

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

Selection Criteria

Call title:	Restoration of degraded wetland ecosystems (ClimaLocal)
Call code:	ACC04
Funding source(s):	Norway grants and State budget of the Slovak Republic

I. Administrative compliance criteria

	Administrative compliance criterion:		Method of criterion verification:		Possibility of submitting missing documents and information:		Notes
1.	Submission of the Project Application within the defined deadline in line with the Call		yes - no		yes		
2.	Submission of the Project Application by way of the delivery method according to Chapter 12 of the Call		yes - no		yes		
3.	Submission of the Project Application in the form and extent according to Chapter 12 of the Call		yes - no		yes		
4.	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 ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

II. Eligibility criteria

	Eligibility criterion:		Method of criterion verification:		Missing documents and information:		Notes
1.	Eligibility of Applicant according to Chapter 1 of the Call		yes – no		yes		
2.	Eligibility of Partner/s according to Chapter 1 of the Call		yes - no - N/A		yes		
3.	Eligibility of activities according to Chapter 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 ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

III. Content related criteria

No.	Content related criterion:	Point scale:				Maximum score:	Score:	Justification:
		0	5	10	20			
Evaluated area: project								
1.	<p>Contribution of the proposed measures to the achievement of the Programme Objective, Outcome and Output (elimination criterion)</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The measures included in the Project cannot be evaluated as eligible and contributing the implementation of all three mandatory activities listed below, in line with the conditions of the Call. Proposed measures do not meet the Objective, expectations and Result Framework in line with the Call, or they are directly defined in the Call as non-recommended.</p> <p>10 points (yes) – The measures included in the Project can be evaluated as eligible and contributing to the implementation all three mandatory activities listed below, in line with the conditions of the Call. Proposed measures, in range of mandatory activities at minimum, meet the Objective, expectations and Result Framework in line with the Call.</p> <p><i>Mandatory activities (in line with Chapter 4 of the Call):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Realization of measures for restoration of degraded wetland ecosystem with positive impact on quality of life of inhabitants in target area in the context of climate change; - Realization of awareness raising campaign for public on the significance of wetland ecosystems in relation to climate change mitigation and/or adaptation and the importance of their restoration and protection, with link to wetland ecosystem restored within the Project; - Realization of information and communication activities providing the mandatory publicity of the Project. 	no		yes		10		
2.	<p>Contribution of the target values of Project indicators to the achievement of the Programme Objective, Outcome and Output</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (low) – The target values of the Project indicators are not set in line with the Call, they do not meet minimum criteria for eligible Project, or they are overestimated and not feasible through proposed Project activities, or are only partially feasible.</p> <p>5 points (medium) – The target values of the Project indicators are set in line with the Call, they meet minimum criteria for eligible Project, they are not overestimated and they are feasible through proposed Project activities. Target values for publicity indicators and bilateral indicators (if relevant) are defined within the range of mandatory indicators.</p> <p>10 points (high) – The target values of the Project indicators are set in line with the Call, they meet minimum criteria for eligible Project, they are not overestimated and they are feasible through proposed Project activities. Target values for optional indicators of publicity and/or bilateral indicator, beyond mandatory indicators, are also defined. Target values for publicity indicators and bilateral indicators (if relevant) are defined beyond the range of mandatory indicators also for optional indicators.</p>	low	medium	high		10		
3.	<p>Relevance and technical preparedness of proposed activities in relation to the baseline situation, defined objectives and expected results of the Project</p> <p>Explanation:</p>	low	medium	high	very high	20		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>0 points (low) – The baseline situation is insufficiently defined in the Project, i. e. environmental status of the target area, relevant target groups, their needs in the context of climate change and the procedures of the implementation of proposed activities are define in general, without relevant data inputs, technical preparedness is low, i. e. planned activities are in stage of Project intent/proposal, technical procedures for realization of the proposed activities/measures (mainly technical measures for wetland restoration) are not specified; the Applicant insufficiently identifies ownership relations and/or other conflicts of interests relevant for successful Project implementation, mainly: target area in the context of proposed technical measures are not well defined, planned technical measures require intervention in adjacent land, or in watercourse, which is not identified by the Applicant as relevant; permits necessary for the implementation of the proposed technical measures within the Project are not defined at all (e. g. consent of responsible nature protection authority for change of wetland status, construction permits and other).</p> <p>5 points (medium) – The baseline situation is partially (not fully) defined in the Project, i. e. environmental status of the target area, relevant target groups, their needs in the context of climate change and the procedures of the implementation are not clearly defined for all proposed activities, or are based on data inputs with partial relevance, technical preparedness of the Project is only partial, i. e. Project documentation for key Project activities (mainly technical measures for wetland restoration) is in stage of preparation, technical procedures for their realization are in stage of proposal; the Applicant identifies all key ownership relations within defined target area, however boundaries of target area are in the context of proposed technical measures delineated too strictly and potential conflicts of interests related to realization of technical measures also out of delineated target area cannot be excluded (e. g. necessary crossings over adjacent lands); the Applicant does not define all the permits necessary for the implementation of proposed technical measures within the Project (e. g. consent of responsible nature protection authority for change of wetland status, construction permits and other).</p> <p>10 points (high) – The baseline situation is sufficiently defined in the Project, i. e. environmental status of the target area, relevant target groups, their needs in the context of climate change and the procedures of the implementation of proposed activities are adequately defined, technical preparedness of the Project is high, i. e. Project documentation for key project activities (mainly technical measures for wetland restoration) is prepared, technical procedures for their realization are defined; the Applicant identifies all key ownership relations and conflicts of interests within defined target area in the context of proposed technical measures, boundaries of target area are delineated sufficiently; the Applicant identifies all permits necessary for the implementation of proposed technical measures within the Project, however when Project Application was submitted he/she does not have all relevant permits approved, or necessary permits were in stage of applications for approval (e. g. consent of responsible nature protection authority for change of wetland status, construction permits and other).</p> <p>20 points (very high) – The baseline situation is clearly defined in the Project, i. e. environmental status of the target area, relevant target groups, their needs in the context of climate change and the procedures of the implementation of proposed activities are clearly defined and described in detail, technical preparedness of the Project is very high, i. e. Project documentation for all relevant planned activities including technical measures for wetland restoration is prepared, technical procedures for their realization are defined; the Applicant identifies all relevant ownership relations and conflicts of interests within defined target area, in the context of proposed technical measures, boundaries of target area are delineated sufficiently; the Applicant identifies all permits necessary for the implementation of proposed technical measures within the Project and has all relevant permits approved and valid (e. g. consent of responsible nature protection authority for change of wetland status, construction permits and other).</p>							
4.	<p>Comprehensiveness of proposed measures for restoration of degraded wetland ecosystem from the point of view of their contribution to the improvement of environmental status of ecosystem and positive impact on quality of life of the inhabitants in target area in the context of climate change</p>	low	partial	high		10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (low) – Project includes measures for restoration of degraded wetland ecosystem which are solitary, not linked to each other, the contribution of proposed measures to the improvement of environmental status of wetland and positive impact on quality of life of the inhabitants in target area in the context of climate change are only generally and declaratory defined, proposal of measures for wetland restoration is not derived from particular data, but e. g. only from local knowledge, assumptions without real data etc.</p> <p>5 points (partial) – Project includes only partially linked measures for restoration of degraded wetland ecosystem, the contribution of proposed measures to the improvement of environmental status of wetland and positive impact on quality of life of the inhabitants in target area in the context of climate change are clearly defined, however proposal of measures for wetland restoration is based only on partially available, limited in time and space, qualitative/quantitative data.</p> <p>10 points (high) – Project includes logically linked measures for restoration of degraded wetland ecosystem, the contribution of proposed measures to the improvement of environmental status of wetland and positive impact on quality of life of the inhabitants in target area in the context of climate change are clearly defined, proposal of measures for wetland restoration is derived from analysis of complete dataset of qualitative/quantitative data, results of modelling, mapping etc.</p>						
5.	<p>Feasibility of the proposed Project activities with respect to Project timetable including milestones and Project sustainability</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (low) – The proposed Project activities are not feasible within the given timetable of the Project, they are not logically linked, milestones are only generally defined and are logically inconsistent, proposed activities providing Project sustainability are not well and logically identified in the context of Project objective, technical/financial issues covering the Project sustainability are defined too generally.</p> <p>5 points (medium) – The proposed Project activities are partially feasible within the given Project timetable including defined milestones, there is still doubt that some activities are not feasible within the given timetable, milestones are defined logically and reasonably in relation to individual activities, however the time realization of milestones is too optimistic (e.g. public procurement, seasonal aspects related to nature protection etc. are not taken into account), proposed activities providing Project sustainability are feasible only partially, with respect to not well defined technical/financial issues covering the Project sustainability and associated uncertainties.</p> <p>10 points (high) – The proposed Project activities are fully feasible within the given timetable of the Project including defined milestones, milestones of the Project are set logically, reasonably and in detail with respect to individual activities, proposed activities providing project sustainability are feasible including the technical/financial issues.</p>	low	medium	high		10	
6.	<p>Project publicity – mandatory attributes, financial and timeline allocation</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The content of Communication plan does not meet all requirements for information and communication in line with Annex 3 of Regulation, financial allocation for information and communication activities is underestimated/overestimated, timeline is not logical and realistic or it is not defined at all.</p> <p>10 points (yes) – The content of Communication plan meets all requirements for information and communication in line with Annex 3 of Regulation including corresponding financial allocation for information and communication activities and logical and realistic timeline.</p>	no		yes		10	

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

		subtotal for evaluated area			70		
		minimum required number of points			40		
Evaluated area: financial							
7.	<p>Eligibility, proportion and necessity of Project costs</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (≤50%) – 50% and more than 50% of requested Project costs do not meet criteria for time/subject eligibility, they are without clear link to planned activities (they are not specified in the Project budget), or are not proportionate and necessary to achieve Project objectives.</p> <p>5 points (>50% – ≤75%) – Requested Project costs in the mentioned range meet criteria for time/subject eligibility, they are clearly and in appropriate manner linked to Project activities (they are specified in the Project budget), they are proportionate and necessary to achieve Project objectives.</p> <p>10 points (>75%) – more than 75% of requested Project costs meet criteria for time/subject eligibility, they are clearly, directly and in appropriate manner linked to planned activities (they are specified in the Project budget), they are proportionate and necessary to achieve Project objectives.</p>	≤50%	>50 – ≤75%	>75%	10		
8.	<p>Reasonability of Project costs and cost-effectiveness</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (≤50%) – 50% and less than 50% of unit prices defined in the Project budget can be evaluated as reasonable (e.g. by market review), unit prices correspond to prices that are usual on the market or the value of budget items amount is adequate and comparable to the costs of other similar projects (for example based on a comparison with similar projects).</p> <p>5 points (>50% – ≤75%) – Unit prices in the defined range within the Project budget can be evaluated as reasonable (e.g. by market review), unit prices correspond to prices that are usual on the market or the value of budget items amount is adequate and comparable to the costs of other similar projects (for example based on a comparison with similar projects).</p> <p>10 points (>75%) – more than 75% of unit prices defined in the Project budget can be evaluated as reasonable (e.g. by market review), unit prices correspond to prices that are usual on the market or the value of budget items amount is adequate and comparable to the costs of other similar projects (for example based on a comparison with similar projects).</p>	≤50%	>50 – ≤75%	>75%	10		
		subtotal for evaluated area			20		
		minimum required number of points			10		
Evaluated area: administrative							
9.	<p>Administrative capacities of the Applicant and Partner (if relevant) for Project management</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The Applicant and Partner (if relevant) does not have within its structure the administrative capacities to manage the Project, including the share of responsibilities between specific working positions or they are not sufficiently defined or not defined at all. Project management in external form is only declaratory and the requirements for Project management are not defined.</p> <p>5 points (partially) – The Applicant and Partner (if relevant) has within its structure the administrative capacities to cover the Project management only partially, including the share of responsibilities between specific working positions. The requirements for external Project management (if relevant) are defined but their relevance is not clearly justified including financial costs.</p>	no	partially	yes	10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>10 points (yes) – The Applicant and Partner (if relevant) has within its structure the administrative capacities to manage the Project, including the share of responsibilities between specific working positions. The requirements for external Project management (if relevant) are clearly specified including reasonable (not overestimated) financial costs.</p>							
10.	<p>Identification and management of Project risks</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>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, risk response (reaction) and its description.</p> <p>5 points (partially) – Risks are described in a sufficiently clear, unambiguous and relevant manner in relation to the Project activities. There is an immediate link between the risk response (reaction) 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.</p> <p>10 points (yes) – Risks are described clearly, unambiguously and appropriately in relation to the Project activities, specificities of the Project or of the Applicant/Partner. There is a direct link between the risk response (reaction) and its description.</p>	no	partially	yes		10		
		subtotal for evaluated area				20		
		minimum required number of points				10		
Evaluated area: bilateral								
11.	<p>The level of involvement of Partners from Norway in the Project</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (none) – Entities from Norway as Project Partners are not involved in the Project at all or in case of declared cooperation the document proving the Partner's interest to participate in the Project as Mandatory annex of the Project Application is not provided and/or information on level of partnership with the entities from Norway in the Project is not provided in the Project Application.</p> <p>5 points (low) – The document proving the Partner's interest to participate in the Project as Mandatory annex of the Project Application is provided. The cooperation with entities from Norway in the Project is described in generally and declaratory manner; it focuses mostly on formal cooperation, without detailed specification of Project activities in which they are involved, and/or for which they are directly responsible; the budget for the Partner is in the minimum range.</p> <p>10 points (medium) – The document proving the Partner's interest to participate in the Project as Mandatory annex of the Project Application is provided. The cooperation with entities from Norway in the Project is described specifically and in sufficient detail, Project activities in which they are involved, and/or for which they are directly responsible are specified; the involvement in the Project is only in soft activities; the budget for the Partner is reasonable.</p> <p>20 points (high) – The document proving the Partner's interest to participate in the Project as Mandatory annex of the Project Application is provided; the cooperation with entities from Norway in the Project is described specifically and in sufficient detail, Project activities in which they are involved, and/or for which they are directly responsible are specified; the involvement in the Project is in hard activities as well; the Partner is demonstrably an expert in the area of involvement; the budget for the Partner is reasonable and sufficient.</p>	none	low	medium	high	20		
		subtotal for evaluated area				20		
		minimum required number of points				N/A		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

Evaluated area: bonus							
12.	<p>Contribution of Project to the achievement of the Programme output „Estimated area of wetland ecosystems restored (in m²)” beyond the minimum requirements for eligible Project in line with the Call</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (low) – The target value for Project indicator „Estimated area of wetland ecosystems restored (in m²)” is set at level of minimum requirements for eligible Project (10 000 m²) in line with the Call, or it is defined beyond the minimum requirements for eligible Project, but at level ≤20%, or it is defined beyond the minimum requirements for eligible Project in line with the Call at level >20% but is overestimated and not feasible through realization of proposed Project activities.</p> <p>10 points (medium) – The target value for Project indicator „Estimated area of wetland ecosystems restored (in m²)” is defined beyond the minimum requirements for eligible Project in line with the Call at level >20 – ≤50% and is feasible through realization of proposed Project activities.</p> <p>20 points (high) – The target value for Project indicator „Estimated area of wetland ecosystems restored (in m²)” is defined beyond the minimum requirements for eligible Project set in line with the Call at level >50% and is feasible through realization of proposed Project activities.</p>	low		medium	high	20	
13.	<p>Involvement of international cooperation with Partners professionally engaged in the field of wetland restoration and protection</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – International organizations professionally engaged in the field of wetland restoration and protection are not involved into the Project as Project Partners, or in case of declared cooperation the document proving the Partner's interest in participating in the Project as Mandatory annex of the Project Application is not provided.</p> <p>5 points (yes) – International organizations professionally engaged in the field of wetland restoration and protection are involved into the Project as Project Partners. Document proving the Partner's interest in participating in the Project as Mandatory annex of the Project Application is provided.</p>	no	yes			5	
14.	<p>Synergy of the Project with other project contributing to the climate change mitigation or adaptation in target area</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – Project does not plan the realization of synergic measures that support measures on climate change mitigation or adaptation implemented within other projects in target area.</p> <p>5 points (yes) – Project plans the realization of synergic measures that support measures on climate change mitigation or adaptation implemented within other projects in target area.</p>	no	yes			5	
15.	<p>Contribution of degraded wetland ecosystem restoration to climate change mitigation through avoiding emissions of greenhouse gases and/or increasing carbon capture</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – Project does not plan the realization of a measure that measurably contributes to climate change mitigation through retaining of greenhouse gas emissions and/or carbon capture or Project plans the realization of measure that measurably contributes to climate change mitigation through retaining of</p>	no	yes			5	

Annex 4 to the Call ACC04 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	greenhouse gas emissions and/or carbon capture but without realization of specific activity focused on greenhouse gas retention and/or carbon capture quantification. 5 points (yes) – Project plans the realization of a measure that measurably contributes to climate change mitigation through retaining of greenhouse gas emissions and/or carbon capture as well as the realization of specific activity focused on greenhouse gas retention and/or carbon capture quantification, i. e. planned Project Output is also quantitative estimation of Project contribution to greenhouse gas retention and/or carbon capture in the form of e. g. technical report, methodology derived from credible source etc.						
16.	Inclusion of disadvantaged groups of inhabitants among target groups of eligible Project activities (e. g. socially isolated people, people with disabilities) Explanation: 0 points (no) – Eligible Project activities does not include disadvantaged group of inhabitants as target group. 5 points (yes) – Eligible Project activities include disadvantaged group of inhabitants as target group.	no	yes			5	
		subtotal for evaluated area				40	
		minimum required number of points				N/A	
	Maximum total number of points:					170	
	Minimum required total number of points:					60	
	Total score:						
	Recommendations:						

Criteria for distinguishing between Projects Applications with equal total number of points at level of disposable allocation for the Call to be applied

Higher number of awarded points for:

1. Criterion: Contribution of the target values of Project indicators to the achievement of the Programme Objective, Outcome and Output;
2. The level of involvement of Partners from Norway in the Project;
3. Criterion: Relevance and technical preparedness of proposed activities in relation to the baseline situation, defined objectives and expected results of the Project.

The Project Application **will be rejected** without reaching:

Minimum required total number of points: **60**

and simultaneously

Minimum required number of points for evaluated area:

- project **40**
- financial **10**
- administrative **10**

Elimination criterion is criterion which negative evaluation can lead to the recommendation of Programme Operator to Selection Committee not to support the Project Application. Further information on the selection process are provided in the Chapter C of the **Guideline for Applicant**.