

Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria – Formal check

sequence	criteria name	function	correctable/ uncorrectable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
F1	The grant application was submitted in the prescribed form	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application	MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the application was finalized in electronic form in the IS KP14+ application.	MS2014+ - control at the application phase automatically, other than electronically submitted grant applications are not possible
F2	In the grant application all required data is filled out	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	Grant application	MS2014+	Inspected at the stage of finalization of the grant application automatically, no need to check by the evaluator.	MS2014+ - Automatic check for fields set as mandatory
F3	All required annexes are documented and in the required form, including numbering	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application annexes	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	a) It is evaluated, whether all relevant mandatory annexes have been delivered, which were specified in the call. b) It is evaluated, whether all annexes (mandatory and optional) are documented in the form specified by the call. It is also evaluated, whether the document is not empty and that the content of the document corresponds to its name. c) It is evaluated, whether all annexes are numbered according to the specifications of the call/IS KP14+.	a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields b) Evaluator - evaluation of the annex form, i.e. according to the call specification (format, annex template, etc.). c) MS2014+ - numbering of mandatory annexes will be set in the grant application form
F4	The grant application was submitted in the language determined in the call	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	c) It is evaluated, whether the application incl. all required and optional annexes was made in the language determined by the challenge, i.e. always in Czech. d) It is evaluated, whether the grant application was submitted in the English language.	a) This criterion is met if the grant application including all compulsory/optional annexes (according to the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part ka. 18.9) was presented in Czech and English. b) This criterion is not met if the grant application or any of the compulsory/optional annexes (according to the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part ka. 18.9) was not presented in Czech or English.
F5	Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	All required identification data of the applicant (name of the statutory body or representative/representatives of the statutory body and its/their functions) are in the grant application and presented in compliance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered/listed. It is evaluated, whether the identification of the applicant is included in the grant application. a) It is evaluated, whether the applicant's identification data is in compliance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.).	a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields b) MS2014+ - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register c) evaluator - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register in the case where it is not possible with MS2014+
F6	Identification data of the partner are in accordance with the extract from the register	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	All required identification data for each of the partners (name of the statutory body/bodies or representative/representatives of the statutory body/statutory bodies and its/their functions) are in the grant application and presented in compliance with the extract/extracts from the register in which the partner is registered/listed. It is evaluated, whether the identification of the partner/partners is included in the grant application. It is evaluated, whether the partner's/partners' identification data is in compliance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.).	a) MS2014+ - evaluation of filled out required fields b) MS2014+ - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register c) evaluator - evaluation for compliance with extracts from the register in the case where it is not possible with MS2014+

Annex No. 2 Evaluation criteria - Formal check

sequence	criteria name	function	correctable/ uncorrectable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
F7	The grant application is signed by the applicant's/partner's legal representative	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	<p>All documents containing the signature box and the name/identification characteristics of the applicant/partner subject have an electronic signature of the statutory body or representative/representatives of the statutory body.</p> <p>It is evaluated, whether the request is electronically signed by the statutory body or an authorized person delegated by the statutory body of the applicant/partner subject, i.e. whether the signature matches the statutory body/authorized of the applicant/partner subject.</p> <p>Documents can also be signed (documents must not be older than 90 calendar days from the date of grant application submission in IS KP14+):</p> <p>By agent authorized by power of attorney to the presented specific project. The applicant shall submit a power of attorney in el. form in IS KP14+ (requires el. signature of the principal and agent) or original/notarized copy on the tab or under the Power of attorney button in the grant application form in the IS KP14+. This power of attorney contains all the formalities of power of attorney.</p> <p>By an authorized person on the basis of a mandate to be represented by the statutory body of the applicant/partner entity acting on behalf of the applicant entity. The authorization is documented in the form of an original/certified true copy on the tab or under the Power of attorney button in the grant application form in the IS KP14+.</p>	<p>a) MS2014+ - check automatically</p> <p>b) evaluator - signature relevancy check</p> <p>Formalities of the power of attorney: principal clearly identified - the one who grants the power of attorney, Agent clearly identified - the one who the the power of attorney is granted, putting a legal act or acts for which the principal authorizes the agent, the period for which the authorization is valid, date and place of signing the power of attorney, signatures of principal and agent.</p>
F8	Estimated time of project implementation in accordance with the call terms	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	<p>It is evaluated, whether the length of the project implementation (number of months) and the period of project implementation (from-to) correspond to the call terms.</p>	<p>This criterion is met if the duration of the project is in compliance with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call, while the term of the project implementation is in compliance with the term date in the call.</p> <p>This criterion is not met if the duration of the project is not in compliance with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call or the term of the project implementation is not in compliance with the term date in the call.</p>
F10	The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application (budget)	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	<p>It is evaluated, whether the request respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries.</p>	<p>a) This criterion is met if the budget is set in compliance with all financial limits under the terms of the call.</p> <p>b) The criterion is not met if the budget setting does not match some of the funding limits in the call.</p>
F11	The amount of the applicant's own resources in the financing summary is being provided in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application	internal evaluator/ MS2014+	<p>It is evaluated, whether in the grant application the applicant's own resources are included, in compliance with the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries and the wording of the call.</p>	<p>a) This criterion is met if the amount of own resources corresponds to the conditions of the call.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the amount of own resources does not correspond to the conditions of the call.</p>



Annex No. 2 Evaluation criteria - Formal check

sequence	criteria name	function	correctable/un-correctable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	main source of information	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
F14	Financial health/Annual organization turnover/of the applicant's company	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	<p>Organization/applicant company annual turnover reaches at least one-half of the amount of eligible project expenditures specified in the grant application.</p> <p>It is evaluated, whether the annual turnover of the applicant entity is min. one half of the eligible project expenditures. With projects lasting 12 months or less, whether it reaches this entire amount. In the case of projects where a financial partner/partners participates/participate on the implementation, the relevant part corresponding to the partner/partners share can be demonstrated by the applicant through a partner/partners. The condition of achieving the required turnover is met for the last two consecutive closed accounting period of 12 months, which exist and for which the applicant had to submit a tax return, and which predate the filing date of the application.</p> <p>This fact is demonstrated by the applicant by submitting the Profit and loss account for the period specified above.</p> <p>For other conditions, see Rules for applicants and beneficiaries - specific part, chap. 5.2.1.</p>	<p>The criterion is met if the applicant demonstrates the fin. health/turnover in compliance with the terms of the call.</p> <p>The criterion is not met if the applicant does not demonstrate the fin. health/turnover in compliance with the terms of the call.</p>



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria –Eligibility check

seq uen ce	quality aspect of the project	critereon name	function	correctable /uncorrecta ble	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	the main source of information (specific grant application bookmark)	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
P1	expediency	The grant application is in its focus in compliance with the objectives and activities of the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Activities - Key activities - Specific objectives - Project description annexes	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the project objectives and activities correspond to the call requirements. It is evaluated, whether the applicant has submitted all the required activities according to the text of the call.	This criterion is met if the project is not in conflict with the call objectives or activities. The method of implementation of activities is not inconsistent with the conditions for implementation of the project mentioned in the call. The criterion is not met if the project is inconsistent with the objectives and/or activities of the call or the way of implementation of activities is contrary to the conditions for the implementation of the project mentioned in the call.
P2	expediency	Target groups are in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the target groups are in compliance with the legitimate target groups in the call.	a) This criterion is met if the target groups correspond to the legitimate target groups defined in the call. b) This criterion is not met if the target groups do not correspond to the legitimate target groups defined in the call.
P3	feasibility	The applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant defined in the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Project annex subjects	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the applicant entity meets the conditions and criteria set out in the call and related documentation.	This criterion is met if the applicant can be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) and also meets the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries. This criterion is not met if the applicant cannot be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) and also does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries. IS KP14+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the applicant. The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries are met.



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Eligibility check									
seq uen ce	quality aspect of the project	critereon name	function	correctable /un correctable	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	the main source of information (specific grant application bookmark)	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
P4	feasibility	The project partner meets the conditions of eligibility of a partner	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the partner entity meets the conditions and criteria for eligibility and partnerships set out in the call and related documentation to the call.	<p>a) This criterion is met if the partner can be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) and also meets the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries of the OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the partner cannot be identified as an entity that is defined in the call (e.g. school, legal entity) or does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules applicants and beneficiaries of the OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise.</p> <p>MS2014+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the partner.</p> <p>The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries are met.</p>
P5	feasibility	Place of implementation and place of impact place of the project is in compliance with the terms of the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: Location Activities Key activities Project description annexes	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the place of implementation and place of impact of the project is in compliance with the conditions set in the call, i.e. specific project activities have an impact only on the relevant territory defined in the call.	<p>The applicant selects the place of impact /place of implementation from a preset dial in relation to specific activities.</p> <p>The evaluator checks the entire application in relation to specific activities:</p> <p>a) This criterion is met if the project has an impact only on the territory according to the call.</p> <p>b) This criterion is not met if the project has not an impact only on the territory according to the call.</p>



Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria – Eligibility check

seq uen ce	quality aspect of the project	criterion name	function	correctable /uncorrecta ble	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	the main source of information (specific grant application bookmark)	evaluator	criteria description	instructions for evaluators
P6	feasibility/effectiveness	Project activities are unique for applicants/partners	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: Project description Activities annex key activities The project charter (MS2014+ database outputs OP EC)	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, for which support for the applicant/partner was already provided by another OP RDE. There must be always substantively different or follow-up outcomes. Evaluation takes place via the IS KP14+ or OP RDE outputs database. It is evaluated, whether endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, for which support for the applicant/partner was already provided by another OP RDI. There must be always substantively different or follow-up activities/outcomes. Verification will take place via control of outcomes in subjects as beneficiaries in the OP EC / OP RDI database outputs.	a) This criterion is met if the project activities are unique for the applicant/partner, i.e. endorsing the project will not finance identical outputs, which were already supported for the applicant/partner by another OP RDE project and another OP RDE / OP RDI project. b) This criterion is not met if the project activities are not unique for the applicant/partner, i.e. endorsing the project will finance identical outputs, which were already supported for the applicant/partner by another OP RDE project and/or another OP EC / OP RDI.
P7	feasibility	Documented involvement of the partner in compliance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the conditions for the involvement of the partner is in compliance with the call.	This criterion is met when the involvement of the partner is in compliance with the conditions in the call. The criterion is not met if the partnership is not set up in compliance with the terms of the call.
P8	feasibility	The uniqueness of the grant application	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: annexes:	internal evaluator	It is evaluated, whether the applicant has submitted only one grant application within the call	This criterion is met if the applicant has made just one grant application. This criterion is not met if the applicant has made more than one grant application within the call.
P8	expediency	The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of total eligible expenditures determined in the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application (budget)	internal evaluator/MS2014+	It is evaluated, whether the amount of the total eligible expenditures correspond to the conditions of the call.	a) This criterion is met if the required amount of financial support is in the stated range of the minimum and maximum amount of financial support for the particular call. b) The criterion is not met in the case that the required level of financial support is not within the specified range of the minimum and maximum amount of financial support in the context of the call, i.e. Claimed funds are lower or higher than the minimum or maximum limit for the call.

Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspects of the project	criteria number	criteria name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	sub-scales	criteria function	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluator's for the use of an arbitrator - criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions
Applicant/partner	Feasibility	V1.1	The structure and size of the administrative team (employments including possible outsourcing)		5	grant application: - Implementation team - Key activities	external evaluator		combined	1	75%	4 The structure and size of the administrative team, including its expertise , is evaluated resp. employment including possible outsourcing, with respect to the character and scope of activities and size of the project. The administrative team consists of job positions project manager, financial manager and other positions to ensure the implementation of the project. The applicant describes obligatory activities within the Project management.	5 points - the applicant has sufficient administrative staff of good quality for the project. 4-3 points - the applicant has a sufficient size of the administrative team for the project. The structure and quality of the administrative team has minor flaws. 2 - 1 point - the size of the administrative team is overvalued/undervalued. The structure and quality of the administrative team has flaws. 0 points - the applicant does not have sufficient administrative staff of good quality for the project.
	Feasibility	V1.2	The structure and size of the expert team (employments including possible outsourcing)		10	grant application: - Implementation team - Key activities			combined	3	75%	8 The structure, size and expertise of the expert team is evaluated resp. employment including possible outsourcing, with respect to the character and scope and development of activities and size of the project. The expert team consists of jobs that provide substantive fulfilment of project activities. The applicant describes obligatory activities within the Project management.	10 points - The expert team's focus, structure and size corresponds to the planned project, the evaluator has no objections. 9 - 6 points - The expert team's focus corresponds to the planned project. The structure and size show the shortcomings. 5 - 3 points - The expert team has shortcomings in its structure, size and expertise. 2 - 0 points - The applicant does not ensure a sufficient expert team for the project, the expert team setting threatens the feasibility of the project.
	Feasibility	V2.2	The impact, the main benefits and the purpose of the project		5	grant application: - Project description annexes:			combined	10	75%	30 It is evaluated, whether the submitted project has the potential to meet the objectives of the call. It is evaluated, whether the way of fulfilling the objectives of the project will be an asset for the institution/target group. The expected benefit of the project should correspond with the needs that are in the given institution and which were identified by the applicant in the grant application. The project's fulfilment of the objectives of the specific objective is evaluated. It is evaluated, whether the total shift of the concerning matter and the corresponding objectives are defined.	5 points - The applicant describes the problem well on a general level - the needs and gaps of the institution/target group in thematic and regional terms. The rationale is documented with quality material (evidence based approach), the conclusions of which fully correspond to the intentions of the project. The applicant proposes a suitable solution which will solve the described problem. The description of the problem justifies the project objective. Clearly and reliably instantiated needs of the project implementation, which correspond to the needs of the region/area and target group. 4 - 3 points - The applicant describes the problem well on a general level - the needs and gaps of the institution/target group in thematic and regional terms. The rationale is demonstrated only partially and/or only partially corresponds with the intention of the project. Proposals/ways of solving show minor shortcomings not threatening the feasibility of the project. The need of project implementation is more generally justified, but it corresponds to the needs of the region/area and target groups. 2 - 1 point - Expected benefits of the project are not convincingly described and/or only declarative phrases are given and/or its achievement does not seem very realistic. 0 points - Expected benefits of the project are not justified and/or it is not real.
	usefulness	V2.3	Target groups definition and adequacy		10	grant application: - Target groups annexes: - TG standpoint							The selection and setting of the target group is evaluated, for which the activities within the project activities be implemented. The aim is to evaluate the suitability and appropriateness of the target group selection, i.e. the adequacy of the target group size with respect to the capacity of the applicant/partners, with respect to the required financial volume of project funds and also considering the given support area topic. Furthermore, the applicant's working experience with the target group is evaluated, from which the applicant's ability to implement defined activities for the target group in the project is derived. Specifically the demonstrable experience of working with the target group is evaluated. The project should also indicate whether and how the applicant has contacts to the target group, whether the applicant has already worked with the target group or if there is a realistic assumption that the target group will participate in the project.

Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspects of the project	criteria number	criteria name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	sub-scales	criteria function	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions	
	exped iency	V2.5	Factual content and relevance of activities		15	grant applicati on: - Target groups - Key activities		15 - 12 points - the activities are designed quite adequately to the project goals and are fully described, their relation to budget items and to identify the related outputs can be well evaluated 11 - 8 points - the activities are				The proposed method of specific project implementation, material quality and content of the project is evaluated. Activities must be planned in compliance with the objectives and conditions of the call and the purpose of the project. In the case of activities to support the panel from the application area the connection settings of panel into the internal structure of the institution will also be evaluated (including competences and panel structure). In the event that part of the project activities is the establishment of an information system (IS), it is necessary to prove that no other IS exists that would meet the project requirements. The planned project activities must be specifically described and linked to the project budget (incl. all required activities according to the text of the call). The setting a description of the activities of the project is a key indicator of future project implementation, indicator performances and project objectives, including its benefits and overall meaningfulness.	15 - 12 points - the activities are designed quite adequately to the project goals and are fully described, their relation to budget items and the related outputs can be well evaluated 11 - 8 points - the activities are adequately designed for the project objectives, but their description leaves a slight doubt about certain aspects of their implementation 7 - 4 points - Project activities show shortcomings, from the description of activities their consistency with some budget items cannot be clearly determined 3 - 1 point - Activities of the project show serious shortcomings and inadequacy, the coherence of activities and their parts and the majority of budget items is not apparent 0 points - the activities are completely inadequately designed for the project objectives, they are vague and inadequate, coherence of activities and the budget cannot be identified	
	Feasi bility	V2.6	Time time schedule and logical consistency of project activities		5	grant applicati on: - Activities - Key activities - Time time schedule - Public procure						It is evaluated, whether activities are logically linked and whether the project is feasible within the scheduled timeframe and whether the continuity of the implemented activities is appropriately apportioned in relation to the possibility of the applicant/partner (implementation team). The evaluation must also include any planned procurement procedures.	5 points - Project activities are logically linked, and the time allocated to each activity is appropriate. 4 - 3 points The proposed time schedule has removable shortcoming in the interdependence of individual activities and/or time allocation activities. 2 - 1 point - Significant shortcomings in coherence and time allocation activities are identified. The proposed time schedule threatens the smooth implementation of the project. 0 points - The time schedule is set unrealistically, activities do not connect logically.	
	Feasi bility	V2.7	Risk management - preparedness for possible risks and their solutions		5	grant applicati on: - Project descript ion						It is evaluated, whether the project reflects the existence of risks in obtaining and the involvement of target group, in the implementation of activities and in financial and operational management of the project. It is also necessary that the project includes ways to prevent risks and proposed measures to eliminate these risks. The purpose of this criterion is to assess the extent to which the applicant is aware of the risks and which mechanisms are used to eliminate them, resp. which actions will be taken in the event that problems arise. The evaluation must also include planned procurement procedures , i.e. Whether, in compliance with the project budget, corresponding procurement procedures are planned (or whether it is justified, why procurement procedures are not planned, e.g. because of a already concluded framework agreement).	5 - 4 points - the risks are adequately described incl. measures to eliminate them. The internal control system is reliably set in terms of compliance with the rules of OP TDE project implementation and following the planned budget items are planned for the corresponding procurement procedure. 3 - 2 points - Setting of risks and/or the internal control system has minor shortcomings not affecting the feasibility of the project. 1 - 0 points - the risks are not adequately described. The internal control system is not reliably set in terms of compliance with the rules of OP RDE project implementation and/or following the planned budget items are not planned for the corresponding procurement procedure.	
Results and outputs	exped iency	V3.1	Appropriateness of selected output indicators and results		5	grant applicati on: - Indicators			combined	6	75%	19	It is evaluated, whether the selected output and result indicators are appropriately chosen for the activity.	5 - 4 points - Selection of indicators is apparent from the project description and appropriately describes the achievement of results / outcomes. 3 - 2 points - Selection of indicators corresponds to the submitted project, but for accurate description of achievements / outputs the evaluator suggests additions. 1 - 0 points - Indicators are set ambiguously and/or from the description of the project can not even be evaluated which indicators should be monitored.
	effici ency /exp edie ncy	V3.2	Appropriateness and feasibility of results and outputs of the project		10	grant applicati on: - Indicators							The appropriateness of setting quantified indicators for the planned activities of the project, while their fulfillment is the focus of the grant application in relation to the target group is evaluated. Specifically, the feasibility and appropriateness of setting given indicator values in relation to the objectives, time schedule (milestones) and the project budget is evaluated. The method of determining base line value and target values is evaluated.	5 points - The proposed indicator values are reasonable to the activities and their achievement is very realistic. 4 points - The proposed indicator values are reasonable to the activities and their achievement is realistic. The evaluator found little shortcomings in their calculation. 3 points - The feasibility of achieving the planned values is not entirely convincing or shows shortcomings. Adjustment is needed in terms of monitored indicators. 2 - 1 point - The proposed indicators are not appropriate and/or the feasibility of achieving the planned values is not very high. A fundamental adjustment in terms of monitored indicators is needed. 0 points - The adjusted values are ambiguous, inappropriate, improper or completely unreal or their value cannot be determined from the project description.

Annex no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Objective evaluation

root criterion	quality aspects of the project	criteria number	criteria name	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point evaluation of root criterion	main source of information	evaluator	sub-scales	criteria function	min. point border in case of combined criteria	min. point spread of the evaluators for the use of an arbitrator criteria	criteria description	instructions for evaluators/leading questions
	expedieny	V3.4	Project output specification		10	annex: - Product specifications for the call						It is evaluated, whether the supported product outputs are clearly specified and described, the applicant must specify the outputs, of which the supported products in the grant application consist. (Assessing the relevance of the outputs with respect to their practical use.)	10 - 9 points - Outputs and results of the project are clearly described. From the description of activities, it is clear that the project is a clear plan that will lead to the creation of defined outputs and the fulfillment of objectives. 8 - 6 points - Outputs and results of the project are adequately described. From the description of the activities it is clear that it is possible to meet the objectives of the project. 5 - 3 points - Outputs and results of the project are adequately described. From the description of activities, it is not very clear whether the project is a clear plan that will lead to the creation of defined outputs and the fulfillment of objectives. 2 - 0 points - Outputs and results of the project are not clearly described. From the description of the activities it is not obvious which purposes, resp. results and outcome derive from the project.
Project financing	efficiency /expendiency/economy	V5.1	The adequacy and consistency of the budget to the content and scope of the project		15	25 grant application: - Budget		15 - 12 points - the budget is entirely appropriate, the parameters of procured supplies are adequate, prices can be considered as normal, budget items are linked to individual activities, enabling reliable assessment of expenditures and efficiency and no adjustment of the budget is proposed. 11 - 9 points - Beside minor observations, the budget is reasonable, there are limited items,	combined	5	75%	19 a) The merits of the budget amount and individual budget items are evaluated, relative to the duration of the project, activities content, planned results/outcomes. (In relevant cases, it is necessary to take into account the duration and intensity of work with the target group.) Whether the expenditures are necessary for the implementation of the project or vice versa, whether the budget is not undervalued. b) The adequacy of the project budget means respecting the 3E rules - economy, efficiency and effectiveness in terms of financial expenditures in relation to the implementation of planned activities, planned outputs and outcomes. Especially it is necessary to consider: - Adequacy of wage expenditures/implementation team time jobs with respect to the quality (professionalism) of its activities and also the length of its activities related to the work with the target group (e.g. the preparation of materials to work with the target group) - If the applicant intends to implement the project also with external supplies, it is necessary to assess whether the procured goods or services will be used in the project, whether that are unnecessary for the project implementation and whether the parameters for the goods and services are not disproportionate. - The adequacy of the leased premises with respect to the needs of the project. - The adequacy of the quantity and characteristics of the acquired IT equipment . - Proportionality of individual budgetary chapters within the budget (e.g. the proportionality of the purchase of equipment for the production team and employments of team members). - Whether individual entries correspond to those in the usual place and time. - Whether individual entries correspond to the prices set in the procedure recommended by the steering body in the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries or in the call. The adequacy and accuracy has to be evaluated both for the individual budget items of the project, or the groups of items and the budget as a whole to avoid the evaluation of only certain parts of the budget, while others will not be taken into account. c) The clarity of the budget is evaluated - the evident breakdown of expenditures to items and groups and their level of concretization.	15 - 12 points - the budget is entirely appropriate, the parameters of procured supplies are adequate, prices can be considered as normal, budget items are linked to individual activities, enabling reliable assessment of expenditures and efficiency and no adjustment of the budget is proposed. 11 - 9 points - The budget is, except for minor observations, reasonable, limited are items that are not justified in the description of the project implementation and/or their procurement volume/quantity does not match the description (the needs of the project), only a minor change of roughly up to 5% of the total budget is proposed. 8 - 6 points - the budget is slightly overvalued or undervalued, there are items that are not clear and well-reasoned and/or the purchased volume/quantity does not match the description (needs) of the project. A reduction (indicatively 5-20% of the total budget) is proposed. 5 - 3 points - The budget is overvalued or undervalued, increasingly there are items that are not justified, a significant reduction (indicatively 20-40% of the total budget) is proposed. 2 - 1 point - The budget is fundamentally overvalued or undervalued and coherence of the budget with the activities is not convincing /cannot be unambiguously identified. 0 points - The budget is totally inadequate, poorly designed and unintelligible, lacking coherence, it is confusing.
	expedieny	V5.2	General conditions for expenditure eligibility.		5	annex: - Product specifications for the call						The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of expenditure eligibility, i.e. the material, local and temporal expenditure eligibility in the budget. In the event that the grant application contains an ineligible expenditure, the evaluator proposes its elimination from the budget. In case it is not possible to exclude an ineligible expenditure from the budget (i.e. the project would not be feasible), it is not possible to recommend the grant application for support.	5 points - The budget is completely in compliance with the eligibility rules. 4 - 2 points - The budget includes ineligible expenditures, which can be eliminated from the budget on the basis of evaluator objections. 1 - 0 points - The project budget includes ineligible expenditures, which cannot be eliminated from the budget while keeping the project's feasibility.
	economy	V5.3	Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.		5	grant application - project budget						It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.	5 points - The co-financing of the project is documented in a transparent manner and is real. 4 - 2 points - The co-financing is real, but the amount of necessary co-financing is not documented in a conclusive manner or the certainty of its achievement raises doubts. 1 - 0 points - Ensuring co-financing is unclear.

