Norway grants

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

ANNEX 1 TO THE CALL GRT01 - Integrated Green Transition Models in Urban Public Institutions

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

Content-related criteria

No.	Criteria	Description	Range	Score	Comments
1. Strategic relevance and institutional readiness (22 points)					
1a	Strategic relevance of the public institution and the proposed project (eliminating criterion)	The project clearly demonstrates the strategic relevance of implementing the proposed pilot project within the public institution concerned. The assessment will take into account the role and functions of the institution, its societal, educational or territorial	0-5		

		reach, the character and scale of the public buildings or premises concerned, including their location in an urban area and the overall significance of the proposed project in relation to the institution and its area of activity. Suggested scoring: 5 points – The strategic relevance of the public institution and the proposed project is clearly and convincingly demonstrated. The role and reach of the institution, the character and scale of the buildings or premises concerned, including their location in an urban area, and the overall significance of the project strongly support the justification for implementing the pilot project in the institution. 3 points – The strategic relevance of the public institution and the proposed project is adequately demonstrated. The buildings or premises concerned are located in an urban area, although some aspects of the justification for implementing the pilot project in the institution are less developed or convincing. 1 point – The strategic relevance is only partially demonstrated. The buildings or premises concerned are located in an urban area, but the justification for implementing the pilot project in the institution is weak, general or insufficiently linked to the role, reach or characteristics of the public institution and the proposed project. 0 points – The strategic relevance of the public institution and the proposed project is not sufficiently demonstrated, or the project does not meet the requirement to be implemented in an urban area.			

1b	Justification of the need for the project and understanding of climate challenges	The project convincingly describes the current situation, identifies the main climate, environmental and operational challenges affecting the public institution, its buildings or premises. The identified challenges and needs are supported by relevant available data, evidence or other information, and the project clearly explains why they require intervention. The proposed project responds directly to the identified needs and clearly explains the changes it is expected to achieve. Suggested scoring: 6 points – The need for the project is clearly and convincingly justified. The current situation and the main climate, environmental and operational challenges are clearly identified and supported by relevant available data, evidence or other information. The project demonstrates a strong and direct link between the identified needs, the proposed intervention and the expected changes. 4 points – The need for the project is adequately justified and the main challenges are identified, but some aspects are less well supported by data or evidence, or the link between the identified needs, the proposed intervention and the expected changes is not fully developed. 2 points – The need for the project is only partially justified. The description of the current situation or identified challenges is general, insufficiently supported by data or evidence, or the link between the identified needs and the proposed intervention is weak. 0 points – The need for the project is not sufficiently	0-6		

		justified, the main challenges are not clearly identified, or the proposed intervention is not credibly linked to the identified needs.			
1c	Relevance to the institution's priorities and institutional readiness	The applicant demonstrates that the proposed pilot project is aligned with the priorities of the public institution in the relevant areas of sustainability, climate change adaptation, energy transition and green governance. The applicant describes relevant previous activities, experience or existing strategic documents and demonstrates its readiness to integrate the project results and the principles of green governance into the day-to-day functioning of the institution. Suggested scoring: 7 points – The project is clearly and convincingly aligned with the priorities of the public institution in the relevant areas of sustainability, climate change adaptation, energy transition and green governance. The applicant demonstrates relevant previous activities, experience or strategic documents and a strong readiness to integrate the project results and green governance principles into the day-to-day functioning of the institution. 5 points – The project is adequately aligned with the institution's priorities and the applicant demonstrates a credible level of institutional readiness, although some aspects of previous experience, strategic anchoring or future integration into institutional practice are less developed. 2 points – The alignment with the institution's priorities or its institutional readiness is only partially demonstrated. Previous activities, experience or strategic documents are limited, or the approach to	0-7		

		integrating the project results and green governance principles into institutional practice is weak or insufficiently developed. 0 points – The project does not demonstrate a credible link to the institution's priorities or sufficient institutional readiness to integrate the project results and green governance principles into its day-to-day functioning.			
1d	Benefits of the project for target groups and the wider community	The project clearly identifies the primary and secondary target groups, describes their needs and credibly explains how they will benefit from the implementation of the pilot project. The project also explains its expected benefits for the wider community, where relevant, taking into account the role and functions of the public institution. Suggested scoring: 4 points – The primary and secondary target groups and their needs are clearly identified, and the expected benefits of the project for these groups are clearly and convincingly explained. Where relevant, the project also demonstrates meaningful expected benefits for the wider community. 3 points – The target groups and their needs are adequately identified and the expected benefits are generally credible, although some aspects are less developed or convincing. 1 point – The target groups or their needs are only partially identified, or the expected benefits are described only in general terms and are not sufficiently linked to the proposed project. 0 points – The project does not clearly identify the relevant target groups and their needs, or does not credibly explain	0-4		

		how they are expected to benefit from the project.			
2. Quality of climate adaptation planning and technical solutions (26 points)					
2a	Quality of the approach to climate change adaptation planning (eliminating criterion)	The project clearly describes the proposed approach to climate change adaptation planning within the public institution. It clearly explains how climate risks will be identified and assessed, how the current situation will be analysed, and how the Adaptation and Resilience Plan will be prepared and applied using climate scenarios, climate risks and vulnerability assessments. Where an existing adaptation or resilience plan is available, the project explains how it will be reviewed and, where necessary, updated or supplemented to meet the requirements of the call. Suggested scoring: 7 points – The proposed approach to climate change adaptation planning is clear, comprehensive and convincing. The project clearly explains how climate risks will be identified and assessed, how the current situation will be analysed, and how climate scenarios, climate risks and vulnerability assessments will be used in the preparation and application of the Adaptation and Resilience Plan. Where an existing plan is available, the approach to its review and, where necessary, updating or supplementation is clearly described. 5 points – The proposed approach is adequate and credible and covers the main elements required for the preparation and application of the Adaptation and Resilience Plan, although some aspects are less developed or convincing. 2 points – The proposed approach is only partially	0-7		

		developed. Important aspects of the climate risk assessment, analysis of the current situation or preparation and application of the Adaptation and Resilience Plan are insufficiently described or contain significant gaps. 0 points – The project does not provide a credible approach to the preparation or application of the Adaptation and Resilience Plan and therefore does not meet the mandatory requirement of the call related to this criterion.			
2b	Quality and logic of the preliminary technical solution (eliminating criterion)	The project clearly describes the preliminary technical solution, including the selection, justification and interlinkage of adaptation measures and measures using renewable energy or strengthening energy resilience. The project demonstrates that the proposed combination of measures is based on the available information on identified climate risks and the needs of the public institution and provides a credible basis for strengthening the climate resilience of the building or buildings and supporting the energy transition. The final scope and technical design of the measures will be refined on the basis of the Adaptation and Resilience Plan prepared or updated during project implementation. Suggested scoring: 8 points – The preliminary technical solution is clear, coherent and convincing. The selection, justification and interlinkage of the proposed measures are well developed, the proposed combination clearly responds to the available information on identified climate risks and the needs of the public institution, and provides a strong and credible basis for	0-8		

		strengthening climate resilience and supporting the energy transition. 5 points – The project proposes a preliminary technical solution that responds to the identified climate risks and the needs of the public institution; however, the selection or justification of some measures, or the links between them, are not sufficiently well developed or convincing. 3 points – The project meets the minimum requirements of the call regarding the scope and combination of measures; however, the proposed measures are not sufficiently justified or interconnected to form a coherent preliminary technical solution responding to the identified climate risks and the needs of the public institution. 0 points – The project does not meet the minimum requirements of the call regarding the scope and combination of mandatory measures.			
2c	Use of sensors and smart technologies (eliminating criterion)	The project describes how sensors or Internet of Things (IoT) technologies will be used for monitoring, data collection and evaluation of the implemented measures. It explains how the collected data will be used to assess the performance and effects of the measures and, where relevant, to support their efficient operation and adjustment over time. Suggested scoring: 5 points – The project clearly and convincingly describes how sensors or IoT technologies will be used for monitoring, data collection and evaluation of the implemented measures. The proposed approach also explains how the collected data will support assessment of the performance and effects of the measures and,	0-5		

		where relevant, their efficient operation and adjustment over time. 3 points – The proposed approach is generally adequate, but some aspects of the use of sensors or IoT technologies, monitoring, data collection or evaluation are only partially developed or insufficiently explained. 0 points – The project does not provide a credible approach to the use of sensors or IoT technologies for monitoring, data collection and evaluation of the implemented measures and therefore does not meet the mandatory requirement of the call related to this criterion.			
2d	Feasibility of the proposed technical solution	The project demonstrates that the proposed technical solution is technically and operationally feasible in the context of the public institution, its buildings or premises. The proposed measures are sufficiently developed at the project application stage to demonstrate that they can realistically be implemented, taking into account the relevant technical, spatial and operational conditions. Suggested scoring: 6 points – The proposed technical solution is clearly and convincingly demonstrated to be technically and operationally feasible in the context of the public institution, its buildings or premises. The proposed measures are sufficiently developed and appropriately take into account the relevant technical, spatial and operational conditions. 4 points – The proposed technical solution is generally feasible and credible, although some technical, spatial or operational aspects require	0-6		

		further development or clarification. 2 points – The feasibility of the proposed technical solution is only partially demonstrated. Important technical, spatial or operational aspects are insufficiently addressed, creating significant uncertainty regarding implementation. 0 points – The project does not sufficiently demonstrate that the proposed technical solution can realistically be implemented in the relevant technical, spatial and operational conditions.			
3. Quality of partnership and implementation capacity (10 points)					
3a	Involvement of project partners and quality of the partnership	Where the project is implemented in partnership, the applicant justifies the selection of project partners and demonstrates that their expertise, experience and competences are relevant to the project objectives and provide clear added value to the project. The project clearly describes the roles, responsibilities and arrangements for cooperation between the project partners throughout the project. Their involvement provides a sound basis for effective project implementation, knowledge transfer and exchange of experience. Suggested scoring: 4 points – The partnership is clearly and convincingly justified. The partners' expertise, experience and competences are highly relevant to the project objectives, their roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, and the cooperation provides clear added value to project implementation, knowledge transfer and exchange of experience. 2 points – The partnership is generally relevant and	0-4		

		adequately justified, with reasonably clear roles and responsibilities, although the added value or contribution of some partners is less developed or convincing. 1 point – The partnership has limited added value or is only partially justified. The relevance of some partners, their roles or the arrangements for cooperation are insufficiently developed. 0 points – The project is not implemented in partnership, or the partnership is not credibly justified, provides no clear added value, or the roles and responsibilities of the partners are not sufficiently defined.			
3b	Implementation capacity of the applicant	The project credibly demonstrates that the applicant has adequate professional, organisational, administrative and financial capacity to successfully implement the project. The applicant demonstrates its implementation capacity through relevant experience in implementing similar projects and/or through other demonstrable professional, organisational and administrative capacities. The proposed project management arrangements, division of tasks and responsibilities, and organisational set-up for project implementation provide a credible basis for achieving the planned results. Where the project is implemented in partnership, the assessment will also take into account whether the project partners have adequate capacity to carry out the tasks assigned to them. Suggested scoring: 6 points – The applicant clearly and convincingly demonstrates adequate professional, organisational,	0-6		

		administrative and financial capacity to implement the project. Relevant experience, project management arrangements, division of tasks and organisational set-up provide a strong and credible basis for successful implementation. 4 points – The applicant demonstrates generally adequate implementation capacity and credible management arrangements, although some aspects of experience, organisation or allocation of responsibilities are less developed. 2 points – The applicant demonstrates only partial implementation capacity. Important aspects of professional, organisational, administrative or financial capacity, or project management arrangements, are insufficiently developed and create some uncertainty regarding implementation. 0 points – The applicant does not sufficiently demonstrate the capacity and management arrangements necessary to implement the project successfully.			
4. Long-term impact, institutional learning and replicability (22 points)					
4a	Long-term impact and integration into institutional practice (eliminating criterion)	The project demonstrates the potential to contribute to long-term changes in the way green transition is planned and implemented within the public institution. It describes the proposed approach to gradually integrating the principles of green governance into the day-to-day functioning of the institution through the development or improvement of relevant guidelines, methodological tools or standardised procedures, data-driven decision making, engagement of relevant stakeholders, and streamlining green public procurement	0-9		

		principles into relevant internal policies and procedures. The project also explains how the results, experience and data generated during implementation are expected to support the further development of these practices within the institution. Suggested scoring: 9 points – The project presents a clear, coherent and convincing approach to achieving long-term changes in the way green transition is planned and implemented within the public institution. The proposed integration of green governance principles into institutional practice is well developed and the expected use of project results, experience and data to further develop these practices is clearly explained. 6 points – The proposed approach is generally well developed and credible. The project addresses the main elements of green governance and their integration into institutional practice, although some aspects of the proposed long-term change or future use of project results, experience and data could be further developed. 3 points – The proposed approach is only partially developed. Important elements of green governance or their integration into institutional practice are insufficiently described, and the potential for long-term change is only partly demonstrated. 0 points – The project does not provide a credible approach to integrating the mandatory principles of green governance into the functioning of the public institution and therefore does not meet the mandatory requirement of the call related to this criterion.			

4b	Institutional learning and demonstration value (eliminating criterion)	The project describes how the implemented measures, monitoring results and experience gained during project implementation are expected to be used to support institutional learning and the further development of the institution's green transition practices. It describes how the project is expected to function as a demonstration site or living laboratory where the implemented solutions can be tested, monitored, evaluated and presented. The project also includes an appropriate educational or awareness-raising component linking the implemented measures with learning, research or community engagement and the dissemination of project results. Suggested scoring: 9 points – The project presents a clear, coherent and convincing approach to using the implemented measures, monitoring results and experience gained to support institutional learning and the further development of green transition practices. The role of the project as a demonstration site or living laboratory is well developed, and the educational or awareness-raising component is clearly linked to the implemented measures, learning, research or community engagement and dissemination of project results. 6 points – The proposed approach is generally well developed and credible. The project addresses institutional learning, demonstration value and the educational or awareness-raising component, although some aspects are less developed or convincing.	0-9		

		3 points – The proposed approach is only partially developed. Institutional learning, demonstration value or the educational or awareness-raising component is insufficiently described, or the links between these elements and the implemented measures are weak. 0 points – The project does not include a credible educational or awareness-raising component linking the implemented measures with learning, research or community engagement and therefore does not meet the mandatory requirement of the call related to this criterion.			
4c	Replicability and use by other public institutions	The project identifies elements of the proposed green transition model that could potentially be relevant and transferable to other public institutions. It explains how the experience, results and practical knowledge generated through the project could support the adaptation or application of similar approaches in other institutional contexts. Suggested scoring: 4 points – The project credibly identifies elements of the proposed green transition model with clear potential for use by other public institutions and explains how the experience, results and practical knowledge generated through the project could support the adaptation or application of similar approaches in other institutional contexts. 2 points – The project identifies some elements with potential for transfer to other public institutions, but their wider relevance or the way in which project experience and results could support their adaptation or application	0-4		

		elsewhere is only partially explained. 0 points – The project does not sufficiently demonstrate the potential relevance or transferability of the proposed model to other public institutions.			
5. Project intervention logic and budget (8 points)					
5a	Intervention logic, results framework and implementation schedule	The project presents a coherent and logically structured proposal in which the identified needs are clearly linked to the project objectives, proposed activities, expected results and relevant indicators. The expected results and target values are realistic and proportionate to the scope of the proposed activities. The implementation schedule is feasible and appropriately reflects the individual stages of the project and the time required for the proposed activities. Suggested scoring: 4 points – The project presents a clear and coherent intervention logic, with a strong link between identified needs, objectives, activities, expected results and indicators. The expected results and target values are realistic, and the implementation schedule is feasible and appropriately structured. 2 points – The project presents a generally adequate intervention logic, but some links between needs, objectives, activities, results or indicators are insufficiently developed. The expected results, target values or implementation schedule contain some weaknesses or require further clarification. 0 points – The intervention logic is unclear or	0-4		

		inconsistent, or the expected results, target values or implementation schedule are not sufficiently realistic or credible.			
5b	Budget adequacy	The project budget is proportionate to the scope and nature of the proposed activities and planned results. Individual budget items are sufficiently justified, cost-efficient and consistent with the expected scope of the proposed measures and activities. Suggested scoring: 4 points – The project budget is proportionate to the scope and nature of the proposed activities and planned results. The budget items are sufficiently justified, cost-efficient and consistent with the proposed measures and activities. 2 points – The project budget is generally adequate, but some budget items are insufficiently justified, appear less proportionate to the proposed activities or results, or require further clarification. 0 points – The project budget is not sufficiently justified or proportionate to the proposed activities and planned results, or contains significant inconsistencies.	0-4		
6. Horizontal and specific priorities (12 points)					
6a	Bilateral cooperation with entities from Norway	The project includes cooperation with an entity from Norway. The involvement of the Norwegian partner is substantively justified, aligned with the partner's relevant expertise and provides clear added value to the project, in particular through the exchange of experience, knowledge transfer, capacity building, or support for project preparation, implementation or long-term use of project results.	0-5		

		Suggested scoring: 5 points – The involvement of the Norwegian partner is clearly and convincingly justified, is well aligned with the partner's relevant expertise and provides clear added value to the project through meaningful exchange of experience, knowledge transfer, capacity building or other substantive contribution to project preparation, implementation or long-term use of project results. 2 points – The involvement of the Norwegian partner is relevant and generally justified and provides some added value to the project, although the expected contribution, exchange of experience or knowledge transfer is less developed or specific. 0 points – The project does not include cooperation with an entity from Norway, or the involvement of the Norwegian partner is not sufficiently justified and does not demonstrate clear added value to the project.			
6b	**Gender mainstreaming** (eliminating criterion)	The project describes how gender equality considerations will be appropriately integrated into the project design, implementation and the involvement of stakeholders and participants in project activities. It also explains how the needs of relevant vulnerable and underrepresented groups have been considered and, where relevant, how barriers to participation and access will be addressed. Suggested scoring: 3 points – The project presents a clear and convincing approach to integrating gender equality considerations into project design, implementation and the involvement of stakeholders and participants.	0-3		

		The needs of relevant vulnerable and underrepresented groups are appropriately considered and, where relevant, barriers to participation and access are clearly addressed. 2 points – The project adequately addresses gender equality considerations and the needs of relevant vulnerable and underrepresented groups, although some aspects of their integration into project design, implementation or participation are less developed. 0 points – The project does not provide an adequate approach to gender mainstreaming and therefore does not meet the mandatory requirement of the call related to this criterion.			
6c	Contribution to addressing challenges resulting from the invasion of Ukraine	The project demonstrates that the proposed activities contribute to addressing challenges resulting from the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine and that this contribution is appropriately justified and linked to the project objectives. This may include, for example, measures strengthening the energy resilience of public buildings in the context of increased energy security risks, or measures increasing the capacity of public institutions to respond to increased pressure on public buildings and services related to the arrival of displaced persons from Ukraine. Suggested scoring: 2 points – The project clearly identifies a relevant challenge resulting from the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine and credibly substantiates its link to the invasion. The proposed activities provide an appropriately justified response to this challenge	0/2		

		and are clearly linked to the project objectives. 0 points – The project does not clearly identify or sufficiently substantiate a relevant challenge resulting from the Russian Federation's invasion of Ukraine, or the proposed activities do not provide a credible and appropriately justified response to such a challenge.			
6d	Territorial priority	The applicant identifies whether the project implementation area is located in a city or district with higher exposure to climate hazards, based on the methodology and analytical sources specified in the call. Where the applicant considers that the project implementation area meets this condition, the Application provides relevant information and justification supporting this assessment. 2 points – Based on the information provided in the Application, the project implementation area is assessed as a city or district with higher exposure to climate hazards, in particular heatwaves, pluvial flooding or drought. 0 points – The applicant does not indicate or does not sufficiently demonstrate that the project implementation area is located in a city or district with higher exposure to climate hazards.	0/2		

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.