Iceland Liechtenstein Norway grants

MINISTRY OF INVESTMENTS, REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INFORMATIZATION OF THE SLOVAK REPUBLIC

ANNEX 1 TO THE CALL CLD01 Sustainable Heritage Restoration and Revitalisation

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 form 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 applicant has indicated that the project concern an eligible cultural heritage site under the call, i.e. a site on the Priority Restoration List, or a site important for the improvement of a UNESCO World Heritage property submitted by an eligible UNESCO site manager, or a site related to the heritage of a national minority or ethnic group[1] where the intended use demonstrably benefits these communities

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

Content-related criteria

No.	criteria	description	range	score	comments
1. Applicant's ability and project maturity (15 points)					
1a	**Administrative, financial and managerial capacity**	The applicant demonstrates sufficient administrative, financial and managerial capacity to implement a large-scale heritage revitalisation project, including	0 – 4		

[1] "**National minority" or "ethnic group**" refers to a minority or ethnicity officially recognised as such in the Slovak Republic, in accordance with Article 34 of the Constitution of the Slovak Republic.

		project management, procurement, financial control, reporting, and cooperation with partners and relevant authorities.			
1b	**Technical preparedness and permits (eliminating criterion)**	The project is sufficiently mature for implementation. The quality and completeness of technical preparation, project documentation, heritage approvals, permits, surveys and other required documentation are adequate to ensure timely implementation. **Suggested scoring:** 8 = Construction Permit has been issued or the construction project documentation was positively appraised by the Monuments Board of the SR; 5 = Project Documentation has been completed; 3 = Consent of the Monuments Board of the SR with the Intention for conservation project was issued and the mandatory research is completed/not necessary; 1 = Consent of the Monuments Board of the SR with the Intention for conservation was issued 0 = insufficient readiness. In case the project includes several buildings in various stages of technical readiness, the expert shall score the criterion as appropriate.	0 – 8		
1c	**Partnership and implementation arrangements**	Roles, responsibilities and contributions of the applicant and partners are clearly defined, proportionate and relevant to the project objectives. Where applicable, the partnership setup supports effective delivery and long-term sustainability.	0 – 3		
2.Relevance, adaptive reuse and community anchoring (21 points)					
2a	**Response to local needs and participatory planning (eliminating criterion)**	The project is based on documented local needs and on participatory planning and co-design with relevant stakeholders. The project application clearly describes how local needs were identified, how relevant stakeholders have been involved before submission of the application, and how participatory planning and co-design will continue throughout project implementation - including the role of different stakeholders where relevant. **Suggested scoring:** 8 points – strong documented evidence of local relevance and	0 – 8		

		meaningful co-design already initiated before submission, with a credible continuation plan 5 points – good evidence of consultation and local relevance, with a generally credible continuation plan 2 points – limited evidence of consultation or weakly developed participatory approach 0 points – no credible evidence of local anchoring or participatory planning			
2b	**Quality of adaptive reuse and community-oriented future function (eliminating criterion)**	The proposed future use goes beyond physical conservation and presents a credible adaptive reuse concept that brings the site into active cultural or community use. The proposed functions are viable, inclusive and aligned with local needs and values.	0 – 5		
2c	**Contribution to local development and social cohesion**	The project contributes to local cultural life, community resilience, social cohesion and, where relevant, local economic vitality, including links to creative industries, education, tourism or local entrepreneurship, where appropriate to the site.	0 – 4		
2d	**Benefit for vulnerable or marginalised communities and/or minority heritage**	The project demonstrates a clear and meaningful benefit for vulnerable or marginalised communities[2] and/or addresses heritage of a national minority or ethnic group in a way that demonstrably benefits these communities. Higher scores shall be given where the project clearly identifies these groups or communities as a primary target group and demonstrates that their inclusion, participation and expected benefit are central to the project concept.	0 – 4		
3. Heritage quality, inclusion and climate resilience (21 points)					
3a	**Heritage approach: authenticity, integrity and traditional skills**	The conservation approach appropriately respects the authenticity and integrity of the site and is consistent with heritage values. The project represents a thoroughly prepared and sensitive conservation with an emphasis on the quality of the conservation works. Where relevant, the project	0 – 8		

[2] „**Vulnerable or marginalised communities**“ - 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.

		meaningfully supports traditional building crafts and skills.			
3b	**Inclusion, accessibility and outreach**	The project application demonstrates a strong inclusion and accessibility approach and credibly describes how inclusion, accessibility and outreach will be ensured during implementation and in the future use of the site. This includes the planned scope, target groups, responsibilities, timing and expected use of the Inclusion and Outreach Plan[3] to be prepared and implemented within the project The assessment shall also consider whether the proposed measures are designed to prevent exclusion and ensure equal access in the planning, programming and long-term use of the site.	0 – 5		
3c	**Environmental responsibility, climate adaptation/mitigation and risk preparedness**	The project application credibly describes how environmentally responsible conservation, climate change mitigation and/or adaptation, preventive conservation and heritage-sensitive risk preparedness will be addressed within the project. The proposed measures are relevant to the site, proportionate, and appropriately integrated into the project design and implementation.	0 – 5		
3d	**Condition and urgency of intervention**	The current condition of the site and the urgency of the proposed intervention are clearly justified. Higher scores shall be given to projects addressing serious deterioration or significant risk to heritage values.	0 – 3		
4. Sustainability, future management and public activation (20 points)					
4a	**Management concept and governance, sustainability (eliminating criterion)**	The project application presents a strong and feasible concept for the future management, governance and long-term sustainability of the restored site. It credibly describes the planned preparation, content, responsibilities, timing and future use of a site-specific Management Plan[4] that including Interpretation Plan during project implementation. **Suggested scoring:** 8 points – excellent and convincing management concept, with clear governance,	0 – 8		

[3] **Inclusion and Outreach Plan** shall envisage how an equal access for vulnerable groups such as women, youth, minorities (including Roma), and persons with disabilities will be ensured.
[4] A site-specific aligned **Management Plan** shall be produced with sustainable development goals to ensure sustainability. **Interpretation plan** should define how the monument's values will be communicated to the public.

		responsibilities, timeline and realistic future use 5 points – good and generally credible concept, with some aspects requiring further elaboration 2 points – weakly developed concept with important gaps 0 points – no credible concept for management, governance and long-term sustainability			
4b	**Preventive maintenance and long-term care**	The project application credibly describes how routine maintenance, preventive maintenance and long-term care of the restored site will be ensured. This includes, where relevant, the planned preparation and/or application of a Preventive **Maintenance Plan** during project implementation, including cooperation with relevant heritage authorities or in cooperation with Pro Monumenta III project.	0 – 4		
4c	**Programming, use and public activation**	The project application includes a credible approach to the future cultural, educational and/or community use of the revitalised site. Where relevant, it clearly describes the intended scope, content, target users, responsibilities and timing for the preparation **of Programming Plan and/or Use and Tenancy Plan**[5] during project implementation.	0 – 4		
4d	**Operational and financial sustainability**	The project application demonstrates a realistic and sustainable long-term operational and financial model for the future use of the site, including expected operation, maintenance, staffing, funding sources, risks and mitigation measures after project completion.	0 – 4		
5. Implementation logic, indicators and budget (14 points)					
5a	**Coherence of activities, work plan and risk management**	The structure of the project is coherent, the activities are clearly described and logically sequenced, the time schedule is realistic, and the key implementation risks and mitigation measures are appropriate.	0 – 4		
5b	**Results framework, indicators and target values**	The project contributes credibly to the results framework of the call. Indicators and target values are realistic, verifiable, proportionate	0 – 4		

[5] **Programming Plan**, **Use and Tenancy Plan** shall be elaborated in order to embed cultural heritage sites in community life, projects are expected to prepare them with commitments from key users, and to organise **participatory workshops** that ensure representation of women, youth, minorities, and persons with disabilities.

		to the project scope, and supported by appropriate means of verification.			
5c	**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.	0 – 6		
6. Horizontal priorities and territorial focus (9 points)					
6a	**Bilateral cooperation with Donor State entities**	The project demonstrates meaningful bilateral cooperation with Donor State partner(s), where applicable. Meaningful cooperation shall be understood as cooperation involving a clear partner role, budget, active contribution to project activities, exchange of knowledge or expertise, and tangible added value for project quality, relevance or sustainability. **Suggested scoring:** 3 points - substantive cooperation contributing to core project delivery and/or sustainability; 2 points -meaningful cooperation throughout implementation; 1 point - limited cooperation or one-off/additional activities; 0 points - no bilateral cooperation.	0 – 3		
6b	**Project localisation in a priority district (purely objective criterion)**	3 points - the cultural heritage site is located in a priority district. 0 points - the cultural heritage site is not located in a priority district.	0 – 3		
6c	**Contribution to 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 and to the future use of the supported heritage site. This may include, for example, activities strengthening social cohesion between local communities and displaced persons, inclusive cultural or community programming involving people affected by displacement, interpretation or outreach activities reflecting the impact of the war, support for access to culture and community life for persons fleeing Ukraine, or other justified measures responding to local needs arising from the invasion of Ukraine. **Suggested scoring:** 3 points - clear, substantive and well-integrated contribution	0 – 3		

		1 point - relevant but limited contribution 0 points - no credible contribution			

Total score - 100 points

Minimum quality standard - 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.

Strictly objective criteria are criteria that, under normal circumstances, must be evaluated identically by independent experts. The program operator may ask independent experts for clarification if their evaluations differ with respect to such a criterion.