

## Annex 4

### Knowledge and support formats template

The aim of the template is to define preparatory, analytical, or capacity-building activities such as studies, pilot actions, stakeholder platforms, or other knowledge-based inputs that support the implementation of the EUSAIR Action Plan and Pillar priorities. The template and the evaluation list ensure the Audit trail. The template should be filled out by the stakeholder from the Adriatic-Ionian Region. The evaluation list must be filled out by a TSG member (evaluator) in order to come up with their decision.

If necessary, a support for preparation can be provided within the scope of EUSAIR governance support projects by engaging external expert/s. In that case it is necessary to fill out Annex 5 External expert engagement form prior to the submission of this template.

#### 1.1 Template for the development of knowledge and support format (filled in by applicant)

<b>Format title</b>	
<b>Acronym</b>	<i>If applicable in CAPITAL LETTERS</i>
<b>Format type</b>	<p><i>Please select:</i></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Study (e.g. strategic study, feasibility study, development plan, impact assessment, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Action (pilot-action, workshop series, campaigns, cooperation networks establishment, etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other format (Terms of reference, educational materials, toolkits, etc.)</p>
<b>ID number</b>	<p><i>Implementation format code – Pillar abbreviation – MM/YYYY – ACRONYM (if applicable)</i></p> <p><i>e.g. KS-OF-P5-07/2025-SOCIALTOR</i></p> <p><i>Depending on the implementation format selected please follow the instruction for the ID number description.</i></p> <p><u><i>Implementation format codes:</i></u>  <i>KS-S – Knowledge and support formats – Studies</i>  <i>KS-A – Knowledge and support formats – Action</i>  <i>KS-OF – Knowledge and support formats – Other formats</i></p> <p><u><i>Pillar abbreviations:</i></u>  <i>Pillar 1 – P1</i>  <i>Pillar 2 on Energy – P2E</i>  <i>Pillar 2 on Transport – P2T</i>  <i>Pillar 3 – P3</i>  <i>Pillar 4 – P4</i>  <i>Pillar 5 – P5</i></p>
<b>Origin of the idea</b>	<p><i>Please list the name and the contact of:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>the person(s) (TSG member, associate, stakeholder etc.)/organization(s) who suggested the concept</i></li> </ol>

	<i>2. or published it on the Stakeholder platform (if applicable)</i>
<b>Please indicate at which TSG meeting the format idea was presented and/or discussed (if applicable)</b>	
<b>Rationale and macroregional relevance</b>	<i>Please explain the need and background of the activity. What macroregional challenges, gaps, or opportunities does it address? Why is this format needed at this stage? How does it support broader EUSAIR implementation goals? (up to 3000 characters)</i>
<b>Compliance with the Guiding Principles/ Priorities of the respective Pillar</b>	<i>Describe the compliance with the Guiding Principles/Priorities (flagships) of the respective Pillar (up to 2000 characters)</i>
<b>Related EUSAIR Action Plan topic(s) and action(s) compliance</b>	<i>Please indicate to which topic/s and action/s within EUSAIR Action Plan does the format contribute to and shortly describe (up to 2000 characters)</i>
<b>Objective (1)</b>	<i>Describe the main objective of the format – what is to be achieved? (up to 1000 characters)</i>
<b>Methodology/approach</b>	<p><i>Describe the overall approach and steps for the format development and implementation. Explain how the methodology is suited to achieving the objective and producing useful outputs. (up to 3000 characters)</i></p> <p><i>Use the examples below to tailor your description:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>For studies: e.g. methods, sources, analysis.</i></li> <li>• <i>For actions: e.g. pilot activities description, testing procedures, co-creation or user engagement methods.</i></li> <li>• <i>For other formats: terms of reference outline, toolkit needs.</i></li> </ul>
<b>Expected outputs and results (up to 5)</b>	<p><i>List up key outputs (concrete deliverables) and describe their intended results (use or benefit):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Outputs: e.g., study report, tool, roadmap, pilot summary, stakeholder brief.</i></li> <li>• <i>Results: e.g., improved policy insights, stronger cooperation, support for future Flagships or projects.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Explain how these outputs will contribute to EUSAIR goals and provide value to Pillars or stakeholders. (up to 2000 characters)</i></p>
<b>Stakeholder involvement</b>	<i>List which stakeholder groups will be involved (e.g., national bodies, academia, civil society, NGOs) and how they will contribute. (up to 1000 characters)</i>
<b>Usefulness for future implementation</b>	<i>Describe how the proposed format can support the development or refinement of other implementation formats such as flagship initiatives, roadmaps/action plans, or strategic project fiches. Explain the expected added value, such as providing evidence, tools, stakeholder insights, etc. that can inform or accelerate future implementation efforts within the EUSAIR framework. Highlight any potential for scaling, replication, or integration into ongoing initiatives. (up to 3000 characters)</i>
<b>Additional Information (optional)</b>	<i>Please include any additional info that strengthens the case (e.g., links to EU policy, past experience, innovation elements).</i>

The project fiche to be further developed should reach the threshold of at least 52,5 points out of maximum 70 (75% threshold)!

Filled in Annex 4 should be submitted via e-mail to the one of the following addresses, depending on the topic addressed:

- TSG1:
- TSG2:
- TSG3:
- TSG4:
- TSG5:

### 1.2 Evaluation list (filled in by TSG member)

<b>Evaluation criteria</b>	<b>Guiding questions</b>	<b>Scoring guidance</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
<b>Rationale and macroregional relevance</b>	Does the format clearly address specific challenges, gaps, or needs at the macroregional level? Is the added value for the Adriatic-Ionian Region well explained?	<b>1–3:</b> Vague or local in scope <b>4–6:</b> General macroregional relevance <b>7–8:</b> Well-argued and justified <b>9–10:</b> Strong, strategic, and aligned with EUSAIR challenges		
<b>Compliance with the Guiding Principles/ Priorities of the respective Pillar</b>	Is the format clearly aligned with the Flagships or strategic priorities of the respective Pillar?	<b>Yes</b> = 10 <b>Partially</b> = 5 <b>No</b> = 0		
<b>Alignment with EUSAIR Action Plan (topics/actions)</b>	Is the link to Action Plan topics/actions clearly explained and justified?	<b>Yes</b> = 10 <b>Partially</b> = 5 <b>No</b> = 0		
<b>Realistic and credible objective</b>	Is the objective clearly stated, realistic, and relevant to the format type and context?	<b>1–3:</b> Vague or unachievable <b>4–6:</b> Generally clear <b>7–8:</b> Mostly well-defined <b>9–10:</b> Clear, achievable, and focused		
<b>Methodology and coherence</b>	Is the approach suitable for achieving the objective and producing the	<b>1–3:</b> Poor or unclear <b>4–6:</b> Adequate, but limited		

## SP4EUSAIR

<b>Evaluation criteria</b>	<b>Guiding questions</b>	<b>Scoring guidance</b>	<b>Score:</b>	<b>Comments:</b>
	<i>outputs? Is it tailored to the selected format type (study, action, other)?</i>	<b>7–8:</b> Structured and logical <b>9–10:</b> Robust and format-appropriate		
<b>Expected outputs and results</b>	<i>Are expected results clearly described and realistic? Are intended results (use or benefit) well explained? Do outputs contribute to EUSAIR goals and provide value to Pillars or stakeholders? Is the link between outputs and results coherent?</i>	<b>1–3:</b> Outputs vague or not linked to results <b>4–6:</b> General list of outputs/results but weak alignment with objectives <b>7–8:</b> Clear and relevant outputs with realistic benefits <b>9–10:</b> Well-defined, actionable outputs and results with direct value for Pillars or implementation		
<b>Usefulness, sustainability and transferability</b>	<i>Can the results support the development or refinement of future formats (flagships, roadmaps, project fiches)? Will the outputs remain relevant and usable beyond the activity's completion? Are the results transferable across EUSAIR countries, sectors, or policy areas? Is there potential for integration, scale-up, or replication?</i>	<b>1–3:</b> Weak or no evidence of future use or broader relevance <b>4–6:</b> Some potential noted, but unclear or limited scope <b>7–8:</b> Good potential for reuse and relevance to future formats <b>9–10:</b> Strong strategic value, sustainability, and clear transferability within the macroregion		
<b>FINAL SCORE</b>				
<b>General comment of the Evaluator (TSG member)</b>				

**Evaluation results:****Final score:** \_\_\_\_\_/70**Threshold reached ( $\geq 52,5$  points):**  **Yes**  **No****Next Steps:**

- **If YES** → The format will be recommended for further development and implementation and shared with relevant EUSAIR governance support project partners. The applicant may be contacted to refine the concept, discuss further development and implementation, etc.
  - *Optional follow up actions by Evaluator (TSG member)*
    - Assign TSG member(s) to support concept refinement:  
\_\_\_\_\_
    - Recommend discussion at next TSG meeting:  Yes  No
- **If NO** → The format does not currently meet the threshold. Feedback should be provided to the applicant with recommendations for improvement. Resubmission may be considered if substantial adjustments are made.
  - **Recommendations for improvement:**