

Selection criteria and selection procedure

Formal compliance criteria shall be assessed by the NFP. Grant Application that was awarded “No” in paragraph 1 shall be excluded from further assessment. If the NFP identifies a shortcoming in the Grant Application, the applicant will be asked to rectify identified shortcomings and/or to supplement the missing information. The applicant shall respond to the findings of the NFP within 5 working days. Within this period the applicant shall also rectify the identified shortcomings and/or supplement the missing information. Upon the request of the applicant the NFP may extend this period.

Should the applicant fail to rectify the identified shortcomings and/or supplement the missing information within the set deadline, the Grant Application shall be rejected. Applicants may appeal to the NFP in case the Grant Application is rejected due to non-compliance with formal and/or eligibility criteria. Further information can be found in chapter 18 of the Bilateral Fund Guide.

1. FORMAL COMPLIANCE CRITERIA

No.	Control question	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
1.	Was the Grant Application delivered by the deadline, using the standard template and method of delivery?				
2.	Are the mandatory attachments attached to the Grant 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 the timeframe of the initiative implementation in compliance with the length and period specified in the Call? ²				
3.	Was the maximal and minimal limit of the Grant applied for observed?				

¹ Relevant in case the NFP requested the submission of missing information/rectify shortcomings.

² Duration of the initiative is maximum 12 months. The latest date of eligibility is set out in the Call.

3. CONTENT RELATED CRITERIA

No.	Criterion	Description	Range	Score	Comments
1.	Relevance of the initiative	Evaluate the contribution to strengthening bilateral relations, enhancing cooperation and improving mutual knowledge and understanding between Slovakia and the Donor States.	0 – 1		
2.	Relevance of the partnership	Evaluate the balance in the partnership and the active involvement of the partners in planning of the initiative and its implementation.	0 – 1		
3.	Relevance of the stakeholders	Evaluate the ability, competence and relevance of the stakeholders to implement the initiative.	0 – 1		
4.	Quality of the application	Evaluate whether the application is clear and concise, incl. the relevance of the measurable indicators.	0 – 1		
5.	Feasibility	Evaluate time concerns, capacity concerns and other risks that may hamper the achievement of the objectives of the initiative.	0 – 1		
6.	Sustainability	Evaluate, whether the initiative may continue, be repeated or provide other benefits after the funding period is over.	0 – 1		
7.	Budget efficiency	Evaluate the Value For Money of the initiative and effectiveness and efficiency of the planned costs.	0 – 1		
Total score					
Decision				FOR / AGAINST	
Substantive comments					

The assessor can award the criterion with points in range from 0 (no) to 1 (yes), while it is acceptable to award 0.5 points. In case the score is lower than 1, the assessor is obliged to justify their decision in the field “Comments”.

The assessors may make comments in order to improve the quality of the Grant Application. Comments shall be entitled as “substantive” or “minor”. In case substantive comments are received, the Grant Application needs to be modified within a period set by the NFP and circulated to all members again.

In case the Grant Application received 4 or less points, it is considered unacceptable and shall not be modified in order to be approved, i.e. it is rejected.