Norway grants

Ministry of Development Funds and Regional Policy

Substantive evaluation chart for a project proposal under Smart 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.

Project identification/details – basic information about the project

Project ID number:	
Applicant's name:	
Project title:	

Norway grants

Ministry of Development Funds and Regional Policy

Part A

Admissible criteria

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

Criterion	Scope/subject of evaluation	YES/NO
1. Compliance of the project with the objectives of the call	Compliance of the project with the objective of the call for proposals, i.e. whether it contributes to strengthening innovativeness in city management through the application of the Smart City 4.0 concept. The verification covers whether the project: a) provides for the use of modern information and communication technologies in at least one of the areas indicated in the Call Announcement; b) fosters the application of public participation mechanisms and the involvement of stakeholders in decision-making and the co-design of solutions (human smart approach); c) includes activities contributing to the achievement of Sustainable Development Goal 11 (the so-called SDG)	YES/NO
2. Compliance of the Project with the values and principles governing the implementation of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism set forth in the Article 1.3.1 of the Regulation	The project complies with the values and principles referred to in Article 1.3.1 of the Regulations, 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 remains at least neutral, in particular with regard to: • accessibility for persons with disabilities, • equality between women and men.	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.

Criterion/ 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)
3. Problem diagnosis, the need for project implementation, the logic of change, and complementarity of activities The assessment focuses on the quality of the problem diagnosis, the description of its scale, causes, and consequences, its relevance to residents' needs, and the consistency of the logic of change (problem – cause – activity – result – method of		**0 pts** – The diagnosis of the problem has not been presented or is overly general; the needs of residents or key target groups have not been demonstrated; there is a lack of data, sources, and descriptions of the scale, causes, and consequences of the problem, as well as a lack of a logical link between the problem, planned activities, and expected results; a logical connection between the activities themselves is also missing.		**2**

measurement), and consistency of activities.		**1 pts** –The project describes the problem, however, the diagnosis is selective, based on incomplete, outdated, or poorly localized data; the needs of residents or key target groups have not been clearly demonstrated, and the logic of change is incomplete or lacks clarity. A link between the activities exists, but it is superficial and poorly justified. **2 pts** –The diagnosis is generally appropriate and is based on partially up-to-date local data; the project indicates the scale of the problem, the main needs of the target groups, and the basic link between the problem, activities, and results, however, the description of the causes, consequences, indicators, or the full logic of change needs to be further specified. A link between the activities exists and is mostly logical, clear, and justified. **3 pts** –The diagnosis is comprehensive, locally contextualized, and well-documented (based on up-to-date local data); it clearly presents the scale, causes, and consequences of the		

		problem, addresses the diverse needs of residents or users, and demonstrates a coherent logic of change: problem – cause – activity – result – method of measurement. A link between the activities exists and is fully logical, clear, and justified.		
4. Quality of stakeholder participation tailored to the project nature The assessment focuses on the quality of involvement of residents and other stakeholders in the design, testing, implementation, or improvement of the solution.		**1 pts** –The project provides for basic forms of stakeholder involvement, such as consultations, information sharing, feedback collection, or testing, however, their scope is selective, poorly tailored to the type of project, or does not clearly demonstrate how the submitted needs and comments can influence the assumptions, functionalities, or the method of implementing the solution; key stakeholder groups are not clearly indicated. **2 pts** –The project provides for participation that is generally appropriate to the type of project; it indicates key stakeholder groups, the moments of their involvement, and how feedback will be used, however, the description of mechanisms for real impact, testing, implementation		**2**

		communication, or user support needs to be further specified **3 pts** –The project presents a mature and coherent participation model adequate to the type of project; it clearly identifies stakeholders, the stages and methods of their involvement, and the points of real impact on the assumptions, functionalities, implementation method, or project priorities, and where needed, it also includes a credible testing, communication, and user support plan.		
5. Inclusiveness, accessibility, and countering the digital divide The assessment focuses on whether the project addresses the needs of groups at risk of digital exclusion, ensures the accessibility of solutions and services, and provides alternative access channels where necessary.		**0 pts** – The project does not identify groups at risk of digital exclusion, does not take their needs into account, or may deepen barriers to accessing services; there is a lack of specific activities ensuring accessibility or alternative channels for using the solution. **1 pts** – In principle, the project identifies groups at risk of digital exclusion, but addresses accessibility or digital exclusion only to a basic extent, mainly by meeting the minimum legal		**2**

		requirements; inclusion activities are general, selective, or poorly linked to the needs of specific target groups. **2 pts** – The project identifies groups at risk of digital exclusion and substantially takes their needs into account, as well as provides for activities that increase the accessibility of solutions or services; it indicates basic forms of support, however, the scope of activities, the selection of target groups, or the method of reducing skills, economic, and technological barriers needs to be further specified. **3 pts** – The project presents a coherent and comprehensive approach to inclusivity, accessibility, and countering digital exclusion; it precisely identifies target groups at risk of digital exclusion, ensures digital accessibility, provides for adequate user support, alternative access channels where needed, and activities reducing skills, economic, or technological barriers.		
6. Adequacy and functional novelty/new value of the solution		**0 pts** –The solution does not address the diagnosed problem, it is purely replicative in nature, or does not show significant functional improvement; the novelty of the solution has not been		**1**

The assessment focuses on the extent to which the proposed solution addresses the identified problem, provides a significant functional improvement, and whether the scope of novelty is justified by the needs and the expected results of the project.		justified by a need or the expected user benefit. **1 pts** – The solution addresses the problem only partially; the scope of functional improvement is limited, poorly justified, or is of minor importance to residents, public service users, or the method of city management. The scope of novelty is small. **2 pts** - The solution is substantially adequate to the diagnosed problem and has the potential for functional improvement; the description indicates the usefulness of the solution, however, the scale of the effect, the scope of novelty, or the link between the need and the proposed functionality are not fully convincingly demonstrated. **3 pts** – The solution fully addresses the diagnosed problem, it is functionally justified and clearly linked to the needs of the city or users; it provides for a significant, measurable improvement in the quality of management or service delivery, and the scope of novelty is adequate to the need and distinguishes		

		the project from standard or replicative solutions.		
7. Complementarity with the existing ecosystem of solutions and no duplication of functionalities The assessment focuses on whether the project develops or complements existing national and local solutions, aligns with urban processes and policies, and does not lead to unjustified duplication of functionalities.		**0 pts** – The project does not indicate links with existing solutions, policies, or urban processes and replicates existing national or local solutions, does not analyse links with the current ecosystem of solutions, processes, and data, or does not demonstrate that the proposed functionalities are actually needed. There is a significant risk of functional duplication. **1 pts** – The project indicates isolated links with the existing solutions, policies, or urban processes, however, the description is selective; the risk of functional duplication remains significant, and synergy with the current ecosystem has not been clearly demonstrated. **2 pts** – The project is substantially complementary to the existing solutions and processes, and the risk of functional duplication has been partially reduced; the description indicates the potential to use previous resources, however, the		**1**

		analysis of synergy and links with urban policies is not fully satisfactory. **3 pts** – The project fully fits into the existing ecosystem of national and local solutions, it develops or complements previous resources, urban processes, and policies, and unequivocally demonstrates the absence of redundant functional duplication; the complementarity is coherent, well-justified, and enhances the project's effects.		
8. Public value of the solution The assessment focuses on the expected public value of the solution, including benefits for residents, public service users, and a public institution. Public value means a measurable benefit to residents, public service users, or a public institution, in particular in terms of quality, accessibility, efficiency, transparency, security, resilience, environmental impact, or social inclusion.		**0 pts** – The project does not demonstrate public benefits to residents, public service users, or a public institution. **1 pts** – The project indicates general public benefits, however, their scale, target group, importance, or method of measurement are described selectively; the link between the solution and the improvement in quality, accessibility, efficiency, transparency, security, resilience, environmental impact, or social inclusion is not clear.		**1**

		2 pts – The project provides for specific and substantially measurable public benefits, linked to the needs of the target groups and the project logic; the description indicates the potential for improvement in at least one important dimension, however, the multidimensionality of the public value, the scale of the effects, or the method of their measurement need to be further specified. **3 pts** – The project fully demonstrates a significant, measurable, and well-justified public value, clearly linked to the needs of residents, public service users, or a public institution; the benefits are coherent with the project logic, encompass key dimensions of quality, accessibility, efficiency, or other public effects, and distinguish the solution from standard activities.		
9. Organizational, financial, and technical sustainability, and operational readiness The assessment focuses on the maintenance model for the project after the funding		**0 pts** – The project does not present a credible model for maintaining results after funding ends; there is a lack of assignment of organizational responsibility, funding sources for maintenance costs, technical support		**1**

period, the assignment of responsibilities, and the organization's readiness to launch and maintain the solution.		policies, updates, cybersecurity, or data management. **1 pts** – The project contains general declarations of sustainability and operational readiness, however, the description is selective or incomplete; responsibility, operating costs, maintenance procedures, the technical support model, or the method of ensuring the quality, cybersecurity, and accessibility of the solution after implementation have not been clearly indicated. **2 pts** – The project presents a substantially adequate model of organizational, financial, and technical sustainability, as well as basic operational readiness; it indicates responsibilities, funding sources, technical support, updates, or data management, however, some elements regarding operation, cybersecurity, further use of results, or mitigating the risk of vendor lock-in need to be further specified.		

		3 pts – The project presents a complete, coherent, and credible model of sustainability and operational readiness; it clearly defines organizational responsibility, funding of maintenance costs, technical support policies, updates, cybersecurity, data management, mitigation of the risk of vendor lock-in, and further use of results after funding ends.		
10. Results, indicators, utilisation and dissemination of results The assessment focuses on the identification of short- and long-term results, their measurability, the expected benefits for society, and the selection of activities for the exploitation and dissemination of the project results. Activities aimed at disseminating project results and utilizing them after the completion of the		**0 pts** – The project results are inadequate, unmeasurable, or unrealistic, and the project does not present credible activities for their use and dissemination after the implementation ends; there is no link between the results and benefits for society or the further development of the organization. **1 pts** – The project indicates basic short- and long-term results, however, their description is general, selective, or poorly justified; indicators, benefits for society, the monitoring method, or the plan for using and disseminating the		**1**

implementation are assessed exclusively under this criterion.		results after the project ends are incomplete or lack conviction. **2 pts** – The project defines substantially adequate and measurable short- or long-term results and indicates how they will be used and disseminated; the description shows potential benefits for society, however, some of the indicators, the monitoring system, the scale of impact, or the sustainability of utilizing the results need to be further specified. **3 pts** – The project presents significant, measurable, and socially relevant short- and long-term results; the indicators are coherent with the project logic, the monitoring system is credible, and the plan for using and disseminating the results after implementation ends is convincing and strengthens the organization's capacity for further digital transformation.		

Norway grants

Ministry of Development Funds and Regional Policy

Part B

Admissible criteria

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

Criterion	Scope of evaluation	YES/NO
1. Project management costs	Management costs do not exceed the allowable 10% of eligible expenditures.	YES/NO
2. Proportion of hard (investment) and soft (non-investment)	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)

3. Schedule The assessment covers: coherence, logic and feasibility, i.e. the possibility of carrying out activities within the deadlines indicated by the applicant and the possibility of carrying out the project within the expenditure eligibility period.	…	**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 pts:** 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.		**1**
4. Budget and cost-effectiveness	…	**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		**1**

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 expenditure to the descriptive section of the application. Accounting accuracy.		purpose, there is no link between the expenditures and the descriptive part of the application, the budget contains many calculation errors; **1 pts:** 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.		
5. Project Team The following aspects are assessed: the composition, experience, and the planned level and manner of	**…**	**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**

the involvement of project team members in project activities, as well as the planned development/strengthening of the 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.		**1 pts:** 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 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.		
6. Management model		**0 pts:** The project does not describe the processes of information flow, monitoring the achievement of results, risk management and financial control.		**1**

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.		**1 pts:** The project describes incompletely or incorrectly the processes of information flow, monitoring of results implementation, risk management and financial control. **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:**