

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

Selection Criteria

Call Title:	Awareness raising on climate change mitigation and adaptation (ClimaInfo)
Call Code:	ACC05
Funding sources:	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 ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

II. Eligibility criteria

	Eligibility criterion:		Method of criterion verification:		Possibility of submitting 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 Chapters 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 ACC05 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's Objective, Outcome and Output</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The measures included in the Project cannot be evaluated as eligible and contributing the implementation of the mandatory activities in line with the conditions of the Call. Proposed measures do not meet the Objective, expectations and Programme's Result Framework in line with the Call, or they are directly defined in the Call as non-recommended.</p> <p>20 points (yes) – The measures included in the Project can be evaluated as eligible and contributing to the implementation of the mandatory activities in line with the conditions of the Call. Proposed activities contribute to the Objective, expectations and Programme's Result Framework in line with the Call.</p>	no			yes	20		
2.	<p>Contribution of the target values of Project indicators to the achievement of the Programme's 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 the minimum requirements for the eligible Project, or they are overestimated and are not achievable through the proposed Project activities or are only partially achievable.</p> <p>5 points (medium) - The target values of the Project indicators are set in line with the Call, they meet the minimum requirements for the eligible Project, however some target values of the Project indicators can be evaluated as overestimated in relation to the proposed Project activities.</p>	low	medium	high		10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>10 points (high) – The target values of the Project indicators are set in line with the Call, meet the minimum requirements for the eligible Project, the target values of the Project indicators are not overestimated and are achievable through the proposed Project activities.</p>							
3.	<p>Relevance, adequacy and technical preparedness of proposed activities in relation to the baseline situation, defined objectives, expected results of the Project and needs of defined target groups</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (low) – The baseline situation is described vaguely, or at all. Target groups for individual activities are set too generally, or inadequately. The needs of target groups are defined on the basis of factually unsubstantiated assumptions. The link between the baseline situation, the proposed activities, the expected results and the needs of the target groups is not clear, or is described too generally. The planned activities in terms of technical readiness (where relevant) are at the stage of the idea / Project charter; ownership is not clear, the necessary permits are not identified.</p> <p>5 points (medium) – The baseline situation is described adequately and clearly. Target groups for individual activities are set in a sufficiently specific and adequate manner. The needs of target groups are defined on the basis of knowledge of local conditions. The link between the baseline situation, the proposed activities, the expected results and the needs of the target groups is clear. The planned activities in terms of technical readiness (where relevant) are in a high stage of development, ownership relations are settled, the necessary permits are in the stage of submitting the necessary applications, etc.</p> <p>10 points (high) – The baseline situation is clearly identified. Target groups for individual activities are set specifically and adequately. The needs of the target groups are demonstrably defined on the basis of surveys, qualified estimates and the Applicant's experience. The link between the baseline situation, the proposed activities, the expected results and the needs of the target groups is clear and obvious. The technical readiness of the planned activities (where relevant) is high, the Project documentation has been prepared, the ownership relations have been settled in full, the application for the necessary permits (where relevant) has been approved, the public procurement has been started, or completed (where relevant).</p>	low	medium	high	10			

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

4.	<p>Coherence and consistency of the proposed activities in terms of raising awareness on climate change mitigation and adaptation</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (unsatisfactory) – The thematic focus of individual measures is too general, the method of implementation of measures is vague, individual measures are planned as solitary. Project measures are selected without support in specific data, or experience of the Applicant which would support their validity and necessity.</p> <p>10 points (satisfactory) – The thematic focus of individual measures is sufficiently specified, the method of implementation of measures is sufficiently specified. The individual measures are systematically grouped into larger thematic units. Project measures are based on relevant data, or experience of the Applicant and support their validity and necessity. Thematic activities aimed at mitigating and adapting to climate change are balanced enough.</p>	unsatisfactory		satisfactory	10		
5.	<p>Rationality and feasibility of the proposed Project activities with respect to Project timetable</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (low) – The proposed milestones are not defined logically and coherently in relation to the Project activities, they are set too generally, they are not feasible in the set Project timetable, or milestones are defined in general, without factual and temporal connection.</p> <p>5 points (medium) – The proposed milestones are defined in relation to the Project activities in a sufficiently specific, logical and coherent way, in factual and temporal connection, but the Project timetable is defined too optimistically (e.g. without taking into account public procurement, seasonality of implementation of some works, etc.).</p> <p>10 points (high) – The proposed milestones are defined in relation to the Project activities in a sufficiently specific, logical and coherent way, in factual and temporal connection, the Project timetable is set realistically.</p>	low	medium	high	10		
6.	<p>Project publicity – mandatory attributes, financial and timeline allocation</p>	no		yes	10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<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>							
		subtotal for evaluated area				70		
		minimum required number of points				35		
Evaluated area: financial								
7.	<p>Eligibility, proportion and necessity of Project costs</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (≤50%) – 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%) – 75% or 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>	≤50%	>50 – ≤75%	>75%		10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>0 points (≤50%) – 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%) – 75% and more 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>							
9.	<p>Ensuring the maintenance of Project Outputs throughout the period of Project's sustainability</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The Project's sustainability is described in a declaratory manner, the planned costs are vague, the sources of funding cannot be considered as credible.</p> <p>10 points (yes) – The Project's sustainability is described clearly and in detail, the planned costs are rational, the sources of funding are considered as credible.</p>	no		yes		10		
		subtotal for evaluated area				30		
		minimum required number of points				10		
Evaluated area: administrative								
10.	<p>Administrative capacities of the Applicant and Partner (where relevant) for Project management</p> <p>Explanation:</p>	no	partially	yes		10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<p>0 points (no) – The Applicant and Partner (where relevant) does not have within its structure the administrative capacities to manage the Project, including sharing the 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 (where relevant) has within its structure the administrative capacities to cover the Project management only partially, including sharing the 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> <p>10 points (yes) – The Applicant and Partner (where 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>							
11.	<p>Applicant's /Partner's experience in carrying out similar activities in the area of climate change mitigation and adaptation</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – Neither the Applicant nor the Partner (where relevant) has proven experience in carrying out similar activities in the area of climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>5 points (yes) – The Applicant/Partner (where relevant) has proven experience in carrying out similar activities (campaigns) in the area of climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>	no	yes			5		
12.	<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>	no	partially	yes		10		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<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>							
		subtotal for evaluated area				25		
		minimum required number of points				10		
Evaluated area: bilateral								
13.	<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>	none	low	medium	high	20		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

	<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>							
		subtotal for evaluated area				20		
		minimum required number of points				N/A		
Evaluated area: bonus								
14.	<p>The Project activities create a synergistic effect with other activities of the Applicant/ Partner in the field of climate change mitigation and adaptation</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – Project activities do not create a synergistic effect with other Applicant’s / Partner’s activities demonstrably implemented beyond the Project in the field of climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p> <p>10 points (yes) – Project activities create a synergistic effect with other Applicant’s / Partner’s activities demonstrably implemented beyond the Project in the field of climate change mitigation and adaptation.</p>	no		yes		10		
15.	<p>The Project includes activities with a multiplier effect</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The Project does not include any activities with a multiplier effect (such as practical instructions to replicate the knowledge gained by the target groups).</p> <p>5 points (yes) – The Project includes activities with a multiplier effect (such as practical instructions to replicate the knowledge gained by the target groups).</p>	no		yes		5		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

16.	<p>The Project includes activities specifically designed for marginalized (socially disadvantaged) groups</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) – The Project does not include any activities specifically designed for marginalized (socially disadvantaged) groups.</p> <p>5 points (yes) – The Project includes specific, sufficiently specified activities specifically designed for marginalized (socially disadvantaged) groups.</p>	no	yes		5		
17.	<p>Project activities include elements that consider the needs of people with disabilities</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) - Project activities do not include any elements that considers the needs of people with disabilities.</p> <p>5 points (yes) - Project activities include elements that considers the needs of people with disabilities.</p>	no	yes		5		
18.	<p>Project involves the number of hard practical measures exceeding the minimum requirements</p> <p>Explanation:</p> <p>0 points (no) - The Project doesn't involve more than 1 hard practical measure vividly demonstrating how to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation defined in the Chapter 4 of the Call as mandatory.</p> <p>10 points (yes) - The Project involves more than 1 hard practical measure vividly demonstrating how to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation defined in the Chapter 4 of the Call as mandatory.</p>	no		yes	10		
					subtotal for evaluated area	35	
					minimum required number of points	N/A	
Maximum total number of points:					180		

Annex 4 to the Call ACC05 Selection Criteria (including scoring chart)

Minimum required total number of points:	55		
Total score:			

Criteria for distinguishing between Project 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. Contribution of the proposed activities to the achievement of the Programme's Objective, Outcome and Output;
2. The level of involvement of Partners from Norway in the Project;
3. Evaluated area: bonus.

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

Minimum required total number of points: **55**

and simultaneously

Minimum required number of points for evaluated area:

- project **35**
- financial **10**
- administrative **10**