ANNEX 1 TO THE CALL CLD02 – Cultural cooperation

SELECTION CRITERIA (INCL. THE SCORING SHEET)

Administrative compliance and eligibility requirements

The Administrative Compliance Check and the Eligibility Check of the Application and of the Applicant is ensured by the technical means of the **EGRANT system**.

The system will allow an application to be submitted, if:

- the Application is submitted via EGRANT system within the time specified in the Call,
- all mandatory fields of the Application in the system are completed,
- the completed Applicant details meet the definition of an eligible applicant,
- the completed Partner/-s details meet the definition of eligible partners,
- the amount of the grant applied for meets the minimum and maximum limits for the grant to be applied for,
- the planned Project duration is within the minimum and maximum duration set by the call,
- the mandatory attachments, including related to the partnership and/or ownership are attached, as requested and appropriate,
- the mandatory activities and target value indicators have been filled in,
- the maximum share of eligible expenditure for infrastructure and equipment has been observed.

The submitted Application cannot be supplemented. The Application will be evaluated as submitted.

Content-related criteria

No.	criteria	description	range	score	comments
1. Artistic quality, relevance and social impact (30 points)					
1a	**Artistic quality, innovation and coherence of the project concept (eliminating criterion)**	The project demonstrates high artistic and/or cultural quality. The concept is coherent, well developed, and appropriate to the objectives of the call. The project application credibly demonstrates commitment to artistic quality and innovation, and/or cultural creation, presentation, or programming that forming the core of the project. Art is valued as a cultural good in its own right and clearly describes the scale and relevance of the proposed arts or cultural events supported under the project. **Suggested scoring**	0 –10		

		10 points – The project demonstrates outstanding artistic and/or cultural quality. The concept is highly coherent, innovative, and convincing. High-quality artistic and/or cultural creation, presentation, or programming clearly forms the core of the project, and the proposed arts or cultural events are highly relevant, well designed and proportionate to the objectives of the call. 7 points – The project demonstrates good artistic and/or cultural quality. The concept is coherent and relevant, with a clear artistic or cultural core and a credible set of arts or cultural events, although some aspects could be developed further. 4 points – The project demonstrates acceptable but only moderately convincing artistic and/or cultural quality. The concept is relevant but lacks sufficient originality, clarity, coherence, or strength of artistic content. 1 point – The project demonstrates weak artistic and/or cultural quality. The concept is underdeveloped, generic, or insufficiently coherent, and the artistic or cultural core is not convincingly presented. 0 points – The project fails to demonstrate sufficient artistic and/or cultural quality, or fails to present high-quality artistic and/or cultural creation, presentation, or programming as the core of the project.			
1b	**Contribution to freedom of expression, dialogue, media and information literacy, and resilience to disinformation**	The project credibly uses artistic and cultural formats to strengthen freedom of expression, dialogue, critical engagement, media and information literacy, information integrity, or resilience to disinformation, hate speech, and extremism.	0 – 8		
1c	**Safe spaces and response to community needs**	The project credibly creates or regularly operates safe spaces for dialogue, self-expression, and inclusive cultural engagement, with clear relevance to the needs of local communities and, where relevant, young people.	0 – 6		
1d	**Access to culture, participation and audience relevance**	The project is well designed with regard to its target groups and expected audiences. It credibly contributes to improved access to arts and culture and to increased participation of local communities in cultural activities.	0 - 6		

2. Inclusion, outreach, digital reach and sector resilience (22 points)					
2a	**Inclusion of vulnerable or marginalised communities**	The project demonstrates a clear and meaningful contribution to the inclusion of vulnerable or marginalised communities[1], including Roma, minorities, women, persons with disabilities, young people, or other underrepresented groups. Higher scores shall be given where these groups are meaningfully involved not only as audiences, but also as co-creators, partners, or primary target groups. The call shall support the inclusion of vulnerable or marginalised communities through funding the three highest-ranked projects targeting these communities, provided they meet the minimum quality standard. At least one of the projects supported shall address marginalised Roma communities as the primary target group.	0 – 8		
2b	**Community participation, co-creation and multi-stakeholder cooperation**	The project demonstrates meaningful community participation and networked cooperation among cultural operators, or between cultural operators and local stakeholders such as municipalities, schools, community and minority organisations, organisations of persons with disabilities, and SMEs. with shared programming, audience development, and joint governance. The proposed local multi-stakeholder partnership is relevant and credible.	0 – 6		
2c	**Outreach, accessibility and digital reach**	The project credibly expands outreach through community-based and/or digital formats. Where relevant, it includes accessibility measures for people with disabilities and makes meaningful use of digital outputs such as streams, podcasts, virtual formats, apps, or other tools broadening access to culture.	0 – 4		
2d	**Sectoral resilience, knowledge and capacity building**	The project contributes to the long-term resilience, knowledge and capacity of the cultural sector, including skills development, peer learning, strategic reflection, better management, audience development, or improved use of research, data and practical	0 – 4		

[1] "**Vulnerable or marginalised communities**" shall mean communities whose members face structural barriers to participation in cultural and community life due to social, economic, territorial, ethnic, cultural, disability-related or age-related disadvantage, and who are therefore at greater risk of exclusion, underrepresentation, limited access to cultural expression and weaker resilience to disinformation, hate speech and extremism. This includes, in particular, Roma from marginalised Roma communities, social, ethnic and cultural minorities, persons with disabilities, women, and young people in disadvantaged areas or in situations of vulnerability.

		knowledge to the suport through those skills/elements to the sustainability and resilience of the sector. Higher scores shall be given where the project demonstrates a clear and credible contribution to artists and cultural professionals either directly involved in project activities or indirectly benefiting from the supported organisations.			
3. Partnership quality and implementation capacity (18 points)					
3a	**Quality of partnership and networked cooperation, including Donor State added value (eliminating criterion)**	The roles, responsibilities and contributions of the applicant and partner(s) are clearly defined, proportionate and relevant to the project objectives. The partnership with the Donor State entity brings clear added value for implementation, artistic exchange, learning, mobility, international cooperation and/or sustainability transfer of know-how, peer learning, and co-creation of practical tools and models applicable in the Slovak context. **Suggested scoring:** 10 points – The partnership is excellent and clearly strengthens the project. Roles, responsibilities budget, and contributions of all partners are clearly defined, balanced and relevant. The Donor State partner makes a strong and substantive contribution to implementation, artistic exchange, learning, mobility, international cooperation and/or sustainability, and the networked cooperation is integral to the project concept. 7 points – The partnership is good and credible. Roles, budget and contributions are generally clear and relevant. The Donor State partner provides meaningful added value and is actively involved in implementation, although the depth of cooperation or long-term effect could be stronger. 4 points – The partnership is acceptable but only partly convincing. Roles, budget or contributions are not sufficiently elaborated, and/or the added value of the Donor State partner is limited, uneven, or only partly integrated into the core of the project. 1 point – The partnership is weak or largely formal. The Donor State partner's contribution is marginal, generic, or insufficiently substantiated, and the networked	0 – 10		

		cooperation does not convincingly support the project objectives. 0 points – The project fails to demonstrate a credible and substantive partnership arrangement or fails to demonstrate clear added value of the Donor State partner for project implementation and results.			
3b	**Project management and implementation capacity**	The project management structure is clear and appropriate. The applicant and partners demonstrate sufficient administrative, financial and professional capacity to implement the project and deliver the proposed activities and outputs.	0 – 4		
3c	**Time schedule and sequencing of activities**	The proposed timeline is clear, realistic and consistent with the content, scale and sequencing of the proposed activities and outputs.	0 – 2		
3d	**Risks and mitigation measures**	The project identifies the main implementation risks and proposes relevant and realistic mitigation measures.	0 – 2		
4. Results framework, communication, budget and sustainability (20 points)					
4a	**Intervention logic, indicators and target values**	The intervention logic of the project is clear and consistent with the objective and focus of the call. The selected indicators correspond to the proposed activities, target groups and intended results. The assessment shall verify whether the application adequately covers all mandatory indicators for all projects. The assessment shall further verify whether the selected "mandatory where relevant" indicators correspond to the activities included in the project. Where relevant, the application shall set target values for all corresponding indicators, and for at least three indicators from the "mandatory where relevant" category. Target values shall be realistic, verifiable, and proportionate to the scope, scale and budget of the project. **Suggested scoring:** 6 points – The intervention logic is clear and fully consistent with the call. The selected indicators correspond very well to the activities, target groups and intended results. Target values are	0 – 6		

		realistic, verifiable and proportionate. 4 points – The logic and indicators are generally good and credible, with some minor weaknesses in alignment or target setting. 2 points – The intervention logic is only partly convincing and/or some indicators or target values are weakly justified. 0 points – The intervention logic is unclear or the selected indicators and target values are not credible.			
4b	**Communication, visibility and audience development approach**	The project application describes a credible approach to communication, visibility and audience development, including outreach to relevant target groups and, where relevant, communication beyond the immediate project audience.	0 – 4		
4c	**Budget and value for money**	Budget items are necessary, eligible, measurable and proportionate. The budget is internally coherent and represents good value for money in relation to the expected outputs and outcomes. **Suggested scoring:** 6 points – Budget items are necessary, eligible, clearly justified and proportionate. The budget is coherent and demonstrates very good value for money in relation to expected outputs and outcomes. 4 points – The budget is generally sound and proportionate, with only minor weaknesses. 2 points – The budget is only partly convincing; some costs appear insufficiently justified, weakly specified or disproportionate. 0 points – The budget is not credible, not coherent, or clearly disproportionate to the expected results.	0 – 6		
4d	**Sustainability and longer-term impact**	The project has credible potential for lasting impact beyond the project period, including continued cooperation, ongoing use of outputs, strengthened organisational capacity, sustained community benefits, or longer-term international cooperation.	0 – 4		
5. Specific priorities of the call (10 points)					
5a	**Independent cultural operators and inclusive cultural/community hubs**	Higher scores shall be given to projects led by, or meaningfully involving, independent cultural operators that function as inclusive cultural and community hubs, in line with the specific provisions of the call.	0 – 4		

5b	**Disadvantaged geographical areas and communities**	The project meaningfully reaches less developed, distant or otherwise disadvantaged geographical areas and/or communities with limited access to culture.	0 –3		
5c	**Addressing challenges arising from the invasion of Ukraine**	The project demonstrably addresses challenges arising from the invasion of Ukraine in a way relevant to the objectives of the call. Higher scores shall be given to projects that credibly support inclusion, dialogue, cultural participation, or collaboration with Ukrainian artists in Slovakia and /or engage with themes of migration, identity, trauma, solidarity, and intercultural understanding.	0 –3		

Total score - 100 points

Minimum quality threshold - Projects receiving **less than 60 points on average** shall not be supported.

Eliminating criteria - For criteria marked as **eliminating criteria**, a score of **0** by all experts means that the project may not be recommended for support by the Selection Committee.