

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

Selection Criteria

Call title:	Awareness raising on climate change mitigation and adaptation at schools (ClimaEdu)
Call number:	ACC03
Funding source(s):	Norway grants and State budget of the Slovak Republic

I. Administrative compliance criteria

	Administrative compliance criterion:		Method of criterion verification: (YES/NO)		Possibility of submitting missing documents and information: (YES/NO)		Notes
1.	Submission of the project application within the deadline defined in the Call		yes - no		yes		
2.	Submission of the project application by way of the delivery method defined in the Call		yes - no		yes		
3.	Submission of the project application in the form defined in the call, i.e. in English, using the standard template including mandatory annexes		yes - no		yes		
4.	Submission of the project application in the extent defined in the Call, i.e. in 1 original and 1 copy		yes - no		yes		
5.	Completion of information and / or elimination of shortcomings to the extent and within the deadline in accordance with the request on completion of documentation, if applicable		yes - no - N/A		no		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

II. Eligibility criteria

	Eligibility criterion:		Method of criterion verification: (YES/NO)		Missing documents and information: (YES/NO)		Notes
1.	Eligibility of applicant according to chapter 1 of the Call		yes – no		yes		
2.	Eligibility of partner/partners according to chapter 1 of the Call		yes – no		yes		
3.	Eligibility of activities according to chapters 3 and 4 of the Call		yes – no		yes		
4.	Eligibility of project duration according to chapter 1 of the Call		yes – no		yes		
5.	Setting of indicators and their target values according to chapter 2 of the Call		yes – no		yes		
6.	Compliance with eligible co-financing rate		yes – no		yes		
7.	Compliance with maximum and minimum limit of the Grant		yes - no		yes		
8.	Completion of information and / or elimination of shortcomings to the extent and within the deadline in accordance with the request on completion of documentation, if applicable		yes - no - N/A		no		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

III. Content related criteria

No.	Content related criterion:	Point scale:				Maximum score:	Score:	Justification:
		0	2	4	6			
Evaluated area: project								
1.	<p>There is a clear link between proposed project activities and Programme objectives, outcome and outputs and set values of indicators (elimination criterion)</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Proposed activities do not contribute or only partially contribute to the achievement of the Programme objective, outcome and outputs, i.e. they do not meet the expected objective and purpose, they are not measurable though indicators or values of indicators are not set in line with the Call, proposed activities are associated with high risk in terms of their feasibility. 6 points (yes) – Proposed activities clearly contribute to the achievement of the Programme objective, outcome and outputs, i.e. they are appropriate and they meet the expected purpose, they are logically linked to the objective and are measurable. Project contains mandatory activities in line with minimum requirements of the Call.</p>	no			yes	6		
2.	<p>The proposed activities on climate change mitigation and adaptation are appropriate and feasible in the context of the project baseline</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – The baseline situation of the applicant to meet project objectives is not favourable (the applicant does not have practical experience in the field of environmental education or did not sufficiently prove this experience), project objectives determined cannot be reached by proposed project activities, e.g. the applicant plans to realise such measure requiring high technical preparedness of the project while only project intent is available, ownership relations are not settled, defined project risks do not take into account the applicant's baseline situation, or they are too general. 2 points (partially) – The baseline situation of the applicant to meet project objectives is relatively favourable however there are risks related to successful project implementation, e.g. the applicant has only partial practical experience in the field of environmental education, the applicant plans to realise such measure requiring high technical preparedness of the project and has prepared project documentation which is not yet approved, ownership relations are only partially settled, defined project risks take into account the baseline situation of applicant but their impacts are not well and clearly defined etc. 6 points (yes) – The baseline situation of the applicant to meet project objectives is favourable, the applicant has enough practical experience in the field of environmental education, or already implemented/implements environmental projects, the applicant plans to realise such measure requiring high technical preparedness of the project and has submitted approved project documentation, ownership relations are settled, building or other permits are approved/issued or public procurement was started/ended, defined project risks and their impacts are well and clearly defined.</p>	no	partially		yes	6		
3.	<p>Proposed activities are feasible with respect to proposed project timetable</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – The proposed activities are not feasible within the given timetable of the project, milestones are only generally defined and are logically inconsistent. 2 points (partially) – The proposed activities are partially feasible within the given project timetable, i.e. there is still doubt that some activities are not feasible within the given timetable, milestones are defined logically and reasonable in relation to individual activities, however the time realization of milestones is too optimistic (e.g. public procurement, construction season is not taken into account). 4 points (yes) – The proposed activities are fully feasible within the given timetable of the project, the milestones of the project are set logically within the time and material framework.</p>	no	partially	yes		4		
4.	<p>The proposed project activities are relevant to the needs of defined target groups</p> <p>Explanation:</p>	no	partially		yes	6		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>0 points (no) – Proposed activities are designed without a clearly defined relevancy to defined target groups.</p> <p>2 points (partially) – Proposed measures or some of them are not with regard to their character clearly defined with equal relevance to the needs of the defined target groups due to their nature.</p> <p>6 points (yes) – All proposed measures are clearly and unambiguously designed for defined target groups.</p>							
5.	<p>Number of other Slovak subjects/partners(without financial contribution as well as with financial contribution) planned to be actively involved in the project activities on raising awareness on climate change</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (0) – Project is not based on cooperation with Slovak subjects without financial contribution or partners with financial contribution. 2 points (1-2) – Project is based on cooperation with 1 or 2 Slovak subjects without financial contribution or partners with financial contribution. 4 points (≥3) – Project is based on cooperation with 3 and more Slovak subjects without financial contribution or partners with financial contribution.</p>	0	1-2	≥3		4		
6.	<p>Hard technical measures are clearly thematically linked to soft education measures</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Hard technical measures are not thematically linked or are only partially linked to soft measures to be implemented within the project, hard measures are not appropriate for long-term education function and the project does not plan the implementation of the supplementary measure – building thematically linked eco-education surface or eco-schoolroom. 6 points (yes) – Hard technical measures are clearly thematically linked with logical relevance to soft measures to be implemented within the project, hard measures meet the requirements for long-term education function or the project plans the implementation of the supplementary measure – building thematically linked eco-education surface or eco-schoolroom.</p>	no			yes	6		
7.	<p>Estimated number of students participating in the education activities of the project</p> <p>Explanation: 2 points (<200) – Number of students participating in the education activities of the project is less than 200. 4 points (200-300) – Number of students participating in the education activities of the project is in the range of 200-300. 6 points (>300) – Number of students participating in the education activities of the project is more than 300.</p>		<200	200-300	>300	6		
8.	<p>Number of the school grades using education materials/tools that are the results of the project</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (1) – Number of the school grades using education materials/tools that are the result of the project is equal to one. 4 points (2) – Number of the school grades using education materials/tools that are the result of the project is equal to two. 6 points (≥3) – Number of the school grades using education materials/tools that are the result of the project is equal to three and more.</p>	1		2	≥3	6		
		subtotal for evaluated area				44		
		minimum required number of points				24		
Evaluated area: Value for Money								
9.	<p>Contribution of the project to the total number of people self-reporting having more climate friendly behaviour as result of project activities expressed in the form of „Value for Money“ (EUR/number of persons). The number of persons include all persons (students of school – applicant, students of other school, public – parents, local communities etc.) planned to participate or to be involved in the campaign on awareness raising (education activities, promotion activities).</p> <p>This contribution is evaluated based on declared target value for binding indicator of the Programme outcome.</p>					45		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>Criterion for distinguishing between projects YES.</p> <p>Explanation: Total eligible expenditures of the project are reasonable towards expected results.</p> <p>Value for money is evaluated towards binding indicator of the Programme outcome: - number of people self-reporting having more climate friendly behaviour.</p> <p>Scoring depends on the level of project contribution (x) to reach target value for indicator within the Programme and it is calculated as rate of total eligible expenditures of the project and the target value of the project (number of persons). The level of contribution is calculated based on the following formula: x=1500/(total eligible expenditures/number of persons)</p> <p>Maximum number of points to be scored by the applicant is 45 points.</p> <p>(Example: project with total eligible expenditures 50 000 EUR involving 200 persons in the awareness raising campaign will be scored by 6 points, project with total eligible expenditures 30 000 EUR involving 200 persons in the awareness raising campaign will be scored by 10 points. etc.)</p>							
		subtotal for evaluated area			45			
		minimum required number of points			N/A			
Evaluated area: financial								
10.	<p>Requested project costs are appropriate and eligible</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (≤50%) – More than 50% of requested project costs are without clear link to planned activities (they are not well specified), or budget contains also non-eligible costs. 2 points (51 – 74%) – Requested project costs in the defined range are clearly and in appropriate manner linked to project activities (they are relatively well specified). 6 points (≥75%) – 75% or more than 75% of requested project costs are clearly, directly and in appropriate manner linked to planned activities (they are very well specified).</p>	≤50%	51 – 74%	≥75%	6			
11.	<p>The unit prices are proportionate and correspond to the usual prices in the market or are comparable with costs for similar projects</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (≤50%) – Less than 50% of unit prices defined in the budget can be evaluated as proportionate (e.g. by market review) and reasonable. 2 points (51 – 74%) – Unit prices defined in the defined range can be evaluated as proportionate (e.g. by market review) and reasonable. 6 points (≥75%) – 75% and more of unit prices defined in the budget can be evaluated as proportionate (e.g. by market review) and reasonable.</p>	≤50%	51 – 74%	≥75%	6			
12.	<p>The applicant clearly declares resources to cover the cost of maintaining the project results throughout the period of project's sustainability</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – The project sustainability is described in a declaratory manner, the planned costs are vague, the sources of funding cannot be considered as credible. 6 points (yes) – The project sustainability is described clearly and in detail, the planned costs are rational, the sources of funding is considered as credible.</p>	no		yes	6			

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

		subtotal for evaluated area				18		
		minimum required number of points				10		
Evaluated area: administrative								
13.	<p>The applicant has sufficiency of administrative capacities for project management</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – The applicant does not have within its structure the administrative capacities to manage the project, including the share of responsibilities between specific working positions. Project management in external form is only declaratory, the requirements for project management are vague. 4 points (yes) – The applicant has within its structure the administrative capacities to manage the project, including the share of responsibilities between specific working positions. In case of external project management the requirements are clearly specified including reasonable (not-overestimated) financial costs.</p>	no		yes		4		
14.	<p>The risks are defined and risk management involves reasonable measures for risks elimination and mitigation</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Risks are described in vague manner, not considering the specificities of project activities or of the applicant/partner. There is not clear link/effectiveness between defined risks and response (reaction) to risk. 2 points (partially) – Risks are described in a sufficiently clear, unambiguous and relevant manner in relation to the planned activities. There is an immediate link between the risk response and its description. However, other risks may also be considered, taking into account the specificities of the project or of the applicant/partner or external factors. 6 points (yes) – Risks are described in clearly, unambiguously and appropriately in relation to the planned activities, specificities of the project or of the applicant/partner. There is a direct link between the risk response and its description.</p>	no	partially	yes		6		
		subtotal for evaluated area				10		
		minimum required number of points				6		
Evaluated area: bilateral								
15.	<p>The entities from Norway are involved in the project as partners</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – The applicant does not plan/declare any project partnership with the entities from Norway. 6 points (yes) – The applicant clearly plans project partnership with the entities from Norway including detail information on partners, description of their roles and submission of partnership statement.</p>	no		yes		6		
16.	<p>The level of involvement of project partners from Norway in the project</p> <p>0 points (none) – there is no participation of subjects from Norway. 2 points (low) – The subjects from Norway will participate the events/actions within the project as lecturers/speakers. 6 points (high) - The subjects from Norway are directly linked to project preparation and/or realisation of individual activities.</p>	none	low	high		6		
		subtotal for evaluated area				12		
		minimum required number of points				N/A		
Evaluated area: bonus								
17.	<p>Proposed hard technical measures contribute to reducing greenhouse gas emissions (CO₂ a CO₂ equivalent)</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Project does not plan to realise the hard measure that contributes to reducing the greenhouse gas emissions or does not include mandatory annex – energetic audit/certificate. 4 points (yes) – Project declares to realise the hard measure on reducing the greenhouse gas emissions and also contains mandatory annex– energetic audit/certificate in the project application submission.</p>	no		yes		4		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

18.	<p>Project in defined area is complementary to other project/s contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Project does not plan the realisation of complementary or synergic measures that support or complement measures on climate change mitigation and adaptation implemented within the other project/s. 4 points (yes) – Project plans the realisation of complementary or synergic measures that support or complement measures on climate change mitigation and adaptation implemented within the other project/s.</p>	no	yes			4			
19.	<p>The project includes activities introducing activating methods and / or innovative methods and forms into the education process, innovative elements (innovations in curriculum, teaching approaches) in the project</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Project does not contain activities introducing activating methods and / or innovative methods and forms into the education process, innovative elements (innovations in curriculum, teaching approaches) in the project. 2 points (yes) – Project contains activities introducing activating methods and / or innovative methods and forms into the education process, innovative elements (innovations in curriculum, teaching approaches) in the project.</p>	no	yes			2			
20.	<p>A public event focused on awareness raising on climate change mitigation and adaptation will be carried out within the project, beyond the Communication plan</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Project does not plan a public event organisation focused on the topic of awareness raising on climate change mitigation and adaptation, beyond the Communication plan 2 points (yes) – Project plans a public event organisation focused on the topic of awareness raising on climate change mitigation and adaptation, beyond the Communication plan</p>	no	yes			2			
21.	<p>Involvement of marginalised (disadvantaged) communities in the project activities</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Project does not plan the involvement of marginalised communities or the applicant does not clearly state which communities plans to involve or in which form. 2 points (yes) – The applicant clearly defines in the project which marginalised communities are planned to be involved into project activities and in which form.</p>	no	yes			2			
22.	<p>Project involves activities with presumed participation of public based on voluntary, free base (parents, friends of the school, local communities etc.)</p> <p>Explanation: 0 points (no) – Project does not plan the participation of public based on voluntary, free base or the applicant does not clearly specify in which form will public participate. 2 points (yes) – The applicant clearly defines in the project the participation of public at project activities based on voluntary, free base including the form of participation.</p>	no	yes			2			
						subtotal for evaluated area	16		
						minimum required number of points	N/A		
						Maximum total number of points:	145		
						Minimum required total number of points:	40		
						Total score:			
						Recommendations:			

Annex 4 to the Call ACC03 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

Criterion for distinguishing between projects with equal total number of points at level of disposable allocation for the Call to be applied

Higher number of awarded points for criterion:

1. contribution of the project to the total number of people self-reporting having more climate friendly behaviour as result of project activities expressed in the form of „Value for Money“;
2. subtotal for assessed project area;
3. subtotal for assessed bilateral area;
4. date of receipt of project application.

The project application **will be rejected** without reaching:

Minimum required total number of points: **40**
and simultaneously

Minimum required number of points for
evaluated area:

- project **24**
- financial **10**
- administrative **6**