MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY

SACEP Executive Authority of the Partnership Agreement, Environmental Sector

Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

STAGE A. COMPLETENESS AND ELIGIBILITY AUDIT

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Water management solutions implemented
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: Output_1_1_02
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE A. FUNDING APPLICATION COMPLETENESS CHECKLIST			
S/N	Criterion description	Criterion specification	Value		Remarks
1	**In time submission of proposal**	The Proposals submission date falls within the deadline fixed in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
2	**Project promoter falling within the scope of the call for proposals**	It is examined whether the project promoter submitting the proposal falls within the eligible aplicants set out in the call	YES		
			NO		
3	**Partners falling within the call**	It is examined if the partners fall within the eligible partners specified in the call. It does not apply in case of partners' absence.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
4	**Project promoter's competence for the project implementation**	It is examined if the project promoter submitting the proposal is competent to execute the project. The check is based on the documentation data (e.g regulatory decisions, articles of association of the bodies involved etc) being attached upon submitting the proposal and specified in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
5.1	**Partnership agreement for the project implementation**	It is examined if the proposal includes a draft partnership agreement or a letter of intent, pursuant to article 7.7 of the Regulation. It does not apply in case of partners' absence.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
5.2	**Partnership agreement for bilateral relations actions**	It is examined if the proposal includes a draft partnership agreement or a letter of intent, pursuant to article 7.7 of the Regulation for the bilateral relations actions. It is not applied in case of absence of proposals on bilateral relations.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
6	**Formal completeness of the submitted proposal**	The proposal is signed by the body's legal representative	YES		
			NO		
		The data specified in the call were submitted (such as studies, licensing, administrative acts etc)	YES		
			NO		
		The requested budget is within the limits fixed in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
7	**Implementation period within ~~an~~ the eligibility period of the call for proposals**	It is examined if the implementation period of the suggested project falls within the programme's eligibility period, unless a different deadline is set in the call for proposals	YES		
			NO		
8	**Non overlapping of the granted funding**	It is examined (Solemn declaration by the project promoter's legal representative) if it is ensured that grants will not be awarded to finance twice the same expenditure from other Programmes, financial instruments or/and national resources	YES		
			NO		
9	**Project's Technical Bulletin Check**	The correctness in filling out the Project's Technical Bulletin and whether it is duly signed are examined.	YES		
			NO		
10	**Submission of decisions by competent or collective bodies of the beneficiary or other competent bodies**	It is examined if decisions by competent or collective bodies of the project promoter or other competent bodies are submitted, as stipulated by the legislation in effect.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
11	**Admissibility of the application**	It is examined whether the Project matches the Objectives of the Programme and the Call. Are the suggested activities/the project's physical object eligible for funding?	YES		
			NO		
		Projects shall propose innovative green technologies/processes/solutions .For projects on desalination, renewable energy solutions shall cover at least part of the energy required for the operation of the plantsThe proposals should include innovative green technologies/methods. The cost of RES shall not exceed 30% of the suggested project's total budget (including the cost of RES).	YES		
			NO		

STAGE A CRITERIA FULFILLMENT	POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT: The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria.	The project proceeds to the Stage B' evaluation
		The project is rejected

	Date					SIGNATURES

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY

SACEP Executive Authority of the Partnership Agreement, Environmental Sector

Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Water management solutions implemented
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: Output_1_1_02
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA+A9:G20	STAGE B1 COMPLETENESS AND CLARITY OF THE PROPOSAL'S CONTENT				
S/N	**Criterion description**	**Criterion specification**	**Value**		**Remarks**
1.1	**Completeness and clarity of the suggested project's physical object**	It regards: a) the basic technical, operational and other characteristics, b) the effectiveness and suitability of the implementation methodology and analysis of the project's implementation or of its individual subprojects, any required actions, time sequence of the actions), c) the presentation of the project's deliverables, d) the publicity/communication of the suggested project (suitability of communication actions, of similar extent like the suggested project), e) the Project implementation feasibility	YES		
			NO		
1.2	**Completeness and clarity of the suggested bilateral relations activities' physical object**	In the context of bilateral relations strengthening eligible are: (a) Activities aimed at strengthening the bilateral relations between the Donor states and Greece (b) Activities Actions relating to cooperation with partners from the Donor States for drawing up and submitting a proposal, further to this call for proposals (the eligible amount for this category of action shall not exceed € 2.000,00 per submitted proposal) (c) Networking, exchanges, exchange and transfer of knowledge, technology, experiences and best practices between bodies in Greece and bodies in the Donor states or/and international organizations.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
2.1	**Realism regarding the suggested project budget**	The elements to be evaluated are: a) how complete the suggested budget is (it is examined if it includes all the necessary costs for the physical object/deliverables implementation), b) whether the costing of the suggested project is reasonable, c) the sound budget allocation to the individual operations/types of expenditure and the reasonable budget allocation to the operations/types of expenditure in relation to the suggested physical object/deliverables, the compliance with the national eligibility rules and any specific terms of the call for proposals in order to avoid non necessary or non eligible costs.	YES		
			NO		
2.2	**Realism regarding the suggested budget for bilateral relations actions**	The elements to be evaluated are: a) how complete the suggested budget is (it is examined if it includes all the necessary costs for the physical object implementation), b) whether the costing of the suggested project is reasonable, c) the proper/correct budget allocation to the individual actions/types of expenditure and the reasonable budget allocation to the actions/types of expenditure in relation to the suggested physical object, the compliance with the national eligibility rules and any specific terms of the call for proposals in order to avoid non necessary or non eligible costs.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
3.1	**Realism of the project completion timetable**	The project completion is examined in relation to: a) the physical object, b) the selected implementation method c) any contingent risks associated with the project implementation or probable delays on the issue of regulatory decisions required for the project implementation, d) the project's maturity level.	YES		
			NO		
3.2	**Realism regarding the completion timetable for bilateral relations actions**	The completion of actions is examined in relation to: a) the physical object, b) the selected implementation method c) the possible risks associated with the implementation d) the maturity level of bilateral relations actions.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
STAGE B1 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		**POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT:** **The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria.**	**The project proceeds to the Stage B2 evaluation**		
			The project is rejected		

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY

SACEP Executive Authority of the Partnership Agreement, Environmental Sector

Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

STAGE B. EVALUATION OF THE PROPOSAL PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Water management solutions implemented
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: Output_1_1_02
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B2 ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLES, INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND INTEGRATION OF HORIZONTAL POLICIES			
S/N	**Criterion description**	**Criterion specification**	**Value**		**Remarks**
4	**Compliance with of EEA FM 2014-2021 ~~implementation~~ principles of implementation**	It is examined if the suggested project is not contrary to the principles of respect to human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and the respect for ~~of~~ human rights, including the rights of people belonging to minorities.	YES		
			NO		
5	**Compliance with of sound good governance principles**	Governance of participation, without exclusions, accountable, transparent, responsive, efficient and effective, showing zero tolerance towards corruption.	YES		
			NO		
6	**Compliance with of sustainable development**	It is examined if the suggested project is consistent with sustainable development, long-term economic growth, social cohesion and environmental protection	YES		
			NO		
7	**Compliance with of gender equality and non discrimination**	It is examined if the suggested project is not contrary to the gender equality principles and if it wards off prevents discrimination on the ground of sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.	YES		
			NO		
8	**Safeguard accessibility of people with disability**	It is examined how the project ensures the accessibility of people with disability, in accordance with the applicable legal framework.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
9	**Compliance with the rules of public contracts, studies, public procurement and services**	It is examined if the suggested institutional framework of subprojects' implementation is aligned with the national, EU law & the EEA FM 2014-2021 legal framework.	YES		
			NO		

STAGE B2 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT	**POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT:** **The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria.**	**The project proceeds to the Stage B3 evaluation**
		The project is rejected

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Water management solutions implemented
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: Output_1_1_02
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B3 PROJECT FEASIBILITY			
S/N	**Criterion description**	**Criterion specification**	**Value**		**Remarks**
10	**Project's implementation necessity**	The necessity of the project implementation, in order to cope with the(need) demand or (predicament) the problem identified, is examined.	YES		
			NO		
11.1	**Project's contribution to the programme's indicators**	The project's contribution to the programme's indicators is evaluated	YES		
			NO		
11.2	**Project's contribution to bilateral relations indicators**	The subproject contribution to the bilateral relations indicator 'Number of projects involving cooperation with a Donor Project Partner is evaluated	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
12	**Sustainability, Functionality, Utilization**	Is the way of utilizing the Project's deliverables sufficiently described and is the way of safeguarding the Project's maintenance and operation documented?	YES		
			NO		

STAGE B3 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT	**POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT:** **The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Non Applicable' in all criteria, barring the criterion 11.2 that could be awarded a negative 'NO' value.**	**The project proceeds to the Stage B4 evaluation**
		The project is rejected

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA					
English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding					
PROGRAMME:	**WATER MANAGEMENT**				
Outcome:	**Status of water bodies improved**				
Output:	**Water management solutions implemented**				
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE:	**Output_1_1_02**				
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:					
CRITERIA		**STAGE B4 PROJECT PROMOTER MANAGING CAPACITY EFFICIENCY / COMPETENCE**			
S/N	**Criterion description**	**Criterion specification**	**Value**		**Remarks**
13	**Administrative capacity efficiency/competence**	It is examined if the potential project promoter has the organizational structure and the necessary procedures to implement the suggested project.	YES		
			NO		
14	**Operational capacity efficiency/competence**	The following are being considered: a. Past experience of the project promoter in implementing similar projects. b. availability /sufficient staff (project team), i.e the number and qualifications (education – professional experience) of the executives to be employed in the project implementation.	YES		
			NO		
15	**Financial capacity efficiency/competence**	The project promoter's capacity to contribute to the suggested project implementation on own resources is examined.	YES		
			NO		
			Not applicable.		
STAGE B4 CRITERIA FULFILLMENT		**POSITIVE EVALUATION REQUIREMENT:** **The Project should be awarded a positive value 'YES' or 'Not Applicable' in all criteria.**	**The project proceeds to the Stage B5 evaluation** **The project is rejected**		

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY

SACEP Executive Authority of the Partnership Agreement, Environmental Sector

Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Water management solutions implemented
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: Output_1_1_02
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

CRITERIA		STAGE B5 PROJECT SCORING				
S/N	**Criterion description**	**Criterion specification**	**Value**	**Weighting factor**	**Scoring**	**Remarks**
16	**Project effectiveness**	The contribution of the suggested project to attaining the indicators' task value, as set out in the Call, is examined. The degree of contribution is expressed as the quotient of an output or outcome Indicator value of the project ~~outcome~~ to the value of said indicator in the call for proposals: Πv= (output or outcome Indicator value of the project) / (output or outcome indicator of Call for proposals). For desalinations, the following indicator is examined: Additional water production capacity installed installed (m3/day). For telemetries, the following indicator is examined: Estimated amount of water saved per year (m3/year). Each proposal's scoring is determined after comparative evaluation of all proposals. The proposal with the highest contribution percentage is granted the highest scoring (value=10). The scoring ~~the~~ of rest of proposals is calculated proportionally to the value 10 [(% of each proposal / % of best proposal) X 10]. In case of a proposal combining desalination actions and telemetric leakage mitigation, the highest contribution degree is taken into consideration. If it is ascertained that the output or outcome Indicator value is not correct in the proposal, the evaluator carries out an evidence-based correction of the indicator value in the project	B=10*Πv/Πκ where Πκ is the proposal with the highest contribution percentage	10%		
17	**Project's efficiency/cost effectiveness**	The output or outcome indicators values in relation to the call's budget are examined. The quotient is calculated: Of (project indicator /call indicator) to (project budget / call's budget). For desalinations, the following indicator is examined: Additional water production capacity installed installed (m3/day). For telemetries , the following indicator is examined: Estimated amount of water saved per year (m3/year). In case of a proposal combining desalination actions and telemetric leakage mitigation, the highest quotient is taken into consideration. The call for proposals budget is considering as follows: a) For the desalinations, 1/2 of the call for proposals budget b) For the telemetries, 1/2 of the call for proposals budget c) For the proposals combining desalination actions and telemetric leakage mitigation, the total budget of the call	The corresponding indicator is ≥ 1,00 : 10 The corresponding indicator is 0,75 ≤ and < 1,00 : 8 The corresponding indicator is 0,50 ≤ and < 0,75 : 5 The corresponding indicator is ≥ 0,50 : 2	10%		
18	**Project location and criticality**	The criticality of the problem being faced is taken into consideration, in relation to the suggested project's location in areas facing a challenge in water adequacy and quality	Small island*: 10 Big island or a coastal area with a poor water condition**: 6 Other areas: 2	30%		* <3.500 inhabitants ** as results from the River Basins Management Plans
19	**Proposal's contribution to the EEA FM 2014-2020 general objective ''strengthening of bilateral relations between Donor States and the state's beneficiary''.**	The general objective of strengthening the bilateral relations between the Donor States and the beneficiary state is evaluated.	With a partner from Donor Countries: 10 without a partner from Donor Countries: 0	5%		

20	**Project maturity**	The project maturity as regards the progress of the required preparatory actions (studies, licensing, approvals, tendering documents, etc) requirted for the start of implmentation of the project is examined / considered The evaluation of the suggested project maturity is carried out per subproject and covers the maturity of those subprojects that contribute to the call's output Indicators. 1 Absolute maturity projects refer to those projects whereby an approved final study and approved tender documents for contracting are available or approved tender documents for procurement as well the whole set of approvals-licensing are also available. 2. High maturity projects refer to those projects with an approved final study for contracting, or approved tender documents for contructing or procurement being available as well as a part of approvals-licensing with the environmental licensing or relevant exemption being mandatory. 3. Sufficient maturity projects refer to those projects with a final study and draft tender documents for contracting or draft tender documents for procurement. Also, a part of approvals-licensing is available with the environmental licensing or relevant exemption being mandatory. 4. Any project falling under any other case shall be considered as immature project . **In that case proposal will be rejected.**	Absolute maturity = 10 High maturity = 7-9 Sufficient maturity= 4-6 Immature project = 0	30%		
21	**Innovation/Green Technologies/RES**	The existence of innovative green technologies, including the Renewable Energy Sources is examined. - High level of innovative green technologies, including RES (e.g. a desalination plant with the use of geothermal energy **or** a desalination plant with an energy recovery system, use of RES for coverage equal to or higher than 50% of energy consumption and an environmentally friendly brine disposal management **or** a telemetry using RES for coverage equal to 100% of energy consumption are examples belonging to this category). - Medium level of innovative green technologies, including RES (e.g. a desalination plant with an energy recovery system, use of RES for coverage lower than 50% and higher or equal to 20% of energy consumption and an environmentally friendly brine disposal management **or** a telemetry using RES for coverage lower than 100% and higher or equal to 30% of ~~this~~ energy consumption are examples belonging to this category). - Low level of innovative green technologies, including RES (e.g. One desalination plant with RES for coverage lower than 20% of the energy consumption and at least one of the following: A system of energy recovery or an environmentally friendly brine disposal management **or** a telemetry using RES for coverage lower than 30% of energy consumption are examples belonging to this category).	High level of innovative green technologies and RES: 10 Medium level of innovative green technologies and RES: 6-8 Low level of innovative green technologies and RES: 3-5 other: 0	15%		
			Total Scoring:			

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY

SACEP
Executive Authority of the Partnership Agreement, Environmental Sector

Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

PROGRAMME: **WATER MANAGEMENT**

Outcome: **Status of water bodies improved**

Output: **Water management solutions implemented**

CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: **Output_1_1_02**

SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:

S/N	Group of criteria	Value/Scoring	Total Scoring:
B1	COMPLETENESS AND CLARITY OF THE PROPOSAL'S CONTENT	YES/NO	YES
B2	ADHERENCE TO PRINCIPLES, INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND INTEGRATION OF HORIZONTAL POLICIES	YES/NO	YES
B3	PROJECT FEASIBILITY	YES/NO	YES
B4	PROJECT PROMOTER MANAGING CAPACITY	YES/NO	YES
B5	PROJECT SCORING		

REMARKS: (Any changes suggested by the evaluator in regarding individual parts of the submitted proposal being a prerequisite for this scoring performance are filled)

	Date			SIGNATURES

MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & ENERGY

SACEP Executive Authority of the Partnership Agreement, Environmental Sector

Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

STAGE B. PROPOSAL EVALUATION PER GROUP OF CRITERIA

English translation for informational purposes. The text in Greek is the only legally binding

OPERATIONAL PROGRAMME: WATER MANAGEMENT
Outcome: Status of water bodies improved
Output: Water management solutions implemented
CALL FOR PROPOSALS CODE: Output_1_1_02
SUGGESTED PROJECT TITLE:
EXAMPLE A project, with a budget of €800.000, without a partner from a donor state, located on an island numbering 2.500 inhabitants. It regards a new desalination plant of producing 500 m3/ day. It includes a RES system that covers 30% of energy consumption, an energy recovery system and an environmentally friendly brine disposal management. All the required approved studies have been submitted with draft tender documents and 80% of licensing has been issued including the environmental licensing.

CRITERIA		STAGE B5 PROJECT SCORING					
S/N	**Criterion description**	**Criterion specification**	**Value**		**Weighting factor**	**Scoring**	**Remarks**
16	**Project effectiveness**	The contribution of the suggested project to attaining the indicators' task value, as set out in the Call, is examined. The degree of contribution is expressed as the quotient of an output or outcome Indicator value of the project ~~outcome~~ to the value of said indicator in the call for proposals: Πv= (output or outcome Indicator value of the project) / (output or outcome indicator of Call for proposals). For desalinations, the following indicator is examined: Additional water production capacity installed installed (m3/day). For telemetries, the following indicator is examined: Estimated amount of water saved per year (m3/year). Each proposal's scoring is determined after comparative evaluation of all proposals. The proposal with the highest contribution percentage is granted the highest scoring (value=10). The scoring ~~the~~ of rest of proposals is calculated proportionally to the value 10 [(% of each proposal / % of best proposal) X 10]. In case of a proposal combining desalination actions and telemetric leakage mitigation, the highest contribution degree is taken into consideration. If it is ascertained that the output or outcome Indicator value is not correct in the proposal, the evaluator carries out an evidence-based correction of the indicator value in the project	B=10*Πv/Πκ where Πκ is the proposal with the highest contribution percentage	Πv = 500/1000 = 0,5 Assume Πκ= 0,8 B=10*0,5/0,8=6,25	10%	0,63	
17	**Project's efficieny/cost effectiveness**	The output or outcome indicators values in relation to the call's budget are examined. The quotient is calculated: Of (project indicator /call indicator) to (project budget / call's budget). For desalinations, the following indicator is examined: Additional water production capacity installed installed (m3/day). For telemetries , the following indicator is examined: Estimated amount of water saved per year (m3/year). In case of a proposal combining desalination actions and telemetric leakage mitigation, the highest quotient is taken into consideration. The call for proposals budget is considering as follows: a) For the desalinations, 1/2 of the call for proposals budget b) For the telemetries, 1/2 of the call for proposals budget c) For the proposals combining desalination actions and telemetric leakage mitigation, the total budget of the call	The corresponding indicator is ≥ 1,00 : 10 The corresponding indicator is 0,75 ≤ and < 1,00 : 8 The corresponding indicator is 0,50 ≤ and < 0,75 : 5 The corresponding indicator is ≥ 0,50 : 2	Δ= (500/1000)/(800.000/2.025.000) = 1,27 Scoring: 10	10%	1,00	
18	**Project delimitation and critical aspect**	The criticality of the problem being faced is taken into consideration, in relation to the suggested project's location in areas facing a challenge in water adequacy and quality	Small island*: 10 Big island or a coastal area with a poor water condition**: 6 Other areas: 2	10	30%	3,00	* <3.500 inhabitants ** as results from the River Basins Management Plans
19	**Proposal's contribution to the EEA FM 2014-2020 general objective "strengthening of bilateral relations between Donor States and the state's beneficiary".**	The general objective of strengthening the bilateral relations between the Donor States and the beneficiary state is evaluated.	With a partner from Donor Countries: 10 without a partner from Donor Countries: 0	0	5%	0,00	

20	**Project maturity**	The project maturity as regards the progress of the required preparatory actions (studies, licensing, approvals, tendering documents, etc) requirted for the start of implmentation of the project is examined / considered The evaluation of the suggested project maturity is carried out per subproject and covers the maturity of those subprojects that contribute to the call's output Indicators. 1 Absolute maturity projects refer to those projects whereby an approved final study and approved tender documents for contracting are available or approved tender documents for procurement as well the whole set of approvals-licensing are also available. 2. High maturity projects refer to those projects with an approved final study for contracting, or approved tender documents for contructing or procurement being available as well as a part of approvals-licensing with the environmental licensing or relevant exemption being mandatory. 3. Sufficient maturity projects refer to those projects with a final study and draft tender documents for contracting or draft tender documents for procurement. Also, a part of approvals-licensing is available with the environmental licensing or relevant exemption being mandatory. 4. Any project falling under any other case shall be considered as immature project . In that case proposal will be rejected.	Absolute maturity = 10 High maturity = 7-9 Sufficient maturity= 4-6 Immature project = 0	8	30%	2,40	
21	**Innovation/Green Technologies/RES**	The existence of innovative green technologies, including the Renewable Energy Sources is examined. - High level of innovative green technologies, including RES (e.g. a desalination plant with the use of geothermal energy **or** a desalination plant with an energy recovery system, use of RES for coverage equal to or higher than 50% of energy consumption and an environmentally friendly brine disposal management **or** a telemetry using RES for coverage equal to 100% of energy consumption are examples belonging to this category). - Medium level of innovative green technologies, including RES (e.g. a desalination plant with an energy recovery system, use of RES for coverage lower than 50% and higher or equal to 20% of energy consumption and an environmentally friendly brine disposal management **or** a telemetry using RES for coverage lower than 100% and higher or equal to 30% of ~~this~~ energy consumption are examples belonging to this category). - Low level of innovative green technologies, including RES (e.g. One desalination plant with RES for coverage lower than 20% of the energy consumption and at least one of the following: A system of energy recovery or an environmentally friendly brine disposal management **or** a telemetry using RES for coverage lower than 30% of energy consumption are examples belonging to this category).	High level of innovative green technologies and RES: 10 Medium level of innovative green technologies and RES: 6-8 Low level of innovative green technologies and RES: 3-5 other: 0	7	15%	1,05	
			Total Scoring:			**8,08**	