



LIFE Info Day

Nature & Biodiversity - Standard Action Projects (SAP) LIFE-2023-SAP-NAT Call

Anita Fassio

Unit D2 - LIFE Environment (Nature & Circular Economy)



What is LIFE Nature and Biodiversity?



**LIFE is the main EU
fund for nature
conservation**



**€3 billion funding
spent on 1 800
projects**



**LIFE contributed to
the conservation of
>750 different
species and >6 000
Natura 2000 sites**

Standard Action Projects (SAPs)

There are two topics under this call:

LIFE-2023-SAP-NAT-NATURE – Nature and Biodiversity

SMART outcome-based implementation of EU nature legislation or targets of the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030

- Topic budget: EUR 145 000 000
- Funding rate: 60%-67%-75%

Deadline: 06/09/2023

LIFE-2023-SAP-NAT-GOV – Nature Governance

EU nature and biodiversity legislation-related compliance assurance, public participation and access to justice

- Topic budget: EUR 3 400 000
- Funding rate: 60%

Deadline: 06/09/2023

Admissibility

1. Submitted through Funding & Tenders Portal
2. Readable, accessible and printable
3. Complete (includes all documents and mandatory annexes, using the forms provided inside the Submission System + compliance with the instructions therein (e.g. **font size limit, no deletion of instructions**, etc.)



Eligibility

1. In scope
2. Eligible participants (legal entities - no natural persons + eligible countries but exceptions)
3. Geographic location (in eligible countries but exceptions)

Award Criteria

There are 4 Award Criteria:

- 1) Relevance
- 2) Quality
- 3) Impact
- 4) Resources

Possible bonus points:

- Synergies between LIFE sub-programmes
- Outermost Regions and areas with specific needs and vulnerabilities
- Up-scaling results of other European Union funded projects
- Exceptional catalytic potential
- Transnational cooperation among Member States

- The award criteria are scored 0-20 and the score of criterion 'Impact' will be given a **weight of 1.5**.
- Minimum pass score: **55**
- The bonuses are based on yes/no criteria. They do not foresee a graduation: either 0 or 2 points are assigned to each proposal



Award criterion 1. Relevance (0-20 points)

a) Relevance of the **contribution to one or several of the specific objectives of the LIFE programme and the targeted sub-programme;**



Compliance with the objective of LIFE and of the sub-programme Nature and Biodiversity

b) Extent to which the project **is in line with the description included in the call for proposals, including, where relevant, its specific priorities;**



Compliance with section 1.3 and 2 of Call document:

- ✓ Assessment of type of action as described for SAPs ;
- ✓ Themes and priorities: level of compliance + order of priority



Sub-criterion 1b: Extent to which the proposal is in line with the description included in the call for proposals, including, where relevant, its specific priorities

Pre-condition: fits one intervention area: “space for nature” and/or “safeguarding our species” + has specific outcome-based biodiversity-related objectives

1. Prioritisation:

- EU Habitats Directive: habitats or species in unfavourable and declining conservation status (U1-), in particular in unfavourable-bad and declining conservation status (U2-)
- bird species, and species and habitats not covered by EU Nature legislation: species or habitats in higher extinction risk categories (endangered or worse) in EU red lists (or Global IUCN red lists for OCTs + other non-EU countries with agreement)

2. Further prioritisation of the proposals will be based on specific policy priorities

- Birds and Habitats Directives
- IAS Regulation
- EU 2030 Biodiversity Strategy

Award criterion 1. Relevance (0-20 points)

c) Concept and methodology: soundness of the **overall intervention logic**;



- Will the project and its activities solve the challenge addressed? Have they selected the right solution and methodology to solve the problem?
- Is the chain of events planned (starting problem, input, activities, expected outcomes) that should lead to the intended change valid and thorough?

d) Extent to which the project offers **co-benefits and promotes synergies** with **other policy areas relevant for achieving environment and climate policy objectives**.



Beyond LIFE (agriculture, health, civil protection, jobs and growth...)

- Are other policy areas identified?
- Are specific activities identified?
- Are they intentional?



Award criterion 2. Impact (0-20 points) x 1,5

- a) **Ambition and credibility of impacts** expected during and/or after the project due to the proposed activities, **including potential negative impacts** on the other specific objectives of the LIFE programme, including ensuring that no substantial harm is done to those objectives.
- b) **Sustainability** of the project results after the end of the project.
- c) Potential for the project results to be **replicated** in the same or other sectors or places, or to be **up-scaled** by public or private actors or through mobilising larger investments or financial resources (catalytic potential).
- d) Quality of the measures for the **exploitation** of project results.



They must be concrete, realistic and quantified. KPIs (Part C) and consistency with Part A



Realistic strategy in place to ensure that the project results will be maintained from the technical, administrative and financial points of view

Strategy to mobilise a wider uptake of the projects' solutions, beyond the project's direct beneficiaries and beyond the project duration

Actual use of the results, i.e. all output generated by the project during its implementation, also in other contexts /sectors or for other purposes



Award criterion 3. Quality (0-20 points)

- a) Clarity, relevance and feasibility of the work plan; → How, when, where, why, by whom; workplan achievable, properly planned; deliverables, milestones defined; risk assessment; permits; etc.
- b) Identification and mobilisation of the relevant stakeholders; → Involvement of key actors not part of the consortium; guarantee of support/commitment
- c) Appropriate geographic focus of the activities; → implementation sites chosen relevant/adequate/justified?
- d) Quality of the plan to monitor and report impacts;
- e) Appropriateness and quality of the proposed measures to communicate and disseminate the project and its results to different target groups.

Important: consistency between specific sections of application form and WPs



Important

Projects involving **Natura 2000 site designations** or boundaries modifications, **update of Standard Data Forms** or approval by competent authorities of **management plans** or other strategic national/regional documents, must:

1. submit a formal letter of support or commitment from the MS competent authority;
2. include a dedicated milestone in the work-plan and proper follow up;
3. ensure that sufficient time is built in project planning so that the designation/approval is realistically achievable before the end of the project.



Award criterion 4. Resources (0-20 points)

- a) Composition of the project team in terms of expertise, skills and responsibilities and appropriateness of the management structure. → Adequacy of the consortium and of the PM
- b) Appropriateness of the budget and resources and their consistency with the proposed work plan. → Compliant with rules; reasonable; justified
- c) Transparency of the budget, i.e. the cost items should be sufficiently described. → Detailed budget table must be consistent with the total budget provided in part A
- d) Extent to which the project environmental impact is considered and mitigated, including through the use of green procurement. The use of recognised methods for the calculation of the project environmental footprint (e.g. PEF or OEF methods or similar ones) or environmental management systems (e.g. EMAS) would be an asset. → For major cost items, lines should be added to provide a detailed breakdown within one cost category, also indicating the work package to which they belong
- e) Value-for-money of the proposed project. → Project 'Green management'
- Conservation benefit vs resources budgeted
Is the overall indicative investment reasonable in view of the expected impacts and results?



Higher funding rate (default: 60%)

67%

Projects targeting BOTH priority and non-priority habitats and species but with a CLEAR FOCUS on priority hab/sp: most of activities are designed to explicitly and directly target the priority hab/sp, bringing them concrete conservation benefits

75%

Projects targeting EXCLUSIVELY priority habitats and species:

- priority habitat or species as listed in the relevant annexes of the EU Habitats Directive Directive;
- bird species considered as “priority for funding” by the Ornithological Committee (EU Birds Directive);
- habitat type or species listed in the annexes of the Habitats Directive, the conservation status of which has been assessed as unfavorable-bad and declining (U2-) in the most recent available EU- and national-level biogeographical region assessments;
- habitat type or species (other than bird species) the EU-level threat status of which has been assessed as “endangered” or worse in the most up-to-date European species or habitats Red Lists
- other habitat or species in territories not covered by the European Red Lists, the threat status of which has been assessed as “endangered” or worse in the most up-to date global IUCN Red Lists.



Important: confirmation of co-financing declarations

In case the proposal includes a non-confirmed co-financing declaration, a 'Co-financing declaration' form with status "Confirmed" needs to be provided during GAP the latest 2.5 months after notification.

No Grant Agreement will be signed without confirmed co-financing!



Bonus 1 Synergies

The proposal offers exceptional synergies and promotes significant co-benefits between LIFE sub-programmes (2 points).

Synergies need to be exceptional, clearly described, well developed, justified in the proposal including in the project tasks. The project needs to bring substantial concrete benefits to those other areas (contribute to the priorities/objectives of the other sub-programmes). These benefits need to be quantified (i.e. through KPI indicators) and their monitoring should be foreseen

Requirements:

- They are clearly described, well developed, justified in the proposal
- The project brings substantial concrete benefits to those other areas (contribute to the priorities/objectives of the other sub-programmes)
- These benefits are quantified (i.e. through indicators) and monitoring is foreseen
- [The data eventually collected is further used to inform...]



Bonus 2 ORs

The proposal is primarily implemented in the Outermost Regions. Where specific regional features are relevant to the needs addressed in the call for proposals, e.g. islands for waste, coal-intensive regions for clean energy, etc., the bonus could be extended to other geographical areas with specific needs and vulnerabilities (2 points).

The European Union (EU) counts nine outermost regions. These are: French Guiana, Guadeloupe, Martinique, Mayotte, Reunion Island and Saint-Martin (France), Azores and Madeira (Portugal), and the Canary Islands (Spain).

'Primary implementation' in the described territories



Bonus 3 Uptake

The proposal substantially builds on or up-scales the results of other EU funded projects. (2 points).

The use of the concrete results of other projects needs to be clearly demonstrated in the intervention logic/actions and necessary to achieve project objectives. The proposal must be clear about how the results of other EU projects will be used. The mere transfer of best practices and experiences, while welcomed and encouraged in LIFE projects, is not sufficient to obtain this bonus point.



Bonus 4 Exceptional catalytic potential

The proposal offers an exceptional catalytic potential (2 points).

It is “exceptional” when the strategy in place leads to a significant multiplication of the impact of the project itself. The extent of replication is such that it triggers an effect that amplifies the project outcome on a much wider scale i.e. in other sectors or cities, at regional or country level, in other countries, etc..

The project could include, for example, coordination and cooperation with a substantial number of relevant actors at EU, national, regional and/or local level, develop a business case that triggers opportunities for further financing, etc.



Bonus 5 Transnationality

The proposal envisages a transnational cooperation among Member States essential to guarantee the achievement of the project objectives. (2 points).

Implementation of the project activities in two or more countries is a precondition to receive bonus points. The cooperation must be essential to reach the objectives. In addition, the proposal should convincingly describe the environmental / climate benefit of the activities implemented in each of the countries.



Project Design

Good design

Solid analysis of the problem and baseline

Key stakeholders involved

Robust assessment of impacts. Value for money

Clear strategy on how to maintain and multiply the impacts

Common problems

Insufficient background information/baseline

Objectives too broad, too many. Research activities not leading to concrete conservation activities

Insufficient support/commitment from stakeholders and competent authorities

Poor partnership

Over-optimistic / unrealistic or lack of quantification of impacts

Replication confused with networking and dissemination

Vague plans to sustain the project/results after project end

Thank you and good luck!



https://cinea.ec.europa.eu/life_en

