

**Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria**

**Selection Criteria**

<b>Call title:</b>	Action plans for climate change mitigation and adaptation implemented by local authorities in urban areas ( <b>ClimaUrban</b> )
<b>Call number:</b>	ACC02
<b>Funding source(s):</b>	Norway Grants and State Budget of the Slovak Republic

**I. Administrative compliance criteria**

	<b>Administrative compliance criterion:</b>		<b>Method of criterion verification: (YES/NO)</b>		<b>Possibility of submitting missing documents and information: (YES/NO)</b>
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 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

### II. Eligibility criteria

	Eligibility criterion:		Method of criterion verification (YES/NO)		Missing documents and information: (YES/NO)
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 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 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

III. Content related criteria

Evaluation area:	No.	Content related criterion	Point scale				Maximum score:	Explanations:
			0	5	10	20		
Project	1.	Clear link between proposed project activities and Programme objectives, outcome, outputs and set values of indicators ( <b>elimination criterion</b> )	no		yes		10	<p><b>0 points (no)</b> – the project application does not include as an activity the elaboration of an action plan and at the same time the implementation of particular measures and/or the proposed activities does not contribute or just partially contribute to the achievement of Programme’s objective, Outcome and Output, what means they do not meet the expected objective and purpose or are connected with high risk in term of their feasibility; measures are not measurable though indicators or values of indicators are not set in line with the Call (e.g. the proposed measures to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to be realised in the project are inconsistent with the recommendations of the energy audit/certificate or other credible source),</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> - the project application includes as an activity the elaboration of an action plan and at the same time the</p>

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								implementation of particular measures on climate change mitigation and adaptation. At the same time, the proposed activities clearly contribute to the achievement of Programme's objective, Outcome and Output, what means they are appropriate and meet the expected purpose, are logical connected, measurable through indicators, proposed measures on reducing CO <sub>2</sub> emissions which applicant plan to implement within the project are in compliance with recommendations of energy audit/certificate or other credible source based on which the target value for reducing CO <sub>2</sub> emissions is declared as project output; values of indicators are set in line with the Call and are defined based on credible sources (especially in case of CO <sub>2</sub> based on energy audit recommendations).
	2.	The proposed project activities are relevant to the needs of defined target groups	no	partially	yes		10	<b>0 points (no)</b> – there is no clear link between selected target group, its background situation and contribution of the project output; target groups are defined too generally ("all for all")

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								<p><b>5 points (partially)</b> – with regard to the background situation and the project activities the target groups are selected sufficiently addressing, a positive contribution of project output to the situation of the selected target group could be expected, however the direct and indirect impact is not stratified enough</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> – with regard to the background situation and the project activities the target groups are selected sufficiently addressing, a positive contribution of project output to the situation of the selected target group could be expected (directly or indirectly)</p>
	3.	Potential of the applicant to implement systematic measures for climate change mitigation and adaptation	low	medium	high		10	<p><b>0 points (low)</b> – the city has no relevant development document in addition to the Municipal development program in line with the Act on Support of Regional Development as amended; proposed measures are based on local knowledge of occurrence of phenomenon without analyses of causes</p> <p><b>5 points (medium)</b> – in addition to the Municipal development program in line with the Act on</p>

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								Support of Regional Development as amended the municipality has other partial strategic, conceptual documents (e.g. for the area of climate change adaptation, sustainable transport, increase of energy efficiency etc.); proposed measures are based on partial quantitative/qualitative data <b>10 points (high)</b> - in addition to the Municipal development program in line with the Act on Support of Regional Development as amended the municipality has a complex strategy for the area of climate change, proposed measures are based on complex analyses, modelling, mapping etc.
	4.	Technical preparedness of the project	low	medium	high	very high	20	<b>0 points (low)</b> – planned activities are at the stage of project proposal, proprietary relations are not settled <b>5 points (medium)</b> – for planned activities the project documentation is elaborated, proprietary relations are settled or partially settled <b>10 points (high)</b> – for planned activities the project documentation is approved, proprietary relations are settled, the construction permit (or other

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								relevant permits) application is submitted, <b>20 points (very high)</b> – for planned activities the project documentation is approved, proprietary relations are settled, the construction permit (or other relevant permits) is issued
	5.	Value for Money <sup>1</sup> – project contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions (CO <sub>2</sub> a CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent)	≤1-5%	6-10%	11-30%	≥31%	20	It is calculated as a proportion of the funds allocated for particular measures and the value of 150 and then as percentage of planned target value of the Outcome indicator “estimated annual CO <sub>2</sub> emissions reduction of supported entities (in tonnes)” <b>0 points (≤1-5%)</b> – project contribution to reducing the GHG emission is in mentioned intervals <b>5 points (6-10%)</b> – project contribution to reducing the GHG emission is in mentioned intervals <b>10 points (11-30%)</b> – project contribution to reducing the GHG emission is in mentioned intervals <b>20 points (≥31%)</b> - project contribution to reducing the GHG emission is in mentioned intervals

<sup>1</sup> It is calculated according to the formula:  

$$\frac{\text{(amount of funds for climate change mitigation measures / 150)} \times 100}{25\ 000}$$

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

	6.	Action plan meets the minimum attributes set in the Call	no		yes		10	<p><b>0 points (no)</b> – Action plan does not include minimum attributes in line with the <b>Annex 3</b> to the Call</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> – Action plan includes minimum attributes in line with the <b>Annex 3</b> to the Call</p>
	7.	Comprehensiveness and diversity of proposed measures for climate change mitigation and adaptation in the framework of the project	none		partial	high	20	<p><b>0 points (low)</b> – project includes solitary, monotonous measures without logical concentration in the demarked territory and/or measures that do not contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation or are counterproductive</p> <p><b>10 points (partially)</b> – project includes complementary measures concentrated in the demarked territory, that complement each other (as minimum 3 diverse measures. There could be applied combination of different sources of funding in one project as well</p> <p><b>20 points (high)</b> – project includes synergic measures concentrated in demarked territory (as minimum 3 diverse measures)</p>
	8	Milestones are set logical in terms of timeline and material terms	no	partially	yes		10	<p><b>0 points (no)</b> – milestones are defined in general, in timely logical mismatch</p>



Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								<p><b>5 points (partially)</b> – milestones are defined logically and factually in relation to particular activities. However, the timeline for the implementation is too optimistic (e.g. the public procurement, disregarding the construction season)</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> - milestones are defined logically and factually in relation to particular activities, sufficiently detailed, timeline for milestones is for particular activities realistic and feasible according to the nature of particular activities</p>
	9.	Promotion of the project is set sufficiently with regard to mandatory attributes, timeline and financial allocation	no	partially	yes		10	<p><b>0 points (no)</b> – Communication plan does not include all mandatory activities, financial allocation for communication activities is clearly underestimated, timeline is vague</p> <p><b>5 points (partially)</b> – Communication plan includes minimum scope of mandatory activities, corresponding financial allocation for communication activities and logical timeline</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> – Communication plan includes activities beyond the scope of mandatory activities, corresponding financial allocation</p>

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								for communication activities, logical timeline and allocated staff
			subtotal for evaluated area				<b>120</b>	
			minimum required number of points				<b>60</b>	
Financial	10.	Requested project costs are appropriate and eligible	≤50%	51 – 74%	≥75%		10	<p><b>0 points (≤50%)</b> – 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</p> <p><b>5 points (51 – 74%)</b> – Requested project costs in the defined range are clearly and in appropriate manner linked to project activities (they are relatively well specified)</p> <p><b>10 points (≥75%)</b> – 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>
	11.	The unit prices are proportionate and correspond to the usual prices in the market or are comparable with costs for similar projects	≤50%	51 – 74%	≥75%		10	<p><b>0 points (≤50%)</b> – less than 50% of unit prices defined in the budget can be evaluated as proportionate (e.g. by market review) and reasonable</p> <p><b>5 points (51 – 74%)</b> – unit prices defined in the defined range can be evaluated as proportionate</p>

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								(e.g. by market review) and reasonable. <b>10 points (≥75%)</b> – 75% and more of unit prices defined in the budget can be evaluated as proportionate (e.g. by market review) and reasonable
	12.	The applicant clearly declares resources to cover the cost of maintaining the project results throughout the period of project's sustainability	no		yes			<b>10</b> <b>0 points (no)</b> – the project sustainability is described in a declaratory manner, the planned costs are vague, the sources of funding cannot be considered as credible. <b>10 points (yes)</b> – the project sustainability is described clearly and in detail, the planned costs are rational, the sources of funding is considered as credible.
			subtotal for evaluated area					<b>30</b>
			minimum required number of points					<b>20</b>
<b>Administrative</b>	13.	The applicant has sufficiency of administrative capacities for project management	no		yes			<b>5</b> <b>0 points (no)</b> – 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 <b>5 points (yes)</b> – the applicant has within its structure the

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								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
	14.	The risks are defined and risk management involves reasonable measures for risks elimination and mitigation	no	partially	yes		10	<p><b>0 points (no)</b> – 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</p> <p><b>5 points (partially)</b> - 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.</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> – risks are described in clearly, unambiguously and appropriately</p>

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

								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.
			subtotal for evaluated area				<b>15</b>	
			minimum required number of points				<b>10</b>	
Bilateral	15.	The entities from Norway are involved in the project as partners	no		yes		10	<p><b>0 points (no)</b> – The applicant does not plan/declare any project partnership with the subjects from Norway</p> <p><b>10 points (yes)</b> – The applicant clearly plans project partnership with the entity from Norway including detail information on partners, description of their roles and submission of partnership statement.</p>
	16.	The level of Involvement of project partners from Norway in the project	none	low	high		10	<p><b>0 points (none)</b> – there is no participation of subjects from Norway</p> <p><b>5 points (low)</b> - the subjects from Norway will participate the events/actions within the project as lecturers/speakers</p> <p><b>10 points (high)</b> - the subjects from Norway are directly linked to project preparation and/or realisation of individual activities</p>
			subtotal for evaluated area				<b>20</b>	
			minimum required number of points				<b>N/A</b>	

Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

<b>Bonus</b>	17.	Project contains the activities supporting the development of smart cities (according to the definition applied in the European Innovation Partnership - Smart Cities and Communities) <sup>2</sup>	no	yes			5	<b>0 points (no)</b> – project does not contain the activities/elements supporting the development of smart cities <b>5 points (yes)</b> - project contains the activities/elements supporting the development of smart cities
	18.	Project plans to build infrastructure to support e-mobility	no	yes			5	<b>0 points (no)</b> – project does not plan to build infrastructure to support e-mobility <b>5 points (yes)</b> – project plans to build infrastructure to support e-mobility
	18.1	Planned infrastructure to support e-mobility includes charging stations with electricity generated from local renewable energy resources	no	yes			5	<b>0 points (no)</b> – planned infrastructure to support e-mobility doesn't include charging stations with electricity generated from local renewable energy resources <b>5 points (yes)</b> - planned infrastructure to support e-mobility includes charging stations with electricity generated from local renewable energy resources
	19.	Project contains/plans specific activities for vulnerable groups of inhabitants towards climate change manifestations	no	yes			5	<b>0 points (no)</b> – project does not contain/plan specific activities on climate change mitigation and/or

<sup>2</sup> [https://ec.europa.eu/info/eu-regional-and-urban-development/topics/cities-and-urban-development/city-initiatives/smart-cities\\_en#european-innovation-partnership-on-smart-cities-and-communities](https://ec.europa.eu/info/eu-regional-and-urban-development/topics/cities-and-urban-development/city-initiatives/smart-cities_en#european-innovation-partnership-on-smart-cities-and-communities)

**Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria**

		(children, chronic patients, older generation, socially isolated people)					adaptation designed for one of the most vulnerable groups of inhabitants <b>5 points (yes)</b> - project contains/plans specific activities on climate change mitigation and/or adaptation designed for one of the most vulnerable groups of inhabitants
	20.	Project plans measures on climate change mitigation/adaptation which contribute to provision of sustainable ecosystem services and biodiversity support in the urban environment	no	yes			<b>0 points (no)</b> – measures are without contribution to increased quality of ecosystem services in the urban environment or biodiversity support (e.g. solitaire planting in the form of decorative greenery, planting alien tree species, planting invasive species) <b>5 points (yes)</b> – measures contribute to increased quality of ecosystem services in the urban environment or biodiversity support (e.g. spatially integrated planting of non-invasive species, interconnection of the elements of blue and green infrastructure etc.)
			subtotal for evaluated area				<b>25</b>
			minimum required number of points				<b>N/A</b>
			<b>Maximum total number of points:</b>				<b>210</b>
			<b>Minimum required total number of points:</b>				<b>90</b>

#### Annex 5 to the Call ACC02 Selection Criteria

#### 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. Value for Money – project contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions (CO<sub>2</sub> a CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent)
2. The entities from Norway are involved in the project as partners
3. Technical preparedness of the project
4. Project contains the activities supporting the development of smart cities (according to the definition applied in the European Innovation Partnership - Smart Cities and Communities)

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

Minimum required total number of points: **90**  
**and simultaneously**

Minimum required number of points for  
evaluated area:

- project **60**
- financial **20**
- administrative **10**