Norway grants

Ministry of Development Funds and Regional Policy

Substantive evaluation chart for a project proposal under the Sustainable City Call within Local Development Programme

The substantive evaluation is conducted on: (1) admissible criteria and (2) scored criteria. The maximum possible score is 39 points. A project receives a positive assessment if it obtains at least 60% of the maximum points (i.e. 24 points or more).
Based on these scores, the Project Selection Committee will decide on funding for projects with the highest ranking.

Part A - criteria related to the thematic scope of the call – evaluated by one or two pairs 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	Verification if the project scope **aligns with the call's goal:** supporting initiatives that allow sub-regional cities and regional agglomerations to play a role of engines of regional growth. These initiatives includes implementing comprehensive, forward-looking development projects that set modern standards, provide access to public services, and improve quality of life. <u>The criteria must be met cumulatively for the project to be subject to further substantive evaluation.</u> • project activities consistent with the call's goal and scope; • use of public participation in decision-making; • consistency with National Urban Policy 2030 and Poland's Development Strategy 2035.	YES/NO
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 Regulations, i. e. human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, rule of law, and respect for human rights, including the rights of persons belonging to minorities.	YES/NO

	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 Alignment of project activities with the Local Development Strategy (LDS) The following are assessed: the degree of alignment and scope of planned project activities with the identified needs and objectives contained in the LDS; whether the project is a coherent tool for implementing local policy.		**0 pts:** Activities do not correspond to the city's problems presented in the LDS; no impact on solving residents' problems shown; project does not support strategic goals. **1 pt:** Only part of the activities meet LDS needs; description is selective and applies only to selected groups of residents, and the impact of the project on solving problems is unclear or limited. **2 pts:** Project largely supports LDS strategic goals; considers residents' needs; correctly describes impact of activities on diagnosed problems. **3 pts:** Project fully supports LDS strategic goals; comprehensively addresses residents' needs and the impact of		**2/**

		actions on solving problems is described clearly and logically, demonstrating their full adequacy.		
2.2. Intervention Logic The assessment covers: Correlation between proposed activities – the project creates a coherent system of activities based on the logical sequence: LDS (diagnosis – intervention – output). Justification of the project's need in connection with the long-term development goals included in the designated strategic document.		**0 pts:** There is no coherent chain between the problem and the outcome, the diagnosis was not utilized, and the actions are haphazard or inadequate. The project's outputs are not defined and the links to the municipality's strategic goals are not aligned, making it impossible to assess the intervention's sustainability and its long-term impact on the city's development. **1 pt:** The project identifies the problem broadly without supporting a strategic diagnosis, the activities are only partially adequate and do not form a complete sequence, and the outcomes are poorly linked to the goals. The project's outputs are described but poorly linked to long-term city development goals. The city office's competences are developed in a limited way, and the sustainability of the results is uncertain. **2 pts:** Most of the problems were defined based on a strategic diagnosis, the need to implement most of the actions is well justified, most of the activities address these needs and create a logical system of actions. Most of planned outputs are realistic, and their connection to the city's strategic goals indicates a well-designed project that has a chance of being sustained after the grant expires. The sustainability of the activities is described in a feasible manner and assumes the effective integration of project outcomes into ongoing city management practices. **3 pts:** The need for the project clearly stems from the diagnosis, the project presents a complete and coherent chain from		**3/**

		diagnosis through intervention to impact on the strategic goal, and the activities form a complete system with measurable outputs. The project brings real added value to the city's development policy.		
2.3. Level of project's innovation and its sustainability and the utility of the proposed solutions, including institutional ones. The assessment covers: Innovation of the proposed solutions. Complementarity of the proposed solutions with existing ones. Practical utility of the proposed solutions in the context of improving the quality of life of residents and the efficiency of public services. Sustainability of the project effects, including in the institutional area.		**0 pts:** The project does not introduce innovative solutions, is repetitive in nature, replicates existing solutions. The complementarity of the proposed solutions with those already in place was not described. No evidence was provided about the impact on improving the quality of life of residents or the efficiency of public services. No mechanisms were described to ensure the sustainability of the effects after the project's completion. **1 pt:** The project introduces minor new solutions at the applicant's level. It complements existing solutions, and their complementarity is limited. The project has little impact on improving the quality of public services and residents' quality of life. The sustainability of the project results is poorly described. Institutional development is not supported by a structured plan, and activities are focused on specific points and are not linked to systemic office management. **2 pts:** The project introduces numerous solutions already used in local/supra-local government. It is complementary to existing structures and demonstrates a real impact on their development. The project significantly improves the quality of public services and translates into an improved quality of life for residents. The sustainability of the project results is largely well-described. At the project level, the method for planning ongoing institutional		**2/**

		development is described; the activities are highly comprehensive and linked to systemic office management. **3 pts**: The project introduces highly innovative solutions at a local/supra-local scale that transform the way the city is managed. It is based on full system integration and has the potential to be scaled to other authorities. The project directly translates into improved public services and improved quality of life for residents. The sustainability of the project's results is clearly documented and ensured through systemic solutions. Institutional development is based on the valid commune's strategy, and activities are planned and comprehensive.		
2.4. Utilization of participation mechanisms and inclusion The assessment covers: The scope and form of involvement of residents (with particular emphasis on excluded groups), social organizations, businesses, and other stakeholders in the project design, implementation, and evaluation process.	**...**	**0 pts:** The project does not provide for real participation mechanisms; the solutions are only minimal legal requirements, and the activities do not provide residents with a say in the project's design. **1 pt:** Participation is limited to standard informational consultations, inclusiveness is treated vaguely, and the activities are of poor quality and do not provide a real impact on decisions. **2 pts:** Extensive consultations and information-gathering mechanisms are planned with the participation of various groups of residents, including the excluded. Stakeholders participate in at least two stages of the project, and dialogue with them is ongoing. **3 pts:** The project was developed in collaboration with residents using a co-design model using advanced mechanisms such as citizen panels. It ensures full inclusivity at every stage of		**1/**

		the project cycle and provides a real influence on its final shape.		
2.5. National partnership The following are assessed: 1. Selection of partner(s), 2. Justification for the partner's participation in the project, incl. impact on achieving objectives, indicators and project impact.		**0 pts:** No partner or a partner is planned, but their participation is not substantively justified. **1 pt:** The project (one or more activities) is implemented in partnership with a local government unit (municipality, county) or an association of local government units. The participation of this partner is not sufficiently justified in the context of the project objectives and outcomes, and no increase in the project impact as a result of the partner's involvement has been demonstrated. The partnership is established solely for the project's purposes. The need for a partner's involvement is not specified in the strategic document. **2 pts:** The project (one or more activities) is implemented in partnership with a local government unit (municipality, county) or an association of local government units, and this partner's participation is justified in the context of the project's objectives and outcomes, increases the project's impact. The partnership is well-established and has operated before (it was not established solely for the project and previous joint activities have been documented). The partner is not responsible for the overall implementation of the activities. **3 pts:** The project was prepared with the active participation of partners (local government unit (municipality, county) or an association of local government units), and their participation is justified in the context of the project's objectives and		**1/**

		outcomes, increasing the project's impact. The partnership is well-established and has operated previously (it was not established solely for the project, and previous joint activities have been documented). The partner selection is based on the strategic documentation. The partner(s) are responsible for the overall implementation of assigned activities.		

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 14% 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)
2.6 Schedule **The assessment covers: coherence, logic and feasibility, i.e. the possibility of carrying out activities within the deadlines indicated by**		**0 pts:** 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 pt:** 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 pts:** 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 pts:** 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.		
2.7 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**		**0 pts:** 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 pt:** 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 pts:** 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 pts:** 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.		
2.8 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 team if gaps and**		**0 pts:** There is no plan in the project to establish a project team and management is planned to be transferred to an external entity. **1 pt:** 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 no clear plan for their completion. The project fails to describe		**1/**

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.**		the level and manner of involvement of project team members. **2 pts:** 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 pts:** 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.		
2.9 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, taking into account the applicant and the partner.**		**0 pts:** The project does not describe the processes of information flow, monitoring the achievement of results, risk management and financial control. **1 pt:** The project describes incompletely or incorrectly the processes of information flow, monitoring of results implementation, risk management and financial control.		**1/**

		2 pts: The project mostly correctly describes the processes of information flow, monitoring the achievement of results, risk management and financial control. **3 pts**: 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:**