

with the decree No 60 of the Minister of Social Affairs from June 11, 2020  
 „Adoption of the Rules and Regulations for the applicants  
 of the call for proposals „Historic old town centres with cultural heritage protection areas“

### Guide to the Expert Evaluation Sheet

Evaluation criteria	Maximum score
<b>Criterion 1: Project quality</b>	<b>30</b>
<p><b>1.1 Competence and performance of the applicant and partner</b></p> <p>The background and competence of the project promoter. Evaluation is given based on the CV of the project manager and description of the roles of the team members as well as other information contained in the application form and budget.</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–5 – level of points (0, 3, 5).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The applicant’s project manager lacks experience in carrying out a similar project (restoration and development, i.e. starting up the planned use of a building) and there are no plans to include relevant expertise to the project team. The applicant and partner have no suitable resources (people, finances) within the organisation to carry out the project and it is not planned to outsource the necessary professional expertise.</p> <p><u>3 points</u> – The applicant’s project manager has some experience in carrying out a similar project (restoration and development, i.e. starting up the planned use of a building) or relevant expertise has been included in the project team, but their roles and tasks as a project team have not been clearly defined or have not been clearly highlighted, which experts are planned to be outsourced. The applicant and partner have the suitable resources (people, finances) partially available for carrying out the project.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – The applicant’s project manager has sufficient experience in carrying out a similar project (restoration and development, i.e. starting up the planned use of a building) or relevant expertise has been included in the project team, whose roles and tasks as a project team have been clearly defined and sufficiently elaborated on, if necessary, it is planned to outsource relevant staff or service providers. The applicant and partner have the suitable resources (people, finances) available within the organisation or there is a plan to outsource them as a service within the framework of the project.</p>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>1.2 Activity plan and time schedule, risks</b></p> <p>The presumable quality of carrying out the project (including time schedule, activity plan, risk factors and their management) is evaluated. As mandatory information activities, the final beneficiary must organise at least two public events that</p>	<b>5</b>

introduce the project activities and outcome and create a project website in Estonian and English.

*Points given in the range 0–5 – level of points (0, 3, 5).*

0 points – There is no project activity plan and time schedule or they are not relevant, clear or realistic from the point of view of the project. The information activities have not been planned or they do not meet the requirements of the financing party. The project risks have not been assessed or the risks related to carrying out the project are excessively high and not managed. The highlighted risks do not arise from the project activities or the management activities are not relevant.

3 points – The project activity plan and time schedule have been partially described and relevant for the most part. The information activities have been described. The project risks have been assessed, all important risks can be managed to a large extent and the measures for their management have been planned to a certain extent.

5 points – The project activities and time schedule have been thoroughly described, they are relevant and realistic. The information activities have been clearly described in the project and they completely meet the requirements of the financing party. The project risks have been assessed and all the significant risks can be managed. Management activities have been planned for each risk.

### **1.3 Sustainability of the project**

**5**

The economic, social and institutional sustainability of the project activities is assessed: how has the keeping of the building in use and its financing after the end of the assistance been ensured. According to Article 8.14 1) (Project duration) of the Implementing Regulation of the Financial Mechanism 2014-2021 of the European Economic Area, the projects that involve investments (including restoration) made into real estate and/or land (including restoration) must be kept continued for at least five years after the final report of the project has been approved and the real estate and/or land must be used for the purpose intended for the aid allocated for the project. Realism of fulfilling this requirement is evaluated, giving preference to the projects that are able to show an even longer period of duration. The evaluation is given based on the information contained in the application (social and institutional sustainability) and financial analysis (economic sustainability).

*Points given in the range 0–5 – level of points (0, 3, 5).*

0 points – The applicant has not planned the potential sources of financing for managing of the building or continuing the planned use of it after the end of the project or they are clearly unrealistic. The internal structures of the applicant that allow steady continuation of the activities have not been set.

3 points – The applicant has planned the potential sources of financing for managing of the building and continuing the planned use of it for at least five years after the end of the project. The internal structures of the applicant that allow steady continuation of the activities have been set. There is no connection to the development plan (or any other development document) of the local municipality in

<p>support of keeping the building in use at the given location. Follow-up activities for the continuation of use of the building after the mandatory five-year period have not been described or they are not realistic.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – The plan for the continuation of the new use of the building has been planned with sufficient detail and as such it is highly likely that it will be realised. Both the internal structures of the applicant that allow steady continuation of the activities and the development plan (or any other development document) of the local municipality support keeping the building in use at the given location. Convincing justification has been highlighted, based on which it can be presumed that using the building for the same purpose will be continued after the mandatory five-year period.</p>	
<p><b>1.4 Financial capability of the applicant</b></p> <p>Evaluation is given on the applicant’s capability to carry out the project, including availability of self-financing. If the necessary funds exist or if realistic sources for acquiring them have been planned (loan, support from other investors). Evaluation is based on the information contained in the financial analysis and certificates attached to the application (e.g. bank confirmation regarding eligibility to loan, investor’s confirmation, budget strategy of the local municipality, confirmation of the council etc.).</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–5 – level of points (0, 3, 5).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The applicant’s financial capability is not sufficient in order to ensure financing of the activities set out in the project and ensuring sustainability of the project results. The applicant lacks financial means or opportunities to include additional financial means to carry out the investments foreseen in the project and ensure sustainability of the results.</p> <p><u>3 points</u> – The applicant’s financial capability is generally satisfactory in order to ensure financing of the activities set out in the project and ensuring sustainability of the project outcomes is probable. It is probably possible for the applicant to include additional financial means for carrying out the investments foreseen in the project plan.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – The applicant’s financial capability is sufficient in order to ensure financing necessary for carrying out the activities set out in the project and sustainability of the project results. The applicant is sufficiently capable to ensure increase in the value of self-financing and covering of the non-eligible costs.</p>	<b>5</b>
<p><b>1.5 Quality of the budget</b></p> <p>The quality of the budget, including justification of the cost articles is evaluated. Evaluation is based on the information and budget contained in the application form and financial analysis.</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–6 – level of points (0, 3, 6).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The budget is poor; it is not realistic or optimal for carrying out the activities or contains excessive or unnecessary expenses. The expense articles are</p>	<b>6</b>

<p>not realistic and not sufficiently justified. The calculation of the construction price is unclear.</p> <p><u>3 points</u> – The budget is realistic in order to carry out the activities, but all expenses are not sufficiently justified, or the budget is not detailed enough. Calculation of the construction price is understandable, but the price is indicative (e.g. based on the average price per m<sup>2</sup>).</p> <p><u>6 points</u> – The budget is realistic, optimal and sufficient for carrying out the activities. The possible need for additional funding has been taken into account. The expense articles are justified and realistic and related to the goal and expected results. The budget has been presented with sufficient detail. All the necessary services have been planned. Calculation of the construction price is understandable or there is the principal building design documentation available, based on which, price quotations have been requested.</p>	
<p><b>1.6 Rate of co-financing</b></p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–4 – level of points (0, 2, 4).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – co-financing rate of the project is 20%</p> <p><u>2 points</u> –co-financing rate of the project is 21% – 30%</p> <p><u>4 points</u> –co-financing rate of the project is over 30%</p>	<b>4</b>
<p><b>Criterion 2: The building, its impact in the urban environment and impact of the function on the heritage conservation area</b></p>	<b>30</b>
<p><b>2.1 Location of the building in the urban environment</b></p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–10 – level of points (0, 5, 10).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The building is not located in a visible location in the urban environment, it is, for example a building in the yard and its restoration has not impact on the surrounding public space. The building is not located where its restoration would have a significantly improving effect on the surrounding urban environment.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – The building is located in a visible place in the heritage conservation area and its restoration has a significant visual impact on the surrounding urban environment.</p> <p><u>10 points</u> – The building is located in a very visible place in urban environment in the heritage conservation area and its restoration has a significant visual impact on the surrounding urban environment. The building is located at the competition area of a central square or central street that was an object in the (successfully carried out) competition ‘Good Public Space’ of the Estonian Association of Architects or at an adjacent property.</p>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>2.2 Cultural value of the building</b></p>	<b>5</b>

<p>The cultural value of the building is evaluated.</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–5 – level of points (0, 3, 5).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The building is not a cultural monument or a building characteristic of the heritage conservation area of the location, instead it is a building that is not characteristic to its location or is unsuitable for the heritage conservation area (e.g. a utility building).</p> <p><u>3points</u> – The building is not a cultural monument but is a building characteristic of the heritage conservation area of the location or a building of outstanding architectural value, or the project ensures restoring of the original appearance of the building of outstanding architectural value (but modified through rebuilding).</p> <p><u>5points</u> – The building is a cultural monument.</p>	
<p><b>2.3 Impact of the planned use of the building on the heritage conservation area</b></p> <p>Evaluation is given based on the application and preliminary design project.</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–15 – level of points (0, 5, 10, 15).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The new function of the building does not bring new users to the heritage conservation area, the use of the building continues in the same volume or attracting new users is not realistic.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – The new function of the building may bring a few new users to the heritage conservation area. The preliminary design project and the application show that the building is not engaged with the neighbourhood and does not have a positive impact on the use of the surrounding urban environment.</p> <p><u>10 points</u> – The planned function will probably bring new users to the heritage conservation area and will thereby enliven the heritage conservation area. The preliminary design project and the application show that the building is engaged with the neighbourhood and has a positive impact on the use of the surrounding urban environment.</p> <p><u>15 points</u> – The planned function will most probably bring many new users to the heritage conservation area, will enliven the heritage conservation area and has thereby a significant impact on the surrounding urban environment. Carrying the project out will diversify the old town functionally or will help to enliven an underused street or improve the logistic connections of the public space of the city centre. The preliminary design project and application show that the building is engaged with the outdoor space, and the indoor and outdoor space as well as their cohesion have been considered when planning the use.</p>	<p><b>15</b></p>
<p><b>Criterion3: Share of public use of and access to the building</b></p>	<p><b>20</b></p>

<p><b>3.1 Share of public use of the building</b></p> <p>Evaluation is given based on the application and preliminary design project.</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–15 – level of points (0, 5, 10, 15).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u>– The rate of public use of the building is 50% of the usable floor space of the building.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – The rate of public use of the building is 51%–65% of the usable floor space of the building.</p> <p><u>10 points</u> – The rate of public use is 66–80% of the usable floor space of the building.</p> <p><u>15 points</u> – The rate of public use is at least 81% of the usable floor space of the building.</p>	<p><b>15</b></p>
<p><b>3.2 Access to the building</b></p> <p>Evaluation is given to the availability of access of the building for different user groups after it has been taken into use, considering the fact that the large proportion of the society are children, seniors, people with special needs and other groups with limited access. A good solution will allow access to the building as well as services provided in it. Evaluation is given based on the application and preliminary design project.</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 1–5 – level of points (1, 3, 5).</i></p> <p><u>1 point</u> – During the planning of the use of the building and preparation of the preliminary design project, no attention has been paid to the needs of different user groups. The planned physical environment is not easily accessible or is accessible only to some user groups and during the planning of the function of the building (the planned service, information environment created around it) access to the service has not been considered.</p> <p><u>3 points</u> –During the planning of the use of the building and preparation of the preliminary design project, the needs of different user groups have been considered. The planned physical environment is, with respect to the public space, at least partially accessible to more than one user group. When planning the function of the building (the planned service, information environment created around it) the access to the service has been considered.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> –During the planning of the use of the building and preparation of the preliminary design project, sufficient attention has been paid to the needs of different user groups, due to which the planned physical environment is, with respect to the public space, easily accessible to more than one user group, including people with special needs and other groups with limited access. When planning the physical and information environment of the building, convenient use of the space,</p>	<p><b>5</b></p>

<p>easy access to the building, into the building and to the service provided there and to using the service has been taken into account.</p>	
<p><b>Criterion 4: Pre-project rate of use and technical condition of the building</b></p> <p>Evaluation is given on how the use of the building will increase and the technical condition improve as compared to the current status. Evaluation on the technical condition of the cultural monument is given based on the data of the National Registry of Cultural Monuments (<a href="https://register.muinas.ee/">https://register.muinas.ee/</a>).</p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–10 – level of points (0, 1, 5, 10).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – The building is in use and in good or satisfactory technical condition and only requires repairs.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – The building is in use or seasonal use and satisfactory technical condition for the most part. In case of a cultural monument, the assessment in the Registry of Cultural Monuments is ‘good’.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – For the most part, the building is not in use with respect to the rooms and/or year. The building is in poor technical condition but is not directly hazardous or is hazardous only in certain parts/locations of the building. In case of a cultural monument, the assessment in the Registry of Cultural Monuments is ‘satisfactory’. The planned function extends the use of the building by year, i.e. the period of use is extended significantly.</p> <p><u>10 points</u> – The project aims at taking into use a building that has been empty / unused. The building is in a bad or broken-down condition. The building is hazardous and/or a respective prescription has been issued for the building. In case of a cultural monument, the assessment in the Registry of Cultural Monuments is ‘bad’ or ‘hazardous’. The planned function extends the use of the building by year, i.e. the period of use is extended significantly.</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>
<p><b>Criterion 5: Participation of partners in planning and carrying out of the project</b></p> <p><i>Points given in the range 0–10 – level of points (0, 5, 7, 10).</i></p> <p><u>0 points</u> – No partners from the Kingdom of Norway, Republic of Iceland or Principality of Liechtenstein, Estonia or another beneficiary country or Russia have been involved in the planning and carrying out of the project.</p> <p><u>5 points</u> – Partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway, Republic of Iceland or Principality of Liechtenstein, a partner from Estonia and/or another beneficiary country or Russia have been involved in the planning and/or carrying out of the project, but the confirmation letter of the partner and/or project does not reveal a clear understanding of the role(s) of the partner(s) in the achievement of the goal.</p> <p><u>7 points</u> – Partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway, Republic of Iceland or Principality of Liechtenstein, Estonia or another beneficiary country or</p>	<p><b>10</b></p>

<p>Russia have been involved in the planning and/or carrying out of the project. The letter of intent of the partner(s) regarding participation in the planning and/or carrying out of the project is attached to the application and the confirmation letter and/or project elaborates sufficiently on the role(s) of the partner(s) and the planned result of the partnership. The project foresees the partnership with co-operation in one activity or for a limited time of the project period.</p> <p><u>10 points</u> – Partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway, Republic of Iceland or Principality of Liechtenstein, Estonia or another beneficiary country or Russia have been involved in the planning and/or carrying out of the project. The letter of intent of the partner(s) regarding participation in the planning and/or carrying out of the project is attached to the application and the confirmation letter and/or project elaborates sufficiently on the clear role(s) of the partner(s) and the planned result of the partnership. The project foresees the partnership with cooperation throughout the project period and in several activities.</p>	
<p><b>Maximum general score</b></p>	<p><b>100</b></p>

I have read the guidelines to the Expert Evaluation Sheet.

Signature of the expert  
(digitally signed)