

with the decree No 49 of the Minister of Social Affairs from May 21, 2020
 „Adoption of the Rules and Regulations for the applicants
 of the small grant scheme „Training of domestic violence specialists and
 establishment of a programme(s) for sex buyers“

Guide to the expert evaluation sheet

Evaluation criteria	Maximum score
1. Team members' background, competencies and involvement in project activities and involvement of partners	15
<p>1.1. Relevant competencies, field knowledge and experiences of the project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and introducer(s) of social programme</p> <p>The applicant has provided CVs of the team members, which include descriptions that allow for a comprehensive assessment of the relation with the field and capacity to successfully complete the project.</p> <p><i>The relevant competencies of the project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and introducer(s) of social programme shall be assessed according to the criteria below in such a way that compliance with one criterion shall provide one point.</i></p> <p><u>A maximum of 6 points can be awarded as part of a single application</u> when assessing the competencies of the project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and introducer(s) of social programme.</p> <p>NB! In case the application contains activities for carrying out both training courses and social programme, the points for the competencies of the training provider(s) and author(s) of social programme shall be added up and this sum shall be divided by two. The project manager's points shall be then added to this sum.</p> <p><u>Project manager has:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) experience in managing a similar project (in terms of the scope of activities and the tasks of the project manager) (1 point); 2) experience in managing a project related to the topic of domestic violence and/or gender-based violence within the last 5 years (1 point); 3) experience in managing a Norwegian Financial Mechanism or EU Structural Fund project (1 point). 	<p>6 (3 + 3)</p>

<p><u>(At least one) trainer has:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) at least 2 years of experience in prevention and/or assisting victims of domestic violence (1 point); 2) experience in carrying out at least 3 training courses on domestic violence (1 point); 3) experience in carrying out at least 1 training course on domestic violence within the last 5 years (1 point). <p><u>(At least one) author or implementer of social programme has:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) at least 5 years of experience in preventing prostitution and trafficking in human beings (1 point); 2) at least 5 years of experience in assisting victims of prostitution and trafficking in human beings (1 point); 3) played a leading role in the establishment and implementation of social programme on domestic violence and/or gender-based violence (1 point); 	
<p>1.2 Involvement of the project team, i.e. project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and implementer(s) of social programme, in the planning of project activities</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 2–0 – score level (2, 1, 0).</i></p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the project team has been defined, the roles and responsibilities of the project team have been clearly defined and sufficiently described.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – the project team has been defined, the roles and responsibilities of the project team have not been clearly defined and/or described superficially.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the project team is either partially undefined or the roles and responsibilities of the project team are not described.</p>	2
<p>1.3 Involvement of the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Iceland or the Principality of Liechtenstein in the planning and implementation of the project</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 4–0 – score level (4, 2, 0).</i></p> <p><u>4 points</u> – partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Iceland or the Principality of Liechtenstein are involved in the planning and/or implementation of the project. The confirmation letter of partner(s) concerning the planning and/or implementation of the project is attached to the submitted application and the project application sufficiently explains the clear role of partner(s).</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Iceland or the Principality of Liechtenstein are involved in the planning and/or implementation of the project, but the partner’s role in the project activities is not clear from the project application description.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – no partners from the Kingdom of Norway, the Republic of Iceland or the Principality of Liechtenstein are involved in the planning and implementation of the project.</p>	4

<p>1.4 Involvement of Estonian and/or other beneficiary countries¹ or Russian partner(s) in the planning and implementation of the project</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 3–0 – score level (3, 1, 0).</i></p> <p><u>3 points</u> – a partner from Estonia and/or other beneficiary country or Russia is involved in the planning and/or implementation of the project. The confirmation letter of partner(s) concerning the planning and/or implementation of the project is attached to the submitted application the project application explains the clear role of partner(s).</p> <p><u>1 points</u> – partner from Estonia and/or other beneficiary country or Russia is involved in the planning and/or implementation of the project, but the partner’s role in the project activities is not clear from the project application description.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – no partners from Estonia or other beneficiary country or Russia are involved in the planning and implementation of the project.</p>	3
<p>2. Action plan of the project, needs of the target group and involvement methods</p>	16
<p>2.1 Comprehensiveness, relevance and feasibility of the action plan of the project.</p> <p>As a result of the funded projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - at least 160 specialists have passed the training courses on the causes of domestic violence, consequences thereof, options for assistance and enhancement of inter-agency cooperation and/or - at least one social programme has been created and piloted to change the attitudes and behaviour of sex buyers and passed by at least 12 sex buyers. <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 8–0 – score level (8, 6, 3, 0).</i></p> <p><u>8 points</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the action plan describes the activities to be carried out as part of the project in detail, the highlighted activities are interlinked, logically sequenced and justified; • the activities are feasible within the planned timeframe and the duration of the activities is reasonable; • all planned activities aim to achieve the objective of the project as efficiently as possible; <p><u>6 points</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the activities of the project are logically sequenced and interlinked, but the action plan is somewhat superficial, so that the content of some of the activities is not sufficiently clear; • there are no unnecessary activities planned for the project, but there are project activities that are under-planned or over-planned; 	8

¹ In accordance with Art. 14.3 of the conditions and procedures for granting support for the implementation of the open call for applications “Training of specialists on domestic violence and establishment of a social programme for sex buyers” are (in addition to Estonia) Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal , Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • most of the planned activities aim to achieve the objective of the project as efficiently as possible. <p><u>3 points</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the activities of the project are logically sequenced and interlinked, but the action plan is superficial, so that the content of the activities is not sufficiently clear; • there are project activities that are under-planned or over-planned and/or the project has also planned unnecessary activities and/or activities that are essential to the achievement of the objectives of the project have been not been adequately planned. <p><u>0 points</u> – the action plan of the project has significant shortcomings: the activity plan does not describe the content of the main activities to be carried out and/or the timeframe is largely unrealistic and/or it remains unclear how the proposed activities will contribute to the achievement of the project objectives.</p>	
<p>2.2 Consideration of the target groups (specialists who come into contact with the victims of domestic violence and/or sex buyers) when planning/implementing project activities.</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 4–0 – score level (4, 2, 0).</i></p> <p><u>4 points</u> – the description of the needs of the target group (including, where appropriate, possible different needs or emphasis within the target group) and/or problems considered in the planning/implementation of the proposed activities is relevant and comprehensive to suggest that the activities will contribute in the best way to the objectives of the call for proposals.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the description of the needs of the target group and/or the problems that will be considered when planning/implementing the proposed activities give reason to assume that the proposed activities will have some positive impact on the objectives of the call for proposals. However, at times the description is too vague to assess whether the proposed activities will contribute in the best way to the objectives of the call for proposals.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the description of the needs/problems of the target group is insufficient or missing to assess the positive impact of the proposed activities on the objectives of the call for proposals.</p>	4
<p>2.3 Methods of involving participants in the training courses and/or social programme</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 4–0 – score level (4, 2, 0).</i></p> <p><u>4 points</u> – methods of involving participants in training courses and/or social programme to participate actively in the project activities (meaningful participation in training courses and/or social programme) are clearly described in the application and these are relevant.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – methods of involving participants in training courses and/or social programme in the project activities are reflected in a way that is unclear and/or superficial.</p>	4

<p><u>0 points</u> – methods of involving participants in training courses and/or social programmes are missing from the project application.</p>	
<p>3. Communication activities</p>	2
<p>3.1 Relevance of communication activities</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 2–0 – score level (2, 1, 0).</i></p> <p><u>2 points</u> – project communication activities are well thought out and realistic. There are justifications why these activities best convey the message of the project.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – project communication activities are generally well thought out, but insufficient to ensure media coverage of the project and its results.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the outreach activities of the project are not well thought out.</p>	2
<p>4. Risk factors</p>	3
<p>4.1 Assessment and mitigation of risk factors</p> <p>The risk categories specified in the application form shall be assessed <i>The scores are given in the range of 3–0 – score level (3, 1, 0).</i></p> <p><u>3 points</u> – both external and internal risks are assessed according to the risk categories specified in the application form. These risks are relevant and cover different aspects of the project implementation. For each risk, feasible mitigation activities have been planned.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – both external and internal risks have been assessed according to the risk categories specified in the application form, however, for all identified risks, there are no planned mitigation activities or planned mitigation activities are not adequate, relevant or feasible.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the risks provided are not the result of the project activities or no risk is subject to the planned mitigation activities or the mitigation activities are not relevant.</p>	3
<p>5. Sustainability and innovation of the project</p>	10
<p>5.1 Impact of the project activities after the end of the project</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 4–0 – score level (4, 2, 0).</i></p> <p><i>(The assessment of the feasibility of the activities from the point of view of follow-up funding is provided separately in clause 5.2).</i></p> <p><u>4 points</u> – convincing reasoning is provided, from which it can be assumed that the impact of the project activities will most likely continue after the end of the project. The training project proposal clearly foresees the further dissemination of the experience and results gained during the project and provides for follow-up action(s) in support of the project objective.</p>	4

<p>In the social programme project application, the plan for the continuation of the social programme is planned in detail and is very likely to be feasible as such.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – reasoning is provided, from which it can be assumed that the impact of the project activities will continue to some extent after the end of the project. The training project proposal foresees to a certain extent the further dissemination of the experience and results gained during the project and/or follow-up action(s) in support of the project objective.</p> <p>The social programme project proposal does not plan the continuation of the social programme in detail to unambiguously assess the feasibility of the project, but it is intended to further disseminate the experience and results gained during the project and/or follow-up action(s) in support of the project objective.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – reasoning is not provided, from which it could be assumed that the impact of the project activities will continue after the end of the project. It is not clear whether the experiences and results gained from the project will be disseminated. No follow-up actions have been planned or these are clearly unrealistic.</p>	
<p>5.2 Perspective of the follow-up financing of the project activities after the expiry of the EEA Financial Mechanism 2014–2021</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 2–0 – score level (2, 0).</i></p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the applicant has planned the possible sources of funding for the project activities (training courses and/or social programme) after the end of the project.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the applicant has not planned the possible sources of funding for the project activities (training courses and/or social programme) after the end of the project or these sources are clearly unrealistic.</p>	2
<p>5.3 Innovation and added value of the project</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 4–0 – score level (4, 2, 0).</i></p> <p><u>4 points</u> – the project identifies at least one innovative element that is likely to add value to the objectives of Outcome 2 of the programme “Reduced domestic and gender-based violence and gender inequalities” (raising awareness/skills of specialists and/or changing attitudes and behaviour of sex buyers).</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the project identifies at least one (partially) innovative element that can bring some added value to the objectives of Outcome 2 of the programme “Reduced domestic and gender-based violence and gender inequalities”.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the project does not identify any innovative elements that could give added value to the objectives of Outcome 2 of the programme “Reduced domestic and gender-based violence and gender inequalities” or the added value does not appear in the project description.</p>	4
<p>6. Economic efficiency and project co-financing</p>	9
<p>6.1 Necessity, justification and budget clarity of the proposed expenditure</p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 6–0 – score level (6, 4, 2, 0).</i></p>	6

<p><u>6 points</u> – all planned expenditure is directly related to the nature of the activities carried out and contributes to the achievement of the project objectives and results. The calculation of expenditure is understandable and arithmetically correct (except human and technical errors). The activities are sufficiently resourced and the planned costs are based on actual market prices.</p> <p><u>4 points</u> – most of the planned expenditure is necessary for the implementation of the specific activities, but there is some unnecessary expenditure and/or some over-planned or under-planned expenditure. Most of the planned expenditure is based on actual market prices.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – there are a number of unnecessary expenses that do not directly support project activities or that the expenditure of a number of activities is over-planned or under-planned or some of the planned expenses are not planned at all.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – in most cases the proposed expenditure is not necessary and justified or does not result from the nature of the activities carried out or does not contribute to the achievement of the project objectives or is not based on actual market prices or cost accounting is incomprehensible.</p>	
<p>6.2 Consideration of co-financing provided by the project promoter and partners</p> <p><i>Project co-financing shall amount to a minimum of 10% of the eligible costs for non-governmental organisations and to a minimum of 15% for other applicants. Volunteer work for non-governmental organisations can cover up to 50% of the co-financing required for a project.</i></p> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 3–0 – score level (3, 1, 0).</i></p> <p><u>3 points</u> – the applicant explains in detail the ways and means of covering project co-financing.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – ways and means to cover project co-financing are described superficially.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – There are no further explanations of how to cover self-financing.</p>	3
<p>Maximum general score</p>	<p>55</p>

I have read the guide on the assessment sheet

(signed digitally)
name of expert