

Attachment no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Teaming call - Formal check

sequence	criterion name	criteria description	function	correctable/ uncorrectable	evaluation method - yes/no or point	main source of information	evaluator	instructions for evaluators
F1	The grant application was submitted in the prescribed form	It is evaluated, whether the application was finalized in electronic form in the MS2014+ application.	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application	MS2014+	Evaluation at the application phase automatically, other than electronically submitted are not possible
F2	In the grant application all required data is filled out	Checked at the stage of finalization of the grant application automatically, no need to check by the evaluator.	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application	MS2014+	MS2014+ evaluated automatically
F3	All required annexes are documented and in the required form	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 are documented in the form specified by the call.	exclusion	correctable	yes/no		evaluator/MS2014+	a) MS2014+ - Automatically controls for mandatory annexes- mandatory fields b) Evaluator - evaluation of the annex form, i.e. according to the call Specification (format, annex template/specimen, etc.).
F4	The grant application was submitted in the language determined in the call	It is evaluated, whether the grant application incl. all required and optional annexes was made in the language determined by the Call, i.e. always in Czech.  Relevant to call using foreign evaluators: It is evaluated, whether the grant application was submitted in the English language. The obligation of the English version will be stated in the call text. The criterion is relevant for calls for which the evaluation of project applications is provided by foreign evaluators.	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application, annexes	evaluator/MS2014+	
F5	Identification data of the applicant are in accordance with the extract from the register	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 accordance with the extract from the register in which the applicant is registered/listed.  a) It is evaluated, whether the identification of the applicant is included in the grant application.  b) It is evaluated, whether the applicant's identification data is in accordance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.).	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application: - Project annex subjects	evaluator/MS2014+	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	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 accordance 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.  a) It is evaluated, whether the partner's/partners' identification data is in accordance with the extracts from the register (e.g. register of schools and educational institutions, commercial register, trade register, business register etc.).	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application: - Project annex subjects	evaluator/MS2014+	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+
F7	The grant application is signed by the applicant's/partner's legal representative	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.  It is evaluated, whether the application 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 entity.  Documents can also be signed (documents must not be older than 90 calendar days from the date of grant application submission in IS KP14+):  By another person 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 in scanned form 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.  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 scanned form as an original/certified true copy on the tab or under the Power of attorney button in the grant application form in the IS KP14+.	exclusion	correctable	yes/no	grant application: - Signature of the application annex	evaluator/MS2014+	cannot be finalized without a signature, automatically checked by MS2014+ the signature relevance is checked by the evaluator (the signature may not agree with the approved/entrusted/authorized person) Formalities of the power of attorney: principal clearly identified - the one who grants the power of attorney, Agent clearly identified - the one who 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.
F8	Estimated time of implementation of the project in accordance with the call terms	It is evaluated, whether the length of the project implementation (e.g. number of months) and the period of project implementation (from-to) correspond to the call terms.	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Project annexes	evaluator/MS2014+	This criterion is met if the duration of the project is in line with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call, while the project implementation period is in line with the call.  This criterion is not met if the duration of the project is not in line with the duration of the project duration referenced in the call or the project implementation period is not in line with the call.

<b>F9</b>	The project respects the minimum and maximum limit of total eligible costs determined in the call	It is evaluated, whether the amount of the total eligible costs correspond to the conditions of the call.	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Budget	MS2014+	a) This criterion is met if the required grant amount is in the stated range of the minimum and maximum grant amount for the particular call.  b) The criterion is not met in the case that the required grant amount is not within the specified range of the minimum and maximum grant amount in the context of the call, i.e. requested funds are lower or higher than the minimum or maximum limit for the call.
<b>F10</b>	The project respects the financial limits of the budget for the particular call	It is evaluated, whether the application respects the financial limits of the budget set by the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries. If the MS2014+ will not automatically control limits, the criterion will be assessed at the stage of objective evaluation	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Budget	MS2014+	
<b>F11</b>	The amount of the applicant's own resources in the financing overview is being provided in accordance with the call	It is evaluated, whether in the grant application the applicant's own resources are included, in accordance with the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries and the wording of the call.	exclusion	uncorrectable	yes/no	grant application: - Budget - Financial resources overview	evaluator/MS2014+	

**Attachment no. 2 Evaluation criteria - Call Teaming – Eligibility check**

sequence	quality aspect of the project	criterion name	function	correctable/uncorrectable	Evaluation criterion description	evaluation method - yes/no or point amount	the main source of information (specific grant application bookmark)	evaluator	instructions for evaluators
P1	expediency	The grant application is in its focus in line with the objectives and activities of the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	It is evaluated, whether the project objectives and activities correspond to the given call requirements. It is evaluated, whether the applicant has submitted the required activities according to the text of the call.	yes/no	grant application: - Activities - Key activities - Specific objectives - Project description annexes	evaluator	a) this criterion is met if the project (activities) 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.  b) The criterion is not met if it 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	feasibility/efficiency	Project activities are unique for applicants/partners	exclusion	uncorrectable	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 project. There must be always substantively different or follow-up outcomes. Evaluation takes place via the MS2014+ 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 EC / OP RDI There must be always substantively different or follow-up activities/outcomes. Verification will take place via control of outcomes in subjects as recipients in the OP EC database outputs.	yes/no	grant application: - Project description - Activities - Key activities annexes	evaluator	The applicant demonstrates an affidavit that no public funding is being/was received for project activities.
P3	feasibility	Place of implementation and place of impact of the project are in accordance with the terms of the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	It is evaluated, whether the place of implementation and place of impact of the project is in accordance with the conditions set in the call, i.e. specific project activities have an impact only on the relevant territory defined in the call.	yes/no	grant application: - Location - Activities - Key activities - Project description annexes	evaluator/ MS2014+	The applicant selects the impact place from a preset dial in relation to specific activities. The evaluator checks the entire application in relation to specific activities:  a) This criterion is met if the project has an impact only on the territory, resp. target group according to the call.  b) This criterion is not met if the project has not an impact only on the territory, resp. target group according to the call.
P4	feasibility	The applicant meets the definition of an eligible applicant defined in the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	Within this criteria it is evaluated, whether the applicant entity meets the conditions and criteria set out in the call and related documentation, in accordance with act no. 218/2000 Coll. On budgetary rules. It is evaluated, whether the applicant meets: • The authorized recipient type according to the call • Min. history of the applicant entity • min. number of years in research, development and education ( <i>if applicable</i> ) • proof of continuous activity in this area ( <i>if applicable</i> ) It is evaluated, whether the applicant meets the following conditions, through an affidavit in the grant application annex. • the applicant is not in bankruptcy pursuant to Act no. 182/2006 Coll., on Bankruptcy and Its Resolution (Insolvency Act), as amended; no execution or enforcement of the judgment is filed against the applicant and he is not in liquidation; • has no unpaid taxes in the tax evidence both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence; • Has no arrears on premiums and penalties for public health insurance or social security contributions and the state employment policy, both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence; • Has clean criminal record. With regard to the principle of transparency and to avoid potential conflicts of interest, applicants will be required to the extent appropriate, to publish/prove their ownership structure. Applicants who do not publish/do not prove ownership structure (or applicants, where there is a conflict of interests) are not legitimate applicants. It is evaluated, whether the applicant documents the ownership structure in accordance with act no. 218/2000 Coll., i.e. if the applicant is a legal entity, whether the identification information was documented 1. persons acting on its behalf was documented, stating whether they are acting as its statutory authority or are acting under a power of attorney, 2. persons with a share in this legal person, 3. persons, in which the applicant has a share, and about that share amount.	yes/no	grant application, annexes	evaluator/ MS2014+	a) This criterion is met if the applicant can be identified as an entity that is defined in the call and also meets the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries OP RDE unless the call determines otherwise.  b) This criterion is not met if the applicant cannot be identified as an entity that is defined in the call or does not meet the conditions laid down in the call or the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries OP RDE unless the call determines otherwise.  MS2014+ 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 as defined in the call.
P5	feasibility	The project partner meets the conditions of eligibility of a partner	exclusion	uncorrectable	It is evaluated, whether the partner entity meets the conditions and criteria for eligibility and partnerships set out in the call, related documentation to the call Rules for applicants and beneficiaries. It is evaluated, whether the partner meets: • Authorized partner type It is evaluated, whether the partner meets the following conditions, through an affidavit in the grant application annex. • The partner is not in bankruptcy pursuant to Act no. 182/2006 Coll., on Bankruptcy and Its Resolution (Insolvency Act), as amended, in the case of a foreign partner according to the legislation in force in the given country; no execution or enforcement of the judgment is filed against the applicant and he is not in liquidation; • has no unpaid taxes in the tax evidence both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence; • Has no arrears on premiums and penalties for public health insurance or social security contributions and the state employment policy, both in the Czech Republic and in the country of residence, place of business or residence; • is criminally blameless. With regard to the principle of transparency and to avoid potential conflicts of interest, partners will be required to the extent appropriate, to publish/prove their ownership structure. Partners who do not publish/do not prove ownership structure or partners, where there is a conflict of interests are not legitimate partners. It is evaluated, whether the partner documents the ownership structure in accordance with act no. 218/2000 Coll., i.e. if the partner is a legal entity, whether the identification information was documented 1. persons acting on its behalf was documented, stating whether they are acting as its statutory authority or are acting under a power of attorney, 2. persons with a share in this legal person, 3. persons, in which the applicant has a share, and about that share amount.	yes/no	grant application, annexes	evaluator/ MS2014+	• 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 OP RDE unless the call determines otherwise. • 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 for applicants and beneficiaries OP RDE, unless the call determines otherwise.  MS2014+ is connected with the insolvency register to check for bankruptcy of the partner.  The evaluator evaluates, whether the conditions laid down in the call and the Rules for applicants and beneficiaries are met as defined in the call.
P6	feasibility	Documented involvement of the partner in accordance with the call	exclusion	uncorrectable	It is evaluated, whether the conditions for the involvement of the partner is in accordance with the call.	yes/no	• grant application: • Project entities • Annexes	evaluator	

Attachment no. 2 Evaluation criteria, Teaming call - Objective evaluation 1. step

criticon group name	quality aspect of the project	criticon number	criticon name	evaluation criteria description	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	point score for criteria group	evaluator	source of information	instructions for evaluators/leading questions	criticon function	min. point border in case of combined criteria
applicant/partner	feasibility	V1.1	Materially - technical readiness (default stage)	It is evaluated, whether the applicant is prepared for the material-technical project implementation.	8	8	evaluation board	grant application, annexes		evaluating	x
Project description	expediency	V2.1	Factual content and relevance of activities	Evaluated are the proposed method of specific project implementation from the material-technical point of view with regard to the planned project activities, <b>material quality and content of the project from the material-technical point of view with regard to the planned project activities.</b> Activities must be planned in accordance with the objectives and conditions of the call.  All planned project activities must be <b>specifically described and linked to the project budget.</b> 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.	10	18		grant application: - Activities - Key activities	10 points - The activities are from the view of their material and technical arrangement designed quite adequately to the project goals and are fully described, their relation to budget items and the related outputs can be well evaluated  9 - 8 points - The activities are from the view of their material and technical arrangement adequately designed for the project objectives, but their description leaves a slight doubt about certain aspects of their implementation  7 - 6 points - Design and description of activities partially do not correspond to their planned material and technical ensuring, from the description of activities, their interconnections with some of the budget items is not apparent  5 - 3 points - Design and description of activities does not correspond to their planned material and technical ensuring, the coherence of activities and their parts and the majority of budget items is not apparent  2 - 0 points - The activities are from the view of their material and technical arrangement completely inadequately designed for the project objectives, they are vague and inadequate, coherence of activities and the budget cannot be identified.	combined	3
	feasibility	V2.2	Time schedule and logical consistency of project activities	It is evaluated, whether the proposed time schedule of activities is logically and realistically set from a material-technical point of view with regard to the planned project activities. Activities must follow each other smoothly. It is evaluated, whether the continuity of the activities implemented is appropriately divided, given the applicant's potential (project team).  (As an activity project application the mandatory activity Project management must be given, i.e. the building of the project team and the setting of project management, project controls and coordination of the various activities planned in the project activities.)	8				grant application: - stages of the project - Activities - Key activities	8 points - Project activities are from the view of their material and technical arrangement logically linked, and the time allocated to each key activity is appropriate.  7 - 2 points The proposed time schedule has shortcoming in the interdependence of individual activities and/or time allocation activities.  1 point - Significant shortcomings in coherence and time allocation activities are identified.  1 point - The proposed time schedule does not enable the smooth implementation of the project.	combined
Results and outputs	expediency	V3.1	Appropriateness of selected indicators of outputs and results	It is evaluated, whether the <b>selected output and result indicators</b> are appropriately chosen for the activity.  (Assessing the <b>relevance of results and outputs with respect to their practical use.</b> )	5	10		grant application: - Indicators	5 points - Selection of indicators is apparent from the project description and appropriately describes the achievement of results / outcomes.  4 - 3 points - Selection of indicators corresponds to the submitted project, but for accurate description of achievements / outputs the evaluator suggests additions.  2 - 1 point - Some of the key indicators are missing, the evaluator proposes additions.  0 points - Indicators are set ambiguously and/or from the description of the project can not even be evaluated which indicators should be monitored.	combined	1
	efficiency	V3.2	Appropriateness and feasibility of results and outputs of the project	The <b>appropriateness of setting quantified indicators for</b> 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, <b>the feasibility of setting given indicator values in relation to the objectives, time schedule (milestones) and the project budget is evaluated.</b>  The <b>method of determining</b> initial and target values is evaluated.	5				grant application: - Indicators	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 - 2 points - The feasibility of achieving the planned values is not entirely convincing or shows shortcomings. Adjustment is needed in terms of monitoring indicators.  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 monitoring 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.	combined

financing of the project	efficiency effectiveness economy	V4.1	<b>The adequacy and consistency of the budget to the content and scope of the project</b>	<p>a) The <b>merits of the budget amount and individual budget items</b> are evaluated, relative to the duration of the project from a material-technical point of view with respect to planned project activities, activities content/phases, planned results/outcomes. Whether the costs are necessary for the implementation of the project or vice versa, whether the budget is not undervalued.</p> <p>b) <b>The adequacy of the project budget</b> means respecting the 3E rules - economy, efficiency and effectiveness in terms of financial costs in relation to the implementation of planned activities of the material-technical point of view with regard to the planned project activities, planned outputs and outcomes. Especially it is necessary to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If the applicant intends to implement the project also with external supplies, it is necessary to assess whether the <b>procured goods or services or construction work</b> 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.</li> <li>- <b>The adequacy of the leased premises</b> with respect to the needs of the project.</li> <li>- The adequacy of the <b>quantity and characteristics of the acquired IT equipment</b>.</li> <li>- Whether individual entries correspond to those in the usual place and time.</li> <li>- 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.</li> </ul> <p>The adequacy and accuracy has to be evaluated for individual budget items of the project from the material-technical point of view with regard to the planned activities of the project, or groups of items.</p> <p>c) The <b>clarity of the budget is evaluated</b> - the evident breakdown of costs to items and groups and their level of concretization.</p> <p>The merits and adequacy of the budget with respect to the objectives and content of the project must be always evaluated in the commentary to the sub-criterion. If it is found that the validity of some items in the budget is not clear or these amounts are inadequate, the evaluator is required to propose their cuts.</p>	10	14	grant application - Budget	<p>10 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 costs and efficiency and no adjustment of the budget is proposed.</p> <p>9 - 8 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.</p> <p>7 - 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>0 points - The budget is totally inadequate, poorly designed and unintelligible, lacking coherence, it is confusing.</p>	combined	3
	expediency	V4.2	<b>General conditions for eligibility of expenditure</b>	<p>The budget is evaluated from the perspective of the general conditions of eligibility of expenditure, i.e. the material, local and temporal eligibility of expenditure in the budget.</p> <p>In the event that the grant application contains an ineligible expenditure, the evaluator proposes its elimination from the budget.</p> <p>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.</p>	4		grant application - Budget	<p>4 points - the budget is clearly set up and does not include any ineligible expenditure in terms of their substantive competence (in accordance with the rules of eligibility of expenditure OP RDE). The amount of the planned expenditure corresponds to the prices at the usual time and place.</p> <p>3 points - The budget includes items that cannot be classified as eligible and/or contains such items their eligibility cannot be unambiguously evaluated. A deletion of these items amount to about 5% of total eligible project costs is suggested.</p> <p>2 points - The budget includes items that cannot be classified as eligible and/or contains such items their eligibility cannot be unambiguously evaluated. Deletion of these items in the amount of about 5-20% of the total eligible project costs is suggested.</p> <p>1 points - The budget includes items that cannot be classified as eligible and/or contains such items their eligibility cannot be unambiguously evaluated. Deletion of these items in the amount of about 20 - 40% of the total eligible project costs is suggested.</p> <p>0 points - The budget includes items that cannot be classified as eligible, but their removal from the budget would lead to the impossibility of the project.</p>	combined	1
	economy	V4.3	<b>Way to provide co-financing of the project during implementation period.</b>	<p>It is evaluated, whether the applicant is able to meet the commitment of co-financing.</p>	10	10	grant application - Financial resources overview - CBA (FA)	<p>10 - 9 points - the applicant clearly justifies how the project co-financing will be ensured and the nature and sources of financing and their amounts are set realistically.</p> <p>8 - 7 points - the applicant justifies how the project co-financing will be ensured, but a way of proving or the co-financing sources or their amount report minor problems which require minor adjustments, but that will not affect the implementation of the project.</p> <p>6 - 3 points - the applicant justifies how the project co-financing will be ensured, but a way of proving or the co-financing sources or their amount report problems which require adjustments, that may affect the project plan e.g. in the project financial plan.</p> <p>2 - 0 points - the applicant justifies how the project co-financing will be ensured, but the proof, the source of co-financing, or the amount thereof exhibit serious shortcomings which would require a fundamental change to the project (e.g. A substantial reduction in project costs) and there would be a lack of co-funding rate of the beneficiary.</p>	combined	3

Construction and technical parameters	feasibility	V5.1	<b>Technical feasibility</b>	It is evaluated, whether the project is technically feasible within the planned timeframe.  The criterion will be evaluated as NO, in case the project has serious shortcomings (e.g. an unrealistic time schedule) and it is not possible to remove these shortcomings in the project without changing the basic content and objectives of the project.	8	18		grant application, annexes	8 points - the project is technically feasible, a realistic time schedule is set.  7 - 5 points The Project is technically feasible, but it has minor flaws, which require minor adjustments of the project. This will not have any impact on the achievement of project objectives.  4 - 2 points - The project is technically feasible, but only if significant modifications, e.g. project time schedule happen.  1 - 0 points - the project has serious shortcomings which would require a fundamental change in content, or the goals of the project. It seems to be technically impossible and unrealistic.	combined	2
	expediency	V5.2	<b>Technical and instrumental equipment, construction costs</b>	It is evaluated, whether the project/construction and technical documentation includes the specification, rationale and time schedule for the acquisition of technical and instrumentation equipment (for all significant items, i.e. with an expected cost over the value defined in the call), and, if relevant, construction costs.	10			grant application, annexes	10 points - The project/construction and technical documentation contains a sufficiently detailed specification, detailed justification and a realistic time schedule for the acquisition of technical and instrumental equipment.  9 - 8 points The project/construction and technical documentation contains detailed specification, detailed justification and a realistic time schedule for the acquisition of technical and instrumental equipment, which show small shortcomings or raise minor doubts about compliance in the procurement of technical and instrumental equipment.  7 - 6 points The project/construction and technical documentation contains specification, justification and a time schedule for the acquisition of technical and instrumental equipment, which show shortcomings or raise doubts about compliance in the procurement of technical and instrumental equipment. Their removal requires a significant change, which may be reflected in the framework of the project.  5 - 3 points - The project/construction and technical documentation contains a general specification, an unclear justification or a general time schedule for the acquisition of technical and instrumental equipment. Clarifications or adjustments are reflected in the framework of the project.  2 - 0 points - the project has serious flaws in the design/construction and technical documentation, or time schedule, there is a lack of specification of project/construction and technical documentation, or appears unrealistic, lacking substantiation of the project/construction and technical documentation, or they appear to be unrealistic. The correction of deficiencies would require a fundamental change in the content of the project/construction and technical documentation. The project/construction and technical documentation seems unrealistic.	combined	3
Compliance with strategies	expediency	V6.2	<b>Compliance with strategies</b>	It is evaluated, whether the project is with its activities/content in accordance with relevant strategies (RIS3) stated in the text of the call and contributes to their achievement.	yes/no			grant application - Activities - Key activities - Project description compulsory annex Continuity of project activities to the strategic objectives RIS3		exclusion	x
horizontal themes	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V7.1	<b>Activities promoting equal opportunities</b>	Equal opportunities are evaluated regardless of the type of disability or social disadvantage, e.g. health, economic, social, ethnic, gender or nationality etc. Specifically, it is evaluated how the equal opportunities are fulfilled through proposed activities. A possible example of taking account of equal opportunities within the project is to provide an accessible space for the project implementation.	yes/no			grant application - Horizontal principles	yes - The project is in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal topic.  No - The project is not in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal topic.	exclusion	x
	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V7.2	<b>Activities supporting sustainable development</b>	The relationship of the project to sustainable development is evaluated, especially its environmental pillars. Specifically, the proposals leading to reduce negative environmental impacts should be evaluated (minimizing noise emissions, air emissions, environmental contamination, etc.) or conversely the effects of the project on environmental improvements. It is also necessary to take into account and assess the project's contribution to raise awareness about sustainable development (especially on environmental issues), the judicious use of natural resources (where appropriate) and the project's contribution to strengthen the social and economic pillars of sustainability.	yes/no			grant application - Horizontal principles	yes - The project is in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal topic.  No - The project is not in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal topic.	exclusion	x
	Compliance of the project with horizontal subjects	V7.3	<b>Activities that do not support discrimination</b>	It is evaluated, whether there is no project to discriminate certain groups.	yes/no			grant application - Horizontal principles	yes - The project is in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a positive or neutral impact on the horizontal topic.  No - The project is not in line with the horizontal principle. The project has a negative impact on the horizontal topic.	exclusion	x

CBA	economy	V8.1	CBA	The grant application is evaluated by CBA (socio-economic analysis) provided by the applicant in the CBA module in IS KP14+.	6	6		CBA (EA)	6 points - positive result of socio-economic analysis of the project (positive economic net present value of the project or the economic internal rate of return equal to or greater than the discount rate), used inputs are adequately justified and appear as real  3 points - positive result of socio-economic analysis of the project (positive economic net present value of the project or the economic internal rate of return equal to or greater than the discount rate), though used inputs are partially overstated or understated, the justification is not complete.  0 points - negative result of socio-economic analysis of the project (negative economic net present value of the project or the economic internal rate of return less than the discount rate) or used inputs into the economic evaluation of the application were not adequately justified and appear as unreal	evaluating	x
sustainability	economy	V6.1 (in MS2014+ V10.1)	sustainability	The project features sufficiently elaborate plan of expenses and profits that is based on reliable and clearly formulated preconditions, and is designed so that it can be justly assumed that financial sustainability of the project will be ensured even after the project finishes at least for as long as is stated in the call.  The project features adequate plan of measures to support sustainability of the activities and outcomes of the project.	10	10		grant application, annexes - CBA (FA)	10 - 9 points - the project has a detailed costs and revenues plan, which is based on clearly formulated assumptions and has an adequate plan of action that will contribute to the sustainability of substantive activities and outputs. It can be reasonably assumed that it will ensure the financial sustainability of the project. Financial sustainability of the project is fully guaranteed for the whole period of evaluating the project, stated financial resources and capacity of its utilization were sufficiently justified and achieving it seems realistic.  8 - 7 points - the project has a costs and revenues plan, which is based on clearly formulated assumptions and has a plan of action that will contribute to the sustainability of substantive activities and outputs, but these show minor shortcomings. The correction of deficiencies requires minor adjustments, but they will not have an impact on ensuring the financial sustainability of the project. It can be assumed that after rectification it will ensure the financial sustainability of the project.  6 - 3 points - the project has a costs and revenues plan, which is based on formulated assumptions and has a plan of action that will contribute to the sustainability of substantive activities and outputs, but these show more significant shortcomings. The correction of deficiencies requires more significant adjustments, that might have an impact on ensuring the financial sustainability of the project. It can be assumed that after rectification it will ensure the financial sustainability of the project.  2 - 0 points - the project does not have a detailed costs and revenues plan, the plan is not based on credible and clearly formulated assumptions, it does not have a plan of action that will contribute to the material sustainability activities and project outputs, it cannot be reasonably assumed that it will ensure the financial sustainability of the project. The financial sustainability of the project was not sufficiently demonstrated, the given resources and their capacity utilization were not sufficiently substantiated, and there are doubts about their achievement.	combined	3
<b>Max. number of points</b>						<b>94</b>					
<b>Min. number of points to advance to the next stage of the approval process</b>						<b>61</b>					



**Attachment no. 2 Evaluation criteria, Teaming call - Objective evaluation 2. step**

quality aspect of the project	criticon number	criticon name	evaluation criteria description	evaluation method - yes/no or max. point amount	evaluator	source of information	instructions for evaluators/leading questions	criticon function
feasibility	V9.1	Consistency of strategic and infrastructure part of the grant application	It is evaluated, whether the strategic and infrastructure parts are in line. The evaluation is based on the conclusions of the evaluation (qualification) to the strategic part from the side of H2020 and conclusions of the evaluation (qualification) for the infrastructure part from the side of OP RDE The Evaluation board will assess the compliance of infrastructure and strategic parts after evaluation in H2020. In the event that a) the change of the strategic part does not constitute a change of the infrastructure part, the Evaluation board shall not formulate reservations; b) in the case that the infrastructure part is in accordance with the strategic part, the Evaluation board will propose reservations to the infrastructure part so as to be in line with the strategic part approved by H2020.	yes/no	evaluation board	grant application - strategic and infrastructural part, the H2020 evaluation results	This criterion is met if the infrastructure part is in line with the strategic part of the approved H2020 and/or can objections to the infrastructure part be formulated, so that it is in line with the strategic part.  The criterion is not met when the infrastructure part is not in accordance with the strategic part, while the infrastructure cannot be adjusted on the basis of the evaluation board objections while preserving the project's feasibility.	exclusion