVES	65,33	<b>Loccmetro - Consultoria em Inovação Territorial, Lda.</b> <i>Small and Medium Enterprise (SME)</i>	<i>Under the proposal issued by Dra. Teresa Barros, a legal expert at SGA and a member of the Selection Committee, this application fulfills the requirements for inclusion in "Fundamental research" as well as in "Experimental development2, including activities that correspond to the examples mentioned in that opinion for both the categories.</i> <i>In this way, article 25, n.º 2. a) and n.º 5. a) are applied, with the attribution of 100 points.</i> <i>Article 25, n.º. 2 c) Experimental development and n.º 5 c) can also be applied with the allocation of 25 points, cumulatively to n.º 6. a) (10 points) and b) (15 points), for a total of 50 points.</i> <i>However, in the absence of a better opinion, it is proposed to apply Article 25, n.º 2. a) Fundamental research and n.º 5. a) with the attribution of 100 points.</i>	100%	2 160 785,77 €
04/Call #3	BIOSFERA Portugal	60,72	<b>Sociedade Portuguesa para o Estudo das Aves</b>  NGO	na	100%	2 199 451,31 €
05/Call #3	REPOR - REservas da biosfera Portuguesas sustentáveis e em Rede	55,72	<b>CONSULAI, Lda</b>  <i>Small and Medium</i>	<i>Under the proposal issued by Dra. Teresa Barros, a legal expert at SGA and a member of the Selection Committee, this application fulfills the requirements for inclusion in "Fundamental research" as well as in "Experimental development2, including activities that correspond to the examples mentioned in that opinion for both the categories.</i> <i>In this way, article 25, n.º 2. a) and n.º 5. a) are applied, with the attribution of 100 points.</i> <i>Article 25, n.º. 2 c) Experimental development and n.º 5 c) can also be applied with the allocation of 25 points,</i>	100%	2 199 887,11 €

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application number	Name of the Project	Overall Score	Project Promotor	Application of GBER rules <sup>(1)</sup>	Project grant rate	PROJECT FINANCING by the Environment Programme
		(0-100 points)				
			Enterprise (SME)	<i>cumulatively to n.º 6. a) (10 points) and b) (15 points), for a total of 50 points. However, in the absence of a better opinion, it is proposed to apply Article 25, n.º 2. a) Fundamental research and n.º 5. a) with the attribution of 100 points.</i>		
06/Call #3	BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Managment & Promotion	51,96	SGS Portugal - Sociedade Geral de Superintendência S.A.  Private Entity	<i>Under the proposal issued by Dra. Teresa Barros, a legal expert at SGA and a member of the Selection Committee, this application fulfills the requirements for inclusion in "Fundamental research" as well as in "Experimental development", including activities that correspond to the examples mentioned in that opinion for both the categories. In this way, article 25, n.º 2. a) and n.º 5. a) are applied, with the attribution of 100 points. Article 25, n.º. 2 c) Experimental development and n.º 5 c) can also be applied with the allocation of 25 points, cumulatively to n.º 6. a) (10 points) and b) (15 points), for a total of 50 points. However, in the absence of a better opinion, it is proposed to apply Article 25, n.º 2. a) Fundamental research and n.º 5. a) with the attribution of 100 points.</i>	100%	2 195 768,13 €

\* All Projects have Partners from Donor Countries

(1) GBER: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:02014R0651-20170710>

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

- In the meeting of 28<sup>th</sup> July 2020, the Selection Committee analyzed the information provided, having agreed with the ranking of the projects by Overall Score and to propose to the Secretary General for Environment the funding of the first project of the Provisional List (shaded green, as shown in the following table) with a total of 2.198.666,46 € (being the funding available 2.200.000,00 €).
- After verification that the selection process has been conducted in accordance with the “Regulation on the implementation of the European Economic Area (EEA) Financial Mechanism 2014-2021” and that the recommendations from the Selection Committee comply with the rules and objectives of the programme, the Secretary General for Environment publicized the results and notified the applicants about the results of the selection process on 31<sup>st</sup> July 2020.

#### Provisional List

Application number	Name of the Project*	Overall Score (0-100 points)	Funding of Environment Programme	Project grant rate
09/Call #3	Reservas da Biosfera: territórios sustentáveis, comunidades resilientes	80,15	2 198 666,46 €	100% <sup>(1)</sup>
07/Call #3	Fomento de modelos de desenvolvimento sustentável nas Reservas da Biosfera portuguesas	73,75	2 191 405,00 €	100%
10/Call #3	Reservas da Biosfera de Portugal: Um Ativo para a Humanidade / Portuguese Biosphere Reserves: An Asset for Humanity	67,29	2 196 713,37 €	100%
08/Call #3	BIOSPHERE.PT- TRANSFORMATIVE ACTION TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY TRANSITIONS IN PORTUGUESE BIOSPHERE RESERVES	65,33	2 160 785,77 €	100% <sup>(1)</sup>
04/Call #3	BIOSFERA Portugal	60,72	2 199 451,31 €	100%
05/Call #3	REPOR - REservas da biosfera PORTuguesas sustentáveis e em Rede	55,72 <sup>(2)</sup>	0,00 €	0%
06/Call #3	BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Managment & Promotion	51,96 <sup>(2)</sup>	0,00 €	0%

\*All Projects have Partners from Donor Countries

(1) GBER: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:02014R0651-20170710>

(2) Not approved: Does not comply with criteria A

- After the period of 10 working days reserved for the previous hearing, which ended on 14<sup>th</sup> August 2020, allegations were registered by two project promoters.

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

- The Secretary General for the Environment analyzed the allegations and their grounds and made the respective promoters aware of their analysis.
- The Secretary General for the Environment submitted the allegations, as well as their analysis, to the Selection Committee on 4 September 2020.
- There was no change in the classifications from the prior hearing phase, so the Final List for evaluating applications remained unchanged from the Provisional List.
- A summary of the allegations and the analysis carried out is attached.
- The Selection Committee approved the Final List for the evaluation of applications, which can be found in the following table:

### Final List

Application number	Name of the Project*	Overall Score (0-100 points)	Funding of Environment Programme	Project grant rate
09/Call #3	Reservas da Biosfera: territórios sustentáveis, comunidades resilientes	80,15	2 198 666,46 €	100% <sup>(1)</sup>
07/Call #3	Fomento de modelos de desenvolvimento sustentável nas Reservas da Biosfera portuguesas	73,75	2 191 405,00 €	100%
10/Call #3	Reservas da Biosfera de Portugal: Um Ativo para a Humanidade / Portuguese Biosphere Reserves: An Asset for Humanity	67,29	2 196 713,37 €	100%
08/Call #3	BIOSPHERE.PT- TRANSFORMATIVE ACTION TOWARDS SUSTAINABILITY TRANSITIONS IN PORTUGUESE BIOSPHERE RESERVES	65,33	2 160 785,77 €	100% <sup>(1)</sup>
04/Call #3	BIOSFERA Portugal	60,72	2 199 451,31 €	100%
05/Call #3	REPOR - REservas da biosfera PORTUGUESAS sustentáveis e em Rede	55,72 <sup>(2)</sup>	0,00 €	0%
06/Call #3	BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Managment & Promotion	51,96 <sup>(2)</sup>	0,00 €	0%

\*All Projects have Partners from Donor Countries

(1) GBER: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:02014R0651-20170710>

(2) Not approved: Does not comply with criteria A

### Conclusion

- Application 09\_Call # 3: “Biosphere Reserves: sustainable territories, resilient communities” was approved for funding under Call # 3 Projects to ‘Enhance sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves’.

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

- The approved project will have a total cost of € 2,198,666.46, with a 100% financing rate, and will run for 30 months, from 1 November 2020 to 30 April 2023.

The Final List will be published on the [Program Operator's website](#).

Lisbon, 11<sup>th</sup> September 2020

Secretary General for Environment

---

Alexandra Carvalho

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

## Annex. Summary of the Allegations and Replies.

### 05\_Call#3

Application n.º: 05			Name of the Project: REPOR - REservas da biosfera PORTuguesas sustentáveis e em Rede				Promotor: CONSULAI	
Appealing			Reply					
Date	Type of appeal	Annexes	Date	Who	Annexes	Appealing State of Play	Overall Score	
14/08/2020	Resolve	3	26/08/2020	Programme Operator	05_Call#3_Pronuncia_RespostaOP Resposta REPOR_MF&A_1 Resposta REPOR_MF&A_2	17/08: we acknowledge the reception; we sent the experts for advice 26/08: we replied to the appealing	Provisional List 55,72	After Appealing 55,72
<p><i>From the assessment reflected in the document received, we are firmly convinced that the totality of documents submitted by the REPOR consortium (included in the attached emails) has not been analyzed, so we request a careful analysis of the arguments we now present.</i></p>			<p>Preliminary observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The e-mail message attached to Your Pronunciation, dated May 15th, with 3 attachments, was integrated on May 26th in the application folder.</li> <li>– The e-mail message attached to Your pronunciation, dated May 19th, with 1 attachment, was filed on May 25th in the folder of this Application.</li> <li>– The information on pages 5 to 10 of the pronunciation is part of a document «Suporte_Memoria_Descritiva_REPOR», received on May 19th and filed in the application folder. This document was analyzed in detailed in the evaluation performed.</li> <li>– No new elements or additional information were considered at this stage.</li> <li>– Experts were consulted, who issued the attached opinions.</li> </ul>					
<p><i>“I - Analyzing the arguments presented by the evaluation panel, the consortium believes that there may have been a lapse in the analyzed documentation. This seems to be the only reason that explains the score of 20 in Criteria A - Technical know-how of the project team: applicant entity and partner entities involved. The REPOR consortium is formed by a team specialized and experienced in the different priority areas. We sought, through the participation of an extended team, to cover all the technical, operational and coordination needs that the</i></p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Criteria A scores were 20 points out of 100, with both experts scoring 20 points.</li> <li>– The contestation that is now presented focuses exactly on the area that was most valued by the assessment. In terms of the remaining areas, the team presented does not clearly demonstrate the existence of experience in the management and implementation of projects regarding the priority areas concerned.</li> </ul>					



EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 05	Name of the Project: REPOR - REservas da biosfera PORTuguesas sustentáveis e em Rede		Promotor: CONSULAI	
Appealing	Reply			
<p><i>application in question requires. It is mentioned in the assessment that "(...) there is almost no people with the necessary skills to ensure relevant aspects such as ecosystem services, climate change and sustainable development plans". Cristina Branquinho and Margarida Reis are specialist ecologists in quantifying ecosystem services at the spatial and temporal level, as can be attested by the various National and International projects in which they have participated as coordinators or as main researchers. Cristina Branquinho is part of, for example, a group of experts in biodiversity and climate change at the invitation of the ICNF to define a national climate change strategy.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, there is presence in the team of elements such as Tiago Capela Lourenço, specialist in Climate Change and Adaptation Strategies. He also played the role of researcher in the project financed by the EEA Grants - ClimAdaPT.Local - Municipal Strategies for Adaptation to Climate Change (2014-2016) and just to mention one of the many projects of unshakable relevance in which he participated.</i></p> <p><i>Pedro Cabral, from NovalIMS, is coordinator of the research project ASEBIO - Assessment of Ecosystem Services and Biodiversity in Portugal, a project funded by FCT, and in which he is coordinator.</i></p> <p><i>And just to mention those specialists whose competence and knowledge is impossible to ignore, since the remaining team allocated to the Priority Area of Knowledge complements the Programme's needs and requirements in an exemplary manner. We reinforce, the team of specialists allocated to the area of knowledge (mostly made up of elements from the Academy) has a capital of knowledge and experience at the best level in Portugal, but also internationally, as can be seen in the various projects and consortia in which they play a role. reference.</i></p> <p><i>Thus, the score of 20 out of 100 in the Selection Criteria A, calls into question the competence and credibility of the team and the institutions they represent. In order to maintain the score in this criteria, we ask for valid arguments so that in this criteria it was possible to obtain a score of 100 out of 100, which was the expected score by the REPOR consortium.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– According to the table given in Annex I of the Call, to issue a rating to Technical know-how of the project team, is not evidenced by the documents presented that the "The project team demonstrates knowledge in the areas identified for the three Priority Areas."</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score attributed to Criteria A remains justified.</li> <li>– This score is not intended, in any way, to call into question the competence and credibility of the team and in the institutions they represent, but only to evaluate the evidence submitted to the competition, according to the rules, clearly established.</li> <li>– We reinforce that a score of 100 to 100 would be obtained if "The project team demonstrates knowledge, proven experience and projects implemented in the areas identified for the three Priority Areas, as well as in relevant areas in the field of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves."</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 05	Name of the Project: REPOR - REservas da biosfera PORTuguesas sustentáveis e em Rede		Promotor: CONSULAI	
Appealing	Reply			
<i>For these reasons, we consider that there may have been a lapse when it was considered that the team does not have competences in these areas and we therefore ask for a reassessment of this parameter. "</i>				
<i>"II - It is also mentioned in one of the evaluations that "(...) description of the activities and very poor indicators", but in the second evaluation it is mentioned that "The indicators are clear and mostly adequate". We therefore request a reassessment of this criteria, considering that the score of 60 out of 100 is not at all adequate. The indicators were established considering the experience of the team of experts and the impacts expected by the Programme. Still regarding the activities, it is said that the character limitation (4,000 maximum) made it very difficult to describe them in greater detail. The team opted for a simple and concise approach, without ever harming the work methodology, as well as the means to achieve the proposed objectives. In order to overcome this limitation, we chose to send a "Suporte Memoria Descritiva REPOR - Annex to the proposal scientific approach", as suggested in a meeting held previously with those responsible for the Programme, precisely with the scientifically based methodologies oriented essentially to the area of knowledge. In this document, we have the activities perfectly described, including the respective tasks and deliverables. We also have a graphical representation that details the relationship between these activities. Once again, we hypothesize that this document, due to lapse, was not analyzed, and in the view of the consortium, the score would always have to be above 80 points. We also believe that the score given in Criteria C - Budget has been hindered by the lapse in the evaluation of activities, as mentioned by the evaluator "the budget does not present complete information, as a result of the lack of clarity in the activities". In fact, at this point, too, we are surprised by the assessment given of 50 points out of 100, since the budget is very detailed, with all the care and detail, carried out by a team that has carried them out on multiple highly complex projects, and always with success, not least because we know that this point is the basis for correct financial execution, and for its monitoring. "</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Criteria D score for indicators was 60 points out of 100, with both experts giving 60 points.</li> <li>– The Criteria C score for the budget was 50 points out of 100, with one expert giving 60 points and the second expert giving 40 points.</li> <li>– As for the indicators, the score was attributed based on the table presented in Annex I of the Call, for classification of the System of indicators, namely by applying that "The indicators are clear and appropriate in relation to the activities to be developed under the three Priority Areas and the targets are realistic in relation to the reference situation for the indicators presented. (...) but "the targets are not achievable within the planned project duration and the sources of verification are not adequate for project monitoring". From the information presented, including in the " Suporte Memoria Descritiva REPOR - Annex to the proposal scientific approach", it was not shown that the goals are achievable in the project allotted time.</li> <li>– Regarding the budget, it was considered that the information presented was adequate, but not entirely complete. This resulted, in large part, from the lack of detail of the activities presented, which made it difficult to validate the adequacy of the values presented.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score attributed to Criteria D is still justified.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score attributed to Criteria C (CO) is still justified.</li> </ul>			
<i>"III - The schedule score (60 out of 100) is also a surprise for the consortium. It is said that "the schedule is very short ... the small detail harms the analysis".</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Criteria C (CC) scores were 60 points out of 100, with both experts giving 60 points.</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 05	Name of the Project: REPOR - REServas da biosfera PORTUGUESAS sustentáveis e em Rede	Promotor: CONSULAI		
Appealing	Reply			
<p><i>Now, the schedule presented was organized by activities and tasks, precisely to detail the works that make up the different activities. In total, we present more than 50 lines of activities / tasks, with the respective duration of execution, and responsibilities. Since the available template could not be modified, we wonder how it could be done in more detail. Has the timetable, again for lapse, not been properly evaluated? "</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The score was assigned based on the table in Annex I to the Call, for classification of the schedule. A score of 80 must be attributed to the Application schedule when "The schedule is adequate to the activities to be developed and to the maximum deadlines set to complete the project, presenting proper detail and rationale, as well as due articulation and complementarity between the three Priority Areas.". The difference to the score of 60 attributed to the Application in question is the presentation of "due articulation and complementarity between the three Priority Areas", which is not demonstrated in this Application.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score assigned to Criteria C (CO) remains justified.</li> </ul>			
<p><i>"IV - It is also mentioned that the REPOR consortium proposal" (...) there is practically no presentation of work methodologies, which would help in the evaluation ". This point is also difficult for us to understand. As previously mentioned, and despite the limited character of the application form, the consortium opted to develop a document " Suporte Memoria Descritiva REPOR - Annex to the proposal scientific approach", where it was assumed from the outset not to include long descriptive texts (it seemed to us this is the reason for the limitation of characters in the form), but rather schematic representations that, in our view, describe our proposed methodology very well, both with regard to the consortium partners, the team of specialists and their multidisciplinary, as well as the relationship between the different priority areas, activities and the expected impact on Biosphere Reserves. "</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The score for Criteria C (CA) was 40 at 100 points, and both experts gave 40 points.</li> <li>– The document "Suporte Memoria Descritiva REPOR - Annex to the proposal scientific approach" was used to complement the information presented in the form. This document effectively presents what is intended to be done, however, being more limited in the specific way of doing it. The option of presenting additional information, which is not argued to be important for the overall framework of the Application, does not replace the obligation to present, in the Application documents, clear information regarding the activities to be developed. These activities constitute the whole "core" of the Application, allowing to validate development deadlines, associated costs, proposed indicators and the ability to achieve objectives. This information was weakly presented at the level of the entire Application.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score assigned to Criteria C (CA) remains justified.</li> </ul>			
<p><i>"V - Taking into account the contrary claims presented here by the REPOR consortium, we also request a careful review of the assessment given in the Specific Criteria E, whose score was low (and manifestly low in Priority Area A), without any reference in the assessment to reasons and criteria that led to the score awarded. This aspect is relevant, because for example also in Priority Area C, a score of 88 is given, when it is said that the Communication Plan is "well</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Criteria E score was 58 points out of 100, with one expert giving 67 (50-50-100) points and the second expert giving 50 (25-50-75) points.</li> <li>– Regarding Priority Area A, the contribution that the candidate project would have to the implementation of the Portugal Action Plan (2018-2025) is recognized, and in the Outcome and Outputs of the 'Environment Programme', and it is valued, partially, the proposed work plan, however it is</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 05	Name of the Project: REPOR - REservas da biosfera PORTuguesas sustentáveis e em Rede		Promotor: CONSULAI	
Appealing	Reply			
<p><i>developed, well structured, quite complete" and was rated at 100 out of 100. As for the Area Priority B, a relevant area in this Programme, there is a complete absence of comments by the evaluators, who still rank it 50 out of 100."</i></p>	<p>considered that it does not have an adequate diversity of entities to be involved in the preparation of sustainable development plans for the Biosphere Reserves, nor does it include innovative proposals and a cohesive set of work tools to be used in the preparation of the sustainable development plans and the sustainable development indicator system for Biosphere Reserves.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Regarding Priority Area B, the contribution that the candidate project would have to the implementation of the Portugal Action Plan (2018-2025), and the Outcome and Outputs of the 'Environment Programme' is recognized, and it is valued, in partly, the proposed work plan and the diversity of target audiences to be involved in the sustainable development of Biosphere Reserves, however it is considered that it does not present an innovative and cohesive set of work tools to promote the transfer of knowledge and the training of entities responsible for the sustainable management of Biosphere Reserves.</li> <li>– Regarding Priority Area C, the score was maximum for one of the experts, and the second expert considered that, as the Communication Plan was not the only final objective in this area, the score of 100 points in the sum of the each aspect submitted to evaluation for this specific area is not attained.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score assigned to Criteria E remains justified.</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

### 06\_Call#3

Application n.º: 06			Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion				Promotor: SGS			
Appealing			Reply							
Date	Type of appeal	Annexes	Date	Who	Annexes	Appealing State of Play	Overall Score			
13/08/2020	Resolve	2	26/08/2020 28/08/2020	Programme Operator	06_Call#3_Pronuncia_RespostaOP 06_Call#3_Pronuncia_RespostaOP_corrigida Resposta BIMP_MF&A_1 Resposta BIMP_MF&A_2 MFA1- TemplateAvaliacao_relatorio_Output21_Call#3_Reservas_revistoSE22042020_6_corrigido_signed MFA2_TemplateAvaliacao_relatorio_Output21_Call#3_Reservas_revistoSE22042020_6_corrigido_Capa_signed 06_Call#3_Avaliacao_rev_26082020_ass	17/08: we acknowledge the reception; we sent the experts for advice 26/08: we replied to the appealing 28/08: we sent a new version of the reply to the appealing	Provisional List 51,96	After Appealing 51,96		
			Preliminary observations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The two documents sent as an attachment to the pronouncement were not part of the Application. These documents are detailed CVs of two of the elements of the project team presented through the document “bimp_equipa do projeto.zip” that is part of the application form.</li> <li>– New elements or additional information cannot be considered at this stage.</li> <li>– Experts were consulted, who issued the attached opinions.</li> </ul>							
- Selection Criteria A. “According to the respective selection criteria, the score awarded recognizes a multidisciplinary team. However, and according to the document attached to the application and this exhibition, the BIMP team has 37 human resources distributed across the three areas of knowledge, with more than 40% adding knowledge and experience in the Thematic Area of Knowledge (A), indicated in qualitative assessment as the weakest.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Criteria A score were 20 points out of 100, with both experts scoring 20 points.</li> <li>– The proposed team is effectively composed of 39 elements and not 37, namely 23 men 16 women. The proposed team is composed of a multinational company (SGS), a national polytechnic institute (IPVC), a start-up of CIBIO / Biopolis (AGP), a collaborative laboratory (MORE), an SME specialized in the development of training content in Reality Virtual (VR2), a national polytechnic institute (IPB), a partner from Norway (Nordic Edge) and a company (FI).</li> <li>– Knowledge and experience in ecosystem services, climate change and sustainable development are not evidenced by those responsible for the area</li> </ul>							

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06	Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion		Promotor: SGS	
Appealing	Reply			
<p><i>The consortium invites the review of this score, through the detailed evaluation of the profiles, which prove that there are elements in the team with "knowledge, proven experience and projects carried out in the areas identified for the three Priority Areas", in particular in what they point out as the most fragile. We highlight, for example: the entire Algorithm Power team, a company specialized in biodiversity management, assessment and evaluation of ecosystem services and bioeconomics, within the IPVC team, Professor Joaquim Cerqueira, specialist in ecosystem mapping and characterization, Professor Ana Vale, Vice-President of IPVC, Professor Carlos Fernandes, as well as Professor Cláudio Paredes, without prejudice to the rest of the team. As an example, we send, in an attachment, the CV's of Professor Ana Vale of IPVC (highlighting the REVITAGRI project) and Hugo Rebelo of Algorithm Power, to reinforce the already exposed. For the remaining areas, we believe the quality and experience of the team, and the due recognition in the evaluation area, is unquestionable. "</i></p>	<p>of knowledge, and, in particular, related to Biosphere Reserves, without mentioning that, in the whole team, there are no elements with experience or knowledge, namely in the area of biodiversity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It should be noted, by way of example, that in the thematic area of Training, the members appointed as responsible, and other members, despite having some experience in the area of training and education, this is not related to the issues associated with this type of training intervention. As for the Communication area, although a significant number of people from the technical team are allocated to this area, their experience in communication is not very associated with the areas of knowledge directly related to this project.</li> <li>- Indeed, in a team very marked by experience at the agri-food, agricultural, livestock, animal welfare, chemical or information technology levels, it is considered that knowledge (for Priority Area A) is not at all evidenced in the areas of conservation and management of habitats, flora and fauna, ecosystem services, spatial planning and planning, participatory planning, cartography, geographic information systems and indicator and monitoring systems, specifically in relevant areas in the field of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves, (for Priority Area B) the knowledge and experience in training and education, specifically in relevant areas in the field of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves and (for Priority Area C), the knowledge and experience in communication, dissemination and awareness, specifically relevant areas in the field of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves.</li> <li>- According to the table given in Annex I of the Call, to issue a rating to the technical know-how of the project team, is not evidenced by the document presented that the "The project team demonstrates knowledge in the areas identified for the three Priority Areas.", which is why the classification assigned is appropriate and which corresponds to a " multidisciplinary project team".</li> <li>- The Programme Operator considers that the score attributed to Criteria A remains justified.</li> </ul>			
<p><i>Selection Criteria C « With regard to this criteria, we proceed to disaggregate the observations by sub-criteria:</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Criteria C score was 60 points out of 100, and from the evaluation of an expert to this criteria he obtained 57 (per sub-criteria: 20-40-100-60) points and the second expert obtained 63 (per sub-criteria: 40- 60-100-40) points.</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06	Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion		Promotor: SGS	
Appealing	Reply			
<p>CA (30%) - There is no scoring scheme for this sub-criteria in the merit reference, registered in Call # 3. We appreciate detail about it as well as complete justification for the attribution of a score that we consider to be underestimated, when the activities presented by the BIMP consortium, and the respective expected results, are in accordance with the text of the Call.</p> <p>CO (50%) - There is no scoring scheme for this sub-criteria in the merit reference, registered in Call # 3. Given the alignment with the total budgeted by the other candidates, it is unclear how to assign such a low score. We appreciate qualitative detail.</p> <p>CC (50%) - We appreciate qualitative detail and clear justification for a 50% attribution when the table in this sub-criteria, published in Call # 3, scales the score in 20 percentage point intervals.»</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Annex I of the Call details the criteria and sub-criteria for which it was considered necessary to do so in order to guarantee a robust assessment, with the concern of maintaining an opening for the assessment of the technical specificities of each project.</li> <li>– Concerning Activities (CA), there is, in fact, no scoring scheme for this sub-criteria in the merit reference registered in Call # 3. What is assessed is whether "the defined activities meet the objectives of the project" and whether they are "necessary and sufficient to achieve those objectives effectively and efficiently". In the case of the analyzed Application, it was considered that the activities presented are very general and poorly developed, resulting in little clarification of what is intended and how it is intended. It is understood that the activities are not evidenced in a sufficient way to allow assessing whether they allow to achieve the intended objectives efficiently, but it is considered that they add little to what was already explained and requested in the Call. The Application proposes seven activities, one of which is related to management. There are six that go through characterization of the Biosphere Reserves, identification of ecosystem services, development of indicators, development of a digital, multifunctional, multiuser ecosystem and development of an Ecosystem Services Marketplace. Obviously, the Application presents a little more detail, but it is considered not very detailed for what is intended in the Call. Looking at the indicators, little more can be achieved, without clearly perceiving the methodologies (even if superficially) that the Candidate intends to follow in order to achieve his objectives. Thus, it is not considered possible to show whether the defined activities meet the project's objectives and whether they are necessary and sufficient to achieve those objectives efficiently.</li> <li>– Regarding the Budget (CO), there is also no scoring scheme for this sub-criteria in the merit reference registered in Call # 3. What is evaluated is if "Do you have a project budget? Is the project budget well detailed? Are the values shown adequate?". In the case analyzed, the budget is presented in a very summarized form, with no detail that allows, with the information provided, to assess whether it is suitable for what was intended with the Application. The</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06	Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Managment & Promotion	Promotor: SGS		
Appealing	Reply			
	<p>figures presented are relatively vague and little supported (the example of dislocations on the continent is given, which refers to a figure that is not explained how it is obtained), making a good analysis difficult. This presentation difficulty is certainly associated with the little detail that cuts across the entire Application and limits the evaluation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Regarding the Schedule (CC), it accompanies the little information that is characteristic of this Application. Despite being consistent with the activities, presenting the associated details and reasons, it does not allow us to understand all the phases of the Project's development, not clearly demonstrating the proper articulation and complementarity between the three Priority Areas, which justifies the score attributed. The specific score attributed results from the methodology of attribution of value that results, as it is explicit in the Call, of the “simple average of the evaluations” made by two independent evaluating experts.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score assigned to Criteria C is still justified.</li> </ul>			
<p><i>Selection Criteria D</i>  <i>“We appreciate qualitative detail and a clear justification for a 60% attribution. It is important to note that the table of this sub-criteria, published in Call # 3, does not contain the breakdown of this criteria into sub-criteria, and the evaluation was carried out accordingly.</i>  <i>In addition, we believe that the system of 39 indicators is recognized as being clear and adequate in view of the activities to be developed within the scope of the three Priority Areas, but it is also endowed with realistic and attainable goals, as well as with a well-designed monitoring and verification system. We request a detailed review of the “verification sources” column. As a result, we request a review of this criteria.”</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The Criteria D score was 60 points out of 100, of which an expert's assessment of this criteria obtained 52 (per sub-criteria: 40-100) points and the second expert obtained 68 (per sub-criteria: 60-100) points.</li> <li>– In point 12 of the Call, Criteria D is described as follows: “D - System of indicators: This criteria is intended to assess the system of indicators to be implemented and the targets to be achieved, including an estimate of the number of jobs created (if applicable) and a balanced representation of women and men on the project team (2 percentage points).”. Since the weighting of this criteria is 10%, the component of the indicator system has a weighting of 8 %. Annex I of the Call presents a detailed description of the evaluation of this component.</li> <li>– The evaluation considered that the indicators were clear and adequate in view of the activities to be developed within the scope of the three Priority Areas and the goals were realistic in view of the reference situation of the indicators presented. However, the goals are not achievable within the expected duration of the project and the sources of verification are not suitable for monitoring</li> </ul>			



EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06	Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion	Promotor: SGS		
Appealing	Reply			
	<p>the project. This assessment is based on the information presented and is also justified by the activities that were presented by the Application. Since the activities presented are very general and poorly developed, resulting in little clarification of what is intended and how it is intended, the choice of indicators is complex and, even more complex is the exercise of validating whether the goals are achievable within the expected duration of the project. and whether the sources of verification are adequate for monitoring the project. It is not necessarily through the selection of many indicators that a project shows good follow-up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score attributed to Criteria D remains justified.</li> </ul>			
<p><i>Selection Criteria E</i>  <i>"We appreciate detail about the scores attributed to the three sub-criteria - 38%, 38%, 88% - since, according to the respective score table published in Call # 3, each of them should be scored with multiples of 25%, having based on a binary response - Yes / No.</i>  <i>Therefore, we appreciate detail about the score attributed to each of the specific aspects of each Thematic Area."</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The score for Criteria E was 54 points out of 100, and from the evaluation of an expert to this criteria he obtained 50 (per priority area (ABC): 25-50-75) points and the second expert obtained 58 (per area priority (ABC): 50-25-100) points.</li> <li>– Values 38-38-88 points (not percentages) are the arithmetic mean of the two experts score for each of the priority areas, according to point 13.2 of the Call "shall be reviewed by two experts appointed by the Programme Operator, who shall be impartial and independent of the Programme Operator and the Selection Committee. The experts shall separately score the project according to the selection criteria published with the Open Call. For the purposes of ranking the projects, the average of the scores awarded by the experts shall be used."</li> <li>– Regarding Priority Area A, the contribution that the candidate project would have to the implementation of the Portugal Action Plan (2018-2025) is recognized, as well as to the Outcome and Outputs of the 'Environment Programme', and it is valued, in part, the adequate diversity of entities to be involved in the preparation of sustainable development plans for Biosphere Reserves. However, it is considered that it does not present an adequate work plan proposal, nor does it include innovative proposals and a cohesive set of work tools to be used in preparation of sustainable development plans and the system of sustainable development indicators for Biosphere Reserves.</li> </ul>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06		Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion			Promotor: SGS										
Appealing		Reply													
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Regarding Priority Area B, the contribution that the candidate project would have to the implementation of the Portugal Action Plan (2018-2025), as well as to the Outcome and Outputs of the 'Environment Programme' is recognized, and it is valued, in partly, the innovation of work tools. However, it is considered that it does not present an adequate work plan proposal or a diversity of target audience to be involved in the sustainable development of Biosphere Reserves.</li> <li>– Regarding Priority Area C, the score was maximum for one of the experts, with the second expert considering that the Communication Plan is not particularly innovative.</li> <li>– The Programme Operator considers that the score assigned to Criteria E remains justified.</li> </ul>													
<p><i>"In addition, and taking into account the fulfillment of all the impact indicators directly correlated with the execution of Objective 2 of the 'Environment Programme'" Promotion of sustainable development models in Portuguese biosphere reserves "and the respective Output 2.1" Management capacity of the Biosphere Reserves increased ", we would like to see justified the non-verification, in the evaluation, of the contribution to the objectives of the Programme and to the reduction of social and economic disparities, strengthening the bilateral relations with the beneficiary states. In details:</i></p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 20%;">Programme Area (PA)   Objective</th> <th style="width: 40%;">Indicator</th> <th style="width: 40%;">BIMP Activity ID (s)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>PA11   Objective 2</td> <td>Number of people benefited by the promotion of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves.</td> <td>Activity 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Output 2.1</td> <td>Number of Biosphere Reserves where the measures were implemented</td> <td>Activity 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Programme Area (PA)   Objective	Indicator	BIMP Activity ID (s)	PA11   Objective 2	Number of people benefited by the promotion of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves.	Activity 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Output 2.1	Number of Biosphere Reserves where the measures were implemented	Activity 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– This analysis has as basis the requirements of the 'Regulation on the implementation of the European Economic Area (EEA) Financial Mechanism 2014-2021' (Art. 1.3.4) and Results Guidelines, including "All Programs and activities funded by the EEA Financial Mechanism 2014-2021 shall follow a results and risk management approach".</li> <li>– It was not possible to show that the defined activities will meet the project objectives and whether they are necessary and sufficient to achieve these goals effectively and efficiently.</li> <li>– As for the Indicators, targets and means of verification, the targets are not achievable within the expected duration of the project and the sources of verification are not suitable for monitoring the project.</li> <li>– With regard to the Schedule, although consistent with the activities, it does not clearly show a proper coordination and complementarity between the three Priority Areas.</li> <li>– The Budget is presented in a very summarized form, without providing any details that allow assessing whether it is suitable for what was intended with the Application.</li> <li>– From the above, the Application is considered to present some degree of uncertainty regarding the good execution of the project. However, and as mentioned by the experts in Criteria E, the Application contributes in an</li> </ul>				
Programme Area (PA)   Objective	Indicator	BIMP Activity ID (s)													
PA11   Objective 2	Number of people benefited by the promotion of sustainable development in Biosphere Reserves.	Activity 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6													
Output 2.1	Number of Biosphere Reserves where the measures were implemented	Activity 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6													

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06			Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion	Promotor: SGS		
Appealing			Reply			
	Number of trained professionals (disaggregated by gender).	Activity 4, 6	important or even relevant way to the Output and Outcome of the "Environment Programme" targeted by this Call. In addition, the Application strengthens bilateral relations with beneficiary states, namely with one of the donor states (Norway). – The Programme Operator changes the analysis of this parameter and resends the Formal Assessment with this revised parameter in the Annex.			
	Number of sustainable development plans for Biosphere Reserves developed.	Activity 1				
<p>"Regarding the Summary of the analysis of the merit of the application, it is necessary, now, to request the availability of the respective full analysis, which may, eventually, clarify the doubts that appear below." «Without prejudice to the aforementioned above, regarding the selection Criteria A, adding, moreover, to the above mentioned, the meaning of the statements "almost absence of people with the necessary skills to ensure aspects as relevant as ecosystem services, changes climate and sustainable development plans "and" The team presented, even if it demonstrates competences, punctually, for some issues to be addressed, does not show experience that allows us to expect a good treatment of all issues ". On the one hand, in quantitative terms, it is not clear how about 40% of the team with excellent skills in the mentioned aspects, evidenced in the application, corresponds to an "almost absence of people". On the other hand, as they could have attested in the application and will be able to confirm by the documentation that is attached, in qualitative terms, the team does not present "punctually" skills for the issues to be dealt with, as, on the contrary, it demonstrates a wide and significant experience, whose project results would certainly confirm.»</p>			<p>– As noted above, the evaluators where not able to find evidence of experience or knowledge in the three priority areas, which is considered to be validated before.</p> <p>– It cannot be argued when the Candidate states that "On the one hand, in quantitative terms, it is not clear how about 40% of the team with excellent skills in the mentioned aspects, evidenced in the Application, corresponds to an "almost absence of people"", since, it is reinforced, the excellent competence in the requested knowledge areas was not evidenced in the Application.</p> <p>– It is also not understood what it means "they will be able to confirm by the documentation that is attached, in qualitative terms, the team does not present" punctually "skills for the issues to be dealt with, as, on the contrary, it demonstrates a wide and significant experience, whose results the project would certainly confirm." The attached documents are two curricula that were duly evaluated in terms of evaluation (in the reduced format, then made available) and accounted for the assigned classification.</p>			
<p>«In turn, we cannot fail to reveal, again, some strangeness in the following statements: "The remaining candidacy suffers from a great lack of detail, which does not allow us to gauge, unequivocally, its real contribution to the objectives of the Programme." and "The activities are presented in a very general way, adding little in terms of steps to be taken to achieve the objectives to what is described in the Call". This taking into account that the application went as far as we were "physically" possible, as the character</p>			<p>– The limited space for submitting the Application is a cross-cutting reality for all candidates, having been considered in the evaluation all the information submitted with the Application, as well as the complementary information that could somehow clarify and support the content of the Application.</p> <p>– The strong need to be able to synthesize what is sought is a fundamental element, which is a clear objective of the Application format. The various elements requested, each for themselves, can and should contribute clearly to</p>			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

Application n.º: 06	Name of the Project: BIMP - Biosphere Innovative Management & Promotion			Promotor: SGS
Appealing	Reply			
<i>limitation (4000 characters for each of the following items - description of the project, characterization of the promoter and team, description of the activities to be developed) was not an option of ours, but an imposition of yours. Nevertheless, appropriate efforts were made to complement the form with supporting documentation that properly discriminated not only the activities to be carried out, but everything that the execution of these activities would imply in the context of the Project.»</i>	the good understanding of the project by the evaluating experts. In the present case, it is considered that this was not fully achieved by the Candidate.			
<i>« Finally, in the same context, the curious part of this statement is added: "Only the communication component is better defended, presenting a developed and well-structured Communication Plan". If, on the one hand, it shows that the non-limitation of characters provided an aspect of the application that did not raise any doubts in the respective quantitative assessment - 100, on a scale of 0 to 100 - and qualitative, on the other hand, it reinforces our strangeness for the options taken in evaluation of this application. This is because, once you have consulted the content of this Communication Plan, it appears that here the description of the activities to be carried out did not merit any repair in your assessment, while elsewhere it deserved the less positive considerations already discussed.»</i>	– The question posed by the Candidate is not understood. In fact, the Communication Plan presented deserved an excellent evaluation, having been attributed according to the quality of the elements submitted to evaluation, as was the case with the other elements submitted to evaluation, for the other aspects to be evaluated in the Application.			
<i>"Finally, we would be very grateful for the possibility of having the list of experts involved in the evaluation process published.»</i>	– The experts responsible for the evaluation of merit in this Call do not need publication, having been hired through a procedure that complied with the rules of Public Procurement. The contracted company was Matos, Fonseca & Associados.			

EEA and Norwegian Financial Mechanisms 2014-2020  
Environment, Climate Change and Low Carbon Economy Programme

### 10\_Call#3

Application n.º:	Name of the Project	Promotor	Appealing				Reply				Appealing state of Play	Overall score	
			date	Type of appeal	Content	Annexes	date	Who	Content	Annexes		Provisional List	After Appealing
10	RBP-AH - Reservas da Biosfera de Portugal Um Ativo para a Humanidade	IPLeiria	31/07/2020	Clarification	We acknowledge receipt of the promoters' notification of the provisional results of the selection process. In view of the above, we would like to know if the other applications and possible evaluations are in the public domain and can be known.	-	18/08/2020	Environment Programme Team	We apologize in advance for the delay in responding to your request, which coincided with a vacation. We attached, as requested, the Global Assessments of the applications eligible for this notice. If you still intend to submit allegations about your proposal's decision decision, you can do so until August 25, preferably by email (Ambiente.eeagrants@sgambiente.gov.pt).	-	18/08: They thanked the information sent. No new message was received.	67,29	-