

## Annex A)

# Selection criteria for Call 5.3 – An effective system of evaluation of targeted support programmes

The project evaluation process for call 5.3 of supported area 3.2 of priority axis 3 of OP RDI is comprised of two parts. The first represents an evaluation of the formal particulars and a review of acceptability, its aim being to eliminate formal shortcomings in projects and to disqualify those projects failing to meet any of the acceptability requirements. The formality and acceptability criteria are defined in the first part of this document: I. General acceptability criteria.

The second part of the project evaluation process is an evaluation according to expert selection criteria. This part of the evaluation process in which the basic qualification requirements, overall quality of the project plan, and other criteria will be evaluated is described in the second part of this document: II. Expert Evaluation<sup>1</sup>.

## I. General acceptability criteria

### Exclusion (binary yes/no) criteria

- 1) The Project Application was delivered within the time limit and in the manner stipulated in the call and the Guide for Applicants.
- 2) Required applicant/partner identification data, especially the name of authorised members of a statutory body of the applicant/partner and their position, are provided in the Project Application, are accurate and correspond to the commercial register or other registry in which the applicant is entered.
- 3) All documents containing a box for a stamp and signature are duly stamped and signed by the statutory body or its member or members authorised to act on behalf of the legal person, or by another person<sup>2</sup> based on a special power of attorney specific to the submitted project, the original or a notarised copy of which is submitted together with these documents.
- 4) The project application has been duly registered (uploaded to IS MONIT7+).
- 5) The applicant (beneficiary) meets the beneficiary acceptability requirements set out in the given call and the Guide for Applicants.
- 6) The project will be executed in the territory of the Czech Republic and the benefits of the project implementation will flow above all into eligible regions.

---

<sup>1</sup> Given its nature and purpose, this document's aim is not to present a detailed description of project selection procedures. Applicants and beneficiaries are provided with a detailed description of procedures and of their rights and obligations in the Guide for Applicants and the Guide for Beneficiaries.

<sup>2</sup> The authorised person must be an employee of the specific entity (applicant/partner).

- 7) The project will be implemented in compliance with the time-frame for the 2007–2013 programming period and the deadlines stipulated in the call requirements.
- 8) The amount of eligible project expenses meets the requirement of falling within the minimum and maximum amounts of eligible expenses stipulated in the respective call.
- 9) The amount of total project expenses complies with the maximum amount of total project expenses stipulated in the call.
- 10) Support provided from the OP RDI is planned exclusively for eligible expenditure in accordance with the OP RDI Expenditure Eligibility Rules of the respective call.
- 11) The project has demonstrably no adverse impact on OP RDI horizontal criteria (i.e. sustainable development and equal opportunities).
- 12) The planned length of project sustainability complies with the requirements set out in the Guide for Applicants.
- 13) The application (project) corresponds to the objectives of the call, i.e. the introduction of a system of evaluation of targeted support in the Czech Republic.
- 14) The project contains all compulsory activities. The project meets the minimum scope for activities b) and c).
- 15) The submitted project plan refers to partial output IPn Methodology<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Partial output of key activity 2: Evaluation system from the project Effective System of Evaluation and Financing of Research, Development and Innovation.

## II. Expert Evaluation

This part of the evaluation is broken down into two steps (A and B). The evaluation is conducted on the basis of exclusion of binary (yes/no) criteria and merit-based criteria.

In **step A**, merit criteria are awarded points based on a pre-set **point scale from 0 to 5**. Awarded points are multiplied by a coefficient representing the weight used to calculate the final point score for the given criterion. Weights are determined based on the relative significance of a criterion in the assessment of overall project quality. Points are awarded based on the following system:

*0 – The project plan fails to address aspects evaluated in the given criterion or these cannot be assessed due to missing or incomplete information.*

*1 – Weak. The project plan has failed to adequately fulfil this criterion or suffers from serious, irremovable shortcomings.*

*2 – Satisfactory. The project plan has generally fulfilled the given criterion, though certain shortcomings exist.*

*3 – Good. The manner in which the project plan has met the given criterion is good, though improvements will be necessary.*

*4 – Very good. The manner in which the project plan has met the given criterion is very good, but improvement is possible.*

*5 – Excellent. The project plan has successfully fulfilled all aspects of the evaluated criterion. Any shortcomings are minor.*

**Only full points may be awarded in the evaluation.**

A project's minimum point award must be at least 65% of the maximum possible point award (i.e. no fewer than 65 points out of a possible 100). Threshold value must also be reached for criteria A.1., A.2. and A.5. Projects with a lower point award will be rejected or returned for revision.

## A. Overall Project Quality Evaluation

### A.1. – Quality of the submitted project

Criterion	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points
a) Will the implementation of the project improve the evaluation culture in the RDI environment in the Czech Republic by setting up an effective system of evaluation of targeted support programmes? b) Is the vision of the planned new system of evaluation of targeted support programmes specific enough? c) Does the proposed evaluation system take into account or is it based on internationally recognised evaluation standards (e.g. DAC quality standards), relevant evaluation methodologies and recommendation materials of the European Commission and national institutions? d) To what extent does the proposed system of evaluation of targeted support programmes incorporate partial output IPn Methodology <sup>4</sup> ? e) Are the defined activities adequate to the set objective of the project? Is the planned scope of activities of the project adequate and proportionate to its set objective? Is the planned time-frame of the activities adequate to the set objective of the project? f) Is the project feasible?	Points (0 to 5)	8	40

**A threshold value of 3 points** (from a total of 5) will be applied to criterion A.1.  
 Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 3 points will be rejected or returned for revision.

### A.2. – Quality of the Project Team

Criterion	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points
a) Does the applicant have an experienced team whose quality is a sufficient guarantee of successful project implementation? b) Does the project involve experts with foreign know-how in an extent relevant to the needs of the project?	Points (0 to 5)	5	25

**A threshold value of 3 points** (from a total of 5) will be applied to criterion A.2.  
 Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 3 points will be rejected or returned for revision.

<sup>4</sup> Partial output of key activity 2: Evaluation system; implemented in OP EC in the project titled Effective System of Evaluation and Financing of Research, Development and Innovation (IPn Methodology).

### A.3. – Project Management System

Criterion	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points
a) Has the applicant described in clear and comprehensible terms the management system, the organization structure, and risk and quality management systems corresponding to the nature of the project plan and designed in accordance with project objectives? b) Does the project involve all stakeholders to a sufficient extent? Will the roles and responsibilities assigned to the individual entities ensure effective project management? c) Are the partner contracts between the applicant, partners, and other collaborating entities clear and desirable, guaranteeing a long-term trouble-free cooperation?	Points (0 to 5)	3	15

### A.4. – Budget, Adequacy of Expenditure

Criterion	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points
a) Is the project budget reasonable? b) Is the budget described in sufficient detail for its evaluation? c) Are project expenditures sufficiently and clearly justified? Do the expenses and their specification comply with the established project objectives and needs?	Points (0 to 5)	2	10

### A.5. – Project Sustainability; Revenue Plan

Criterion	Points	Coefficient	Maximum points
a) Will factual sustainability of the supported activities (on-going evaluation of programmes at the applicant, partners or cooperating organisations) be maintained at least 5 years after the end of the project? Is there an adequate description of planned precautions that could ensure sustainability of the individual project outputs? b) Will the financial sustainability of the supported activities be maintained at least 5 years after the end of the project? Is there an adequate description of the system for	Points (0 to 5)	2	10

financing individual activities of the project after the termination of funding from OP RDI?			
--	--	--	--

*A **threshold value of 3 points** (from a total of 5) will be applied to criterion A.5. Projects that fail to reach the threshold value of 3 points will be rejected or returned for revision.*

A maximum of 100 points in total is awarded in step A. The minimum required score is 65 points. Projects that fail to reach this value will be excluded from further evaluation.

## **B. Compliance with the Integrated Urban Development Plan (IUDP) and evaluation of the territorial distribution of projects**

### **B. 1 Merit-based criterion**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Maximum points</b>
<b>B.1.</b> Is the project <b>part</b> of the given IUDP of the city in which the project is to be located?	10% of awarded points from preceding parts of the evaluation.

*Successfully evaluated projects (i.e. those that fulfil all the qualifying criteria and meet the threshold values for criteria A.1., A.2. and A.5.) that exceed the threshold value of no less than 65% of the maximum point award receive an additional bonus of 10% of the total score obtained at the end of step A based on submission of a confirmation that the project is a part of the IUDP issued by the authorities of the respective city (the authority responsible for drafting the IUDP)<sup>5</sup>.*

<sup>5</sup> Refer to the Ministry for Local Development Methodological Directive regarding the key principles for Integrated Urban Development Plan preparation, evaluation and approval No. 15450/2008 – 72 (based on Czech Government Resolution No. 883 of 13 August 2007).