Norway grants

Ministry of Development Funds and Regional Policy

Substantive evaluation chart for a project proposal under Resilient City call within Local Development Programme

The substantive evaluation is conducted on the basis of: (1)admissible criteria and (2) scored criteria. The maximum number of points to be awarded is 45, and projects that receive at least 60% of the maximum score (i.e., 27 points or more) will achieve a final positive assessment.

On this basis, the Selection Committee will make funding decisions for the projects with the highest scores.

Part A - criteria related to the thematic scope of the call – evaluated by a pair of thematic experts
Part B - project criteria (financial/organizational) – evaluated by a pair of financial/organizational experts.

Part A

Admissible criteria

Note: *Failure to meet any admissible criterion (selecting NO) results in the termination of the assessment and rejection of the application.*

Criterion	Scope of evaluation	YES/NO
1.1 Compliance of the project with the objectives of the call	The scope of the project is consistent with the objective of the call for proposals, i.e. it contributes to increasing the city's resilience to various types of threats and crises, including strengthening the institutional capacity of local government in the development and management of resilience.	
1.2 Compliance of the project with the values and principles governing the implementation of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism set forth in Article 1.3.1 of the Regulations.	The project is consistent with the values and principles referred to in Article 1.3.1 of the Regulation, i.e., human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law, and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. The project has a positive impact or at least remains neutral, in particular with regard to: • accessibility for persons with disabilities,	

	• equality between women and men.	

Scored criteria

The evaluation under the criterion is cumulative – the applicant shall receive the indicated points only if all conditions defined for a given point threshold are met.

Subject of evaluation	**Position in the application form**	**Point thresholds**	**Score and its justification** (Any score below the maximum requires a justification in each instance.)	**WEIGHT/ Weighted score (points x weight)**
2.1 Diagnosis of the problem The assessment focuses on the quality of the evidence-based problem diagnosis which forms the basis for project planning	2.1	**0 points** – the problem diagnosis is generic and insufficient, without indicating sources or providing quantitative and qualitative data; **1 point** – the diagnosis includes a description of the problem, its scale, causes and consequences with reference to quantitative and qualitative data but without indicating sources, or it includes such a description together with data and their sources, however part of the data is outdated and does not directly refer to the city situation; **2 points** – the diagnosis includes a description of the problem, its scale, causes and consequences with reference to up-to-date quantitative and qualitative data and indication of their sources; however, it is descriptive in nature and lacks adequate interpretation of the data; **3 points** – the diagnosis includes a description of the problem, its scale, causes and consequences; it is in-depth and of high quality, based on up-to-date and reliable data (quantitative and qualitative), with clear indication of current sources. The presented		**2**

		data have been appropriately interpreted in the context of selecting the project objectives. The analysis clearly refers to the situation of the city and provides a coherent basis for designing the scope of the project.		
2.2. Intervention Logic The assessment focuses on the scope and quality of the planned activities, on whether the activities are consistent with the diagnosis, appropriately selected in relation to the identified challenges, adequate for achieving the project objectives and equipped with indicators for evaluating evidence-based results.	2.2	**0 points** – the planned activities do not stem from the diagnosis or are generic, unclear, or not linked to the project objectives; **1 point** – the activities are linked to the project objectives and stem from the diagnosis; however, they are poor quality, they relate to less significant of the identified problems or the proposed activities are not appropriately selected for the scope of the project; **2 points** – the activities are linked to the project objectives, stem from the diagnosis, and address the most important problems of the city. The activities are adequate quality, are generally well aligned with the project scope; however, there are some inconsistencies between them; **3 points** – the activities are linked to the project objectives, fully stem from and are consistent with the diagnosis and project objectives, focus on key problems, are excellent quality, are designed in a logical and comprehensive manner and accompanied with adequate indicators. The selected activities and solutions are optimally chosen and appropriate to the scope of the project.		**3**
2.3 Project replicability The assessment focuses on the project's potential for implementation and	2.3	**0 points** – the activities proposed in the project do not demonstrate potential for implementation or adaptation in other local government units;		**1**

adaptation of good practices in other local government units, including those with a different scale, organizational structure, or specific context.		**1 point** – the activities proposed in the project have partial potential for implementation or adaptation in other local government units; however, the possibility of replication has not been described in detail or no specific tools supporting implementation in other local government units have been planned; **2 points** – the activities proposed in the project have potential for implementation or adaptation in other local government units, and the project includes replication tools such as implementation models, sets of standard procedures, guidelines, or manuals; however, their scope or applicability is limited (e.g. territorially); **3 points** – the proposed activities have high, universal potential for implementation or adaptation and can be applied across various local government units (of different scale and specificity). The project includes comprehensive and well-designed replication tools (e.g. implementation models, procedures, standards, guidelines) as well as a structured approach for their large-scale implementation by other local government units.		
2.4 Complementarity of project activities with the existing city resilience measures (activities related to Information Integrity are not subject to assessment under this criterion)	2.2	**0 points** – no complementarity with other initiatives financed outside the project has been demonstrated; **1 point** – the planned activities only marginally extend and largely duplicate the city's resilience-related measures financed outside the project. They do not form a coherent system; **2 points** – the planned activities extend the city's resilience measures financed outside the project, i.e. they include other, complementary types of activities than those already being carried out; they demonstrate coherence/complementarity with other		**2**

The assessment focuses on the degree of complementarity between the project and other resilience-related measures implemented by the city, in particular those financed from other sources. The assessment examines whether the project complements, extends or strengthens existing measures, ensuring a coherent, comprehensive system.		initiatives implemented outside the project, however they do not form a coherent system. Only a small portion of the planned activities duplicates the city's resilience measures financed outside the project; **3 points** – the planned activities extend the city's resilience measures financed outside the project, i.e. they include other, complementary types of activities than those already being carried out; they demonstrate a high level of complementarity with other city initiatives in the area of resilience. The activities across different categories are interconnected, mutually reinforcing, and together form a coherent, comprehensive system of interventions.		
2.5 Alignment of the project with crisis management plans and other relevant strategic documents (e.g. municipal climate change adaptation plan) The assessment focuses on the extent to which the project is aligned with and operationally linked to existing	2.2	**0 points** – the project does not refer to existing crisis management plans or other relevant strategic documents (e.g. a municipal climate change adaptation plan); **1 point** – the project partially refers to crisis management plans or other strategic documents (e.g. a municipal climate change adaptation plan); however, the links are mainly general and declarative in nature; **2 points** – the project refers to crisis management plans and other relevant documents (e.g. a municipal climate change adaptation plan). Specific areas of alignment are identified and the link		**2**

strategic and planning documents, in particular crisis management plans and other relevant strategies (e.g. the municipal climate change adaptation plan).		between the project and the objectives or directions of these plans is justified; **3 points** – the project demonstrates a high level of integration with crisis management plans and other relevant strategic documents (e.g. a municipal climate change adaptation plan). The project activities directly implement or further develop the provisions of these plans, strengthening their effectiveness and coherence.		
2.6 Identification of stakeholders and their involvement in the project, analysis of their needs The assessment focuses on the adequacy of the identification of relevant stakeholder groups (residents and other entities) during the diagnostic phase, as well as on the scope and quality of their involvement in project implementation, in relation to the project objectives and planned activities.	2.4	**0 points** – no stakeholder analysis has been included in the application, or no stakeholder involvement in project implementation has been planned; **1 point** – the identified stakeholders have been defined based on a superficial analysis. The project identifies some groups, individuals, or organizations that may be related to the project activities, regardless of whether they are direct users or have an influence on the implementation, or stakeholder involvement in the project implementation is insufficient; **2 points** – stakeholders and final beneficiaries have been appropriately identified based on data analysis with reference to quantitative and qualitative data but without indicating sources, or part of the data is outdated; stakeholder involvement in the project implementation is adequate and linked to the project scope; **3 points** – stakeholders and final beneficiaries have been accurately and comprehensively (including inclusiveness) identified based on a thorough analysis of data and needs, with reference to quantitative and qualitative data and clear indication of up-to-date		**1**

		sources. The project provides for active, multi-stage, and appropriate stakeholder involvement (e.g. co-creation of solutions, testing, implementation), closely linked to the project objectives and scope.		

Norway grants

Ministry of Development Funds and Regional Policy

Part B

Admissible criteria

Note: *Failure to meet any admissible criterion (selecting NO) results in the termination of the assessment and rejection of the application*

Criterion	Scope of evaluation	YES/NO
1.3. Project management costs	**Management costs do not exceed the allowable 10% of eligible expenditures.**	YES/NO
1.4. Proportion of hard (investment) and soft (non-investment) measures.	**Expenditures have been correctly assigned to soft and hard measures, and the allowable proportions specified in the call documentation have been maintained (max. 78% of investment expenditures).**	YES/NO

Scored criteria

The evaluation under the criterion is cumulative – the applicant shall receive the indicated points only if all conditions defined for a given point threshold are met.

Subject of evaluation	**Position in the application form**	**Point thresholds**	**Score and its justification** (Any score below the maximum requires a justification in each instance)	**WEIGHT/Weighted Score (points x weight)**
2.7 Schedule **The assessment covers: coherence, logic and feasibility, i.e. the possibility of carrying out activities within the deadlines indicated by**	5	**0 points:** The schedule is inconsistent and illogical; activities are impossible to complete within the deadlines indicated by the applicant and the project is unfeasible as a whole within the expenditure eligibility period.		**1**

the applicant and the possibility of carrying out the project within the expenditure eligibility period.		**1 point:** There are unclear dependencies between tasks. The schedule is vague, lacking critical deadlines; some activities are underestimated in time; and there is a high risk of failure to complete the project within the expenditure eligibility period. **2 points:** The activities are mostly coherent and logically arranged, the schedule includes key activities that can mostly be implemented within the deadlines indicated by the applicant, there is a low risk of the project not being implemented within the expenditure eligibility period; **3 points:** The schedule is coherent and logical, describing all activities in detail. All activities are feasible within the deadline specified by the applicant, taking into account the interdependencies between them. The feasibility of completing the project within the eligibility period is clearly demonstrated.		
2.8 Budget and cost-effectiveness **The assessment covers: the cost-effectiveness of the project, i.e., the adequacy of the adopted rates to market prices. Accuracy of the description of budget items, including the scope and purpose of the expenditure. Linking the**	4	**0 points:** Costs are inadequate to market prices; descriptions of budget items are imprecise; most of the items have no explanation of the scope or purpose, there is no link between the expenditures and the descriptive part of the application, the budget contains many calculation errors;		**1**

expenditure to the descriptive section of the application. Accounting accuracy.		**1 point:** Many costs are not in line with market prices, many item descriptions are imprecise, many items appear without explanation of scope or purpose, many expenditures are not related to the descriptive part of the application. The budget contains several calculation errors**.** **2 points:** Some costs are out of line with market prices, few item descriptions are imprecise, few items appear without a clear scope or purpose, and few expenditures are unrelated to the descriptive portion of the proposal. The budget contains several calculation errors. **3 points:** All costs are consistent with market prices, item descriptions are precise, and there are no items without a clear scope or purpose, and expenditures are linked to the descriptive section of the application. The budget contains no calculation errors.		
2.9 Project Team **The following aspects are assessed: the composition, experience, and the planned level and manner of the involvement of project team members in project activities, as well as the planned development/strengthening of the**	3.2	**0 points:** There is no plan in the project to establish a project team and management is planned to be transferred to an external entity. **1 point:** The team's composition is inadequate for the project's scope; the planned team consists of individuals with no project experience. The project fails to identify the need for increased competencies and presents		**1**

team if gaps and development/training needs are identified. **In the case of a partnership project, the involvement of the applicant's project team and the partner's project team is assessed.**		no clear plan for their completion. The project fails to describe the level and manner of involvement of project team members. **2 points:** The team composition is partially inadequate for the project's scope, and the planned project management team is partially composed of individuals with insufficient projects implementation experience. The project identifies the need for increased competencies and presents a clear plan for their completion. The project insufficiently describes the level and manner of involvement of project team members. **3 points:** The team's composition is appropriate to the project's scope. The planned project management team consists of individuals experienced in projects implementation. The project is expected to be implemented through optimal utilization of the project team.		
2.10 Management model **The assessment covers: information flow, monitoring** the achievement **of results, risk management, and financial control within the project.** **In the case of a partnership project, the management model is assessed,**	3.1	**0 points:** The project does not describe the processes of information flow, monitoring the achievement of results, risk management and financial control. **1 point:** The project describes incompletely or incorrectly the processes of information flow, monitoring of results implementation, risk management and financial control.		**1**

taking into account the applicant and the partner.		**2 points:** The project mostly correctly describes the processes of information flow, monitoring the achievement of results, risk management and financial control. **3 points**: The project correctly describes the processes of information flow, monitoring the achievement of results, risk management and financial control.		

Compliance of the Applicant and/or Partner(s) with the values and principles set out in Article 1.3.1 of the Regulation: Does the expert raise any concerns regarding the compliance of the Applicant and/or Partner(s) with the values and principles set out in Article 1.3.1 of the Regulation, i.e. human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, the rule of law and the respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities. **Please provide an answer (yes/no). If "yes" please provide justification:**