



Annex 4 to the Call GGC01 – Selection criteria (including the scoring sheet)

1. FORMAL COMPLIANCE CRITERIA

No.	Control question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
1.	Was the Project Application delivered by				
	the deadline, using the standard template				
	and method of delivery?				
2.	Are the mandatory attachments attached to				
	the Project Application?				
3.	Has the applicant submitted the missing				
	information/rectified identified				
	shortcomings within the set deadline? ¹				

2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

No.	Control question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
1.	Are the applicant and its partner(s) eligible?				
2.	Is at least one of the partners a public entity established as a legal person in Ukraine?				
3.	Was the maximal and minimal limit of the Grant applied for observed?				

Applications not meeting Formal Compliance Criterion no 1, no 3 or any of the Eligibility Criteria shall be rejected.

 $^{^{\}rm 1}$ Relevant in case the PO requested the submission of missing information/rectify shortcomings.





Annex 4 to the Call GGC01 – Selection criteria (including the scoring sheet)

3. CONTENT RELATED CRITERIA

No.	Criterion	Description	Range	Score	Comments		
1. Impo	. Importance of the project and its contribution to the issue (a total of 53 points)						
	ating criterion (0 – 1) Activities are sufficiently d Involvement of the Slovak – 2), Project includes approproperation with Ukraine	escribed and detailed $(0-1)$, and Ukrainian public entities in the project's activities is balanced $(0-3)$, oriate measurements for fostering institutional cross-border $(0-3)$, achieved are supposed to be sustainable $(0-2)$.	0 – 9				
	nating criterion (0 – 1), e: sufficiently described and record (0 – 3), needed, useful and benefic	aims of the programme $(0-2)$,	0 – 9				
	ating criterion) (0 – 1).	shops organised between Slovak and Ukrainian public sector entities orkshops is in full compliance with the aims of the programme (0 –	0-5				





 Workshops are attractive for the target groups (0 - 1), Duration and size of the workshops are appropriate for its aim and target groups (0 - 1). 			
 1d) The project includes secondments from Ukraine to Slovakia (eliminating criterion) (0 - 1). The aims of the secondments are sufficiently described and detailed (0 - 1), The secondments are in full compliance with the aims of the programme (0 - 1), The secondments provide crucial knowledge and skills for the institution involved in the area of good governance, accountable institutions and transparency (0 - 2), The secondments are needed, useful and beneficial for the secondee within the scope of their expertise (0 - 1). 	0-6		
 1e) The project includes activities aimed at improving integrity and accountability of the public institutions in Slovakia and Ukraine that are: eliminating criterion (0 – 1) reflecting the recommendations of the OECD recommendation of the Council on Public integrity² (0 – 2), ensuring that the public integrity system defines, supports, controls and enforces public integrity (0 – 2), integrated into the wider public management and governance framework within the organization (0 – 2), establishing clear responsibilities at the organisational levels for designing, leading and implementing the elements of the integrity system for the public sector (0 – 3), in full compliance with the aims of the programme (0 – 2), implemented in cooperation with an organisation active and experienced in the field of good governance with a relevant track record (0 – 2). 	0 – 14		
 1f) Project includes activities aimed at facilitating the Ukrainian accession process to the EU implementable by the project promoter and project partners that are: sufficiently described and detailed (0 – 2), needed, useful and beneficial for Ukraine (0 – 3). 	0 - 5		

² https://www.oecd.org/gov/ethics/OECD-Recommendation-Public-Integrity.pdf





		T		
1g) Project includes awareness raising activities and the activities aimed at appropriate communication				
about the ambitions and the achieved results of the project to the general public that are: (eliminating				
$\frac{\text{criterion}}{(0-1)}$	0 – 5			
 sufficiently described and detailed (0 − 1), 	0-3			
 appropriate to the ambitions and results to be achieved (0 − 2), 				
 appropriate, accessible and attractive to general public (0 − 1). 				
2. Project structure, risks, activities and outcomes (a total of 16 points)				
2a) Design to management is adequately defined and clearly described. The role of northers at national				
2a) Project management is adequately defined and clearly described. The role of partners at national and international level and their contribution to project preparation and implementation is clearly				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0 - 4			
defined. Experience of the persons responsible for the management and implementation of activities at national or international level.				
2b) The proposed time schedule of project implementation is clear, realistic and corresponds to the				
content and needs of the project —clearly defines the process of implementation of individual activities	0 – 3			
and outcomes.	0-3			
2c) Project risks are clearly defined and relevant, including a proposal of risk elimination measures.	0 – 2			
2d) Project publicity is suitably set up, with a communication strategy and adequate budget.	0-2			
2e) The logical framework of the project clearly outlines the relevance of the project in relation to the	<u> </u>			
Programme, specifying the indicators and methods of their verification (outcomes, results, objective).				
The baseline and target indicator values are realistic; the indicators are quantified and objectively				
measureable in terms of quantity and time. The resources for verification are specified in the project	0-5			
and will be available and appropriate for verification of the initial and final indicator values. The overall				
objective of the project is in line with the result/outcome of the Programme. The structure of the				
project, activities and outcomes is clearly defined. The activities are interconnected.				
3. Cost-effectiveness and sustainability (a total of 12points)				
3a) A detailed budget is indicated for the entire project period. The indicated budget items are	0 – 4			
,		l	1	





necessary for the implementation of the project activities and the indicated amounts are reasonable.		
Unit prices are adequate and correspond to prices that are usual in the local market.		
3b) Total project costs are adequate to the expected results.	0 – 4	
3c) The proposed activities have the potential for long-term contribution and development of further	0 – 4	
activities.	0-4	
4. Specific requirements (a total of 19 points)		
4a) Project is implemented in partnership with entity/ies from Norway/ Iceland/ Lichtenstein (donor		
project partner).		
a) Sector of the donor project partner ³ (purely objective criterion):		
 public institution – 3 points, 		
 any other institution – 1 point. 	0 – 7	
b) Bilateral cooperation:		
 will continue after project completion – throughout sustainability period – 4 points, 		
 will be continuous throughout the project period – 2 points, 		
 is limited to individual events (e.g. additional activities) – 1 point. 		
4b) Project includes cooperation with NGO/s as a project partner/cooperating entity that:		
• are active in the field of good governance, accountable institutions and transparency $(0-1)$,	0 – 5	
 have long-term experience in this field (0 – 2), 	0-3	
 is continuous throughout the project period − (0 − 2). 		
4c) Project involves cooperation partnerships of line ministries in Slovakia and Ukraine.		
a) Cooperation		
 will continue after project completion – throughout sustainability period – 4 points, 		
 will be continuous throughout the project period – 2 points, 	0 – 7	
 • is limited to individual events (e.g. additional activities) − 1 point, 		
• no cooperation partnership of line ministries – 0 points.		
b) The line ministry/ies is/are a Project Promoter/Project Partner or Project Partners (purely objective		
criterion):		

-

³ If there are more donor project partners, the prioritised one is considered (i.e. public institution).





•	yes – 3 points				
•	no – 0 points.				
	Total score				
	Recommendation			Recommended / Not recommended	
	Substantive comments				

Eliminating criterion is considered as being of special importance as regards the successful implementation and/or timely completion of the project. The Selection Committee shall be notified and may recommend special measures to be taken in order to mitigate the risk, incl. the recommendation not to support the project.

Purely objective criteria are criteria that must be, under normal circumstances, scored the same by the independent experts. The Programme Operator may ask the independent experts for clarification in case the score awarded for this criterion differs.

Projects receiving less than 45 points (in total score) shall not be supported.