

**Guide to the expert evaluation sheet**

Evaluation criteria	Maximum score
<p><b>1. Justification of the project, incl. project objective and suitability of activities for achieving the stated goals</b></p>	<p><b>7</b></p>
<p>1.1. Justification and objective of the project</p> <p>Project compliance with the conditions for granting support and its suitability for achieving the goals and results set out in chapter 5 of the Rules shall be evaluated.</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> – it can be assumed based on the description of the project goals that the project contributes to the adoption of approaches and methods based on restorative justice and awareness-raising on the topic. The applicant has clearly justified why the activities are intended for the specific target group (e.g. institutions for children and youth, social, child protection and youth work, police, prosecutor’s office, courts, probation supervision, closed institutions, including prison, or the wider society). The goals established as well as the justifications provided are relevant and sufficient, giving reason to believe that the project supports achieving the goals of the call for applications.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the description of the project goals and justification of the selected target groups give reason to assume that the project has a certain positive impact on the adoption of approaches and methods based on restorative justice and awareness-raising on the topic, however, the description is at times too general or its content is somewhat dubious to suggest that the project might not achieve the goals of the call for applications in the best possible manner.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the description of the project goals and the justification of the selected target groups is inadequate or insufficient to assess the positive impact of the project on the goals of the call for applications.</p>	<p>4</p>
<p>1.2. Suitability of activities for achieving the stated goals</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> – it can be assumed based on the activities selected that the goals of the project are very likely to be achieved. The applicant has clearly justified why these activities are the most suitable for fulfilling the project goals. The applicant has clearly described how the planned activities were determined.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – the description of the proposed activities gives reason to assume that they have a certain positive impact on the goals of the project. However,</p>	<p>3</p>

<p>at times the description is too general or associations with the goals of the project are somewhat dubious leaving room for doubt whether the proposed activities will best contribute to the objectives of the project.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the description of the proposed activities is inadequate or insufficient to suggest their positive impact on the goals of the project.</p>	
<p><b>2. Activity plan of the project, consideration and involvement of target groups</b></p>	<p><b>17</b></p>
<p>2.1. Comprehensiveness, relevance and feasibility of the activity plan of the project</p> <p>As a result of the funded project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at least 10 trainers in the theory or practice of restorative justice have been trained</li> </ul> <p>and/or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at least one intervention based on restorative justice has been created/adapted and implemented</li> </ul> <p>and/or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- at least one awareness-raising campaign has been carried out on restorative justice<sup>1</sup>.</li> </ul> <p><i>The scores are given in the range of 9–0 – score level (9, 6, 3, 0).</i></p> <p><u>9 points</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>all planned activities</b> aim to <b>achieve</b> the objective of the project as <b>efficiently</b> as possible;</li> <li>• the activity plan reveals the content of the activities to be carried out as part of the project in <b>high detail</b>, the highlighted activities are <b>interlinked, logically sequenced</b> and <b>justified</b>;</li> <li>• the activities are feasible <b>within the planned timeframe</b> and the duration of the activities is <b>reasonable</b>;</li> <li>• there is a clear explanation as to how the <b>results of the project</b> will be measured and their impact assessed.</li> </ul> <p><u>6 points</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>most</b> of the planned activities aim to <b>achieve</b> the objective of the project as <b>efficiently</b> as possible;</li> <li>• the activities of the project are <b>logically</b> sequenced and <b>interlinked</b>, but the activity plan is <b>sometimes superficial</b> and the content of some of the activities is not sufficiently revealed;</li> <li>• the project includes an activity or activities that is/are <b>under-scheduled or over-scheduled</b>;</li> <li>• there is a reference to how <b>project results</b> will be measured but the explanation remains unclear.</li> </ul>	<p>9</p>

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to article 2.1 of the conditions and procedures for implementing and granting support for the small project call for applications “Developing restorative justice measures in Estonia”, awareness-raising includes activities and information materials in various formats, targeted on raising the awareness of specialists, specific target groups or the general public on the topic of restorative justice.

<p><u>3 points</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the activities of the project are logically sequenced and interlinked, but the <b>activity plan is too general</b>, the content of the activities is not sufficiently revealed;</li> <li>there are project activities that are <b>under-scheduled or over-scheduled</b> and/or the project has also planned <b>unnecessary activities</b> and/or activities that are essential to the achievement of the objectives of the project have been planned <b>in an unreasonable amount</b>;</li> <li>there is a reference to keeping <b>project statistics</b>, but no plan for measuring results or impact.</li> </ul> <p><u>0 points</u> – the activity plan of the project has significant shortcomings: the activity plan does not reveal the content of the activities to be carried out and/or the timeframe is unrealistic and/or it remains unclear how the proposed activities will contribute to the achievement of the project objectives or how the results will be evaluated.</p>	
<p>2.2. Considering the target group<sup>2</sup> during planning/implementation of 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 proposed activities will best contribute to the objectives of the call for applications.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the description of the needs of the target group and/or problems considered in the planning/implementation of the proposed activities give reason to assume that the planned activities have a certain positive impact on the goals of the call for applications, however, the description is at times too general or its content is somewhat dubious to suggest that the proposed activities will best contribute to the objectives of the call for applications.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the description of the needs/problems of the target group is insufficient to assess the positive impact of the proposed activities on the objectives of the call for applications.</p>	4
<p>2.3. Methods of involving participants in training courses and interventions and/or target groups of awareness campaigns</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 methods of involving participants in training courses and interventions and/or target groups of the campaign to actively participate in</p>	4

<sup>2</sup> The goal of the call for applications is to popularise the approaches, interventions and methods based on restorative justice in institutions for children and youth, social, child protection and youth work, the police, the prosecutor's office, courts, criminal probation services, closed institutions, including prisons, or in the wider community.

<p>the project activities (including meaningful participation in activities) are relevant and clearly described in the application.</p> <p><u>2 points</u> – the methods of involving participants in training courses and interventions and/or target groups of the campaign to actively participate in the project activities are reflected in a way that is unclear and/or too superficial.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the methods of involving participants in training courses and/or target groups of the campaign have not been included in the project application.</p>	
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

<p><b>3. Background, competence and involvement of team members in project activities and involvement of partners, incl. partners from donor countries</b></p>	<p><b>14</b></p>
<p>3.1. Relevant competencies, field knowledge and experiences of the project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and/or introducer(s) of the methods</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. The project team may include experts from Estonia, the Kingdom of Norway, another beneficiary country<sup>3</sup> or Russia.</p> <p><i>The relevant competencies of the project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and introducer(s) of the methods shall be evaluated according to the criteria below in such a way that compliance with one criterion shall provide one point.</i></p> <p><b>A maximum of 6 points</b> can be awarded as part of a single application when evaluating the competencies of the project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and introducer(s) of methods.</p> <p><b>NB: if the application contains activities for creating and carrying out both training courses as well as methods, the points for the competencies of the training provider(s) and author(s) and introducer(s) of the methods shall be added up and this sum shall be divided by two. The project manager’s points shall be then added to this sum.</b></p> <p><b><u>Project manager has:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) experience in managing a similar project (in terms of the scope of activities and the tasks of the project manager) (1 point);</li> <li>2) experience in managing a project related to the topic of restorative justice, creation and implementation of a training course or method within the last 5 years (2015–2020) (1 point);</li> <li>3) experience in managing a Norwegian Financial Mechanism or EU</li> </ol>	<p>6 (3+3)</p>

<sup>3</sup> In accordance with article 14.3 of the conditions and procedures for granting support for the implementation of the open call for applications “Development of restorative justice measures in Estonia”, the beneficiaries are (in addition to Estonia) Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia.

<p>Structural Fund project (1 point).</p> <p><b><u>(At least one) training provider has:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) experience in implementing an approach or method based on restorative justice within the last 3 years (2017–2020) (1 point);</li> <li>2) experience in carrying out at least 5 training courses (1 point);</li> <li>3) experience in carrying out at least 1 training course on restorative justice within the last 3 years (2017–2020) (1 point).</li> </ol> <p><b><u>(At least one) adaptor/author or introducer of the method has:</u></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) at least 3 years of experience in using an approach or method based on restorative justice (1 point);</li> <li>2) had a leading role in the adaptation or creation and implementation of a method (2 points).</li> </ol>	
<p>3.2. Involvement of the project team, i.e. project manager, training provider(s) and/or author(s) and introducer(s) of the methods 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 described.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – the project team has been defined, the roles and responsibilities of the project team have been either vaguely or only partly described.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – the project team is either partially undefined or the roles and responsibilities of the project team have not been described.</p>	2
<p>3.3. Involvement of partner(s) from the Kingdom of Norway 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> – partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway has/have been involved in the planning and implementation of the project. The confirmation letter of the partner(s) concerning the planning and implementation of the project has been attached to the submitted application and the confirmation letter and the project exhaustively explain the clear role(s) of partner(s).</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – partner organisation(s) from the Kingdom of Norway have been involved in the planning and implementation of the project, however, there is no clear understanding of the role(s) of partner(s) in achieving the project goal in the partner's confirmation letter and/or the project.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – partner from the Kingdom of Norway has not been involved in the planning and/or implementation of the project.</p>	3

<p>3.4. Involvement of Estonian and/or other beneficiary countries or Russian partner(s) in the planning and implementation of the project</p> <p>The scores are given in the range of 3–0 – score level (3, 1, 0).</p> <p><u>3 points</u> – a partner from Estonia and/or other beneficiary country or Russia has been involved in the planning and implementation of the project. The confirmation letter of the partner(s) concerning the planning and implementation of the project has been attached to the submitted application and the confirmation letter and/or the project explain(s) the clear role(s) of partner(s).</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – partner from Estonia and/or other beneficiary country or Russia has been involved in the planning and implementation of the project, however, there is no clear understanding of the role(s) of partner(s) in achieving the project goal in the partner’s confirmation letter or the project.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – no partners from Estonia or other beneficiary country or Russia have been involved in the planning and implementation of the project.</p>	<p>3</p>
<p><b>4. Communication</b></p>	<p><b>5</b></p>
<p>4.1. Relevance of outreach 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 outreach activities of the project 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 outreach 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>	<p>2</p>
<p>4.2. Awareness campaign</p> <p>An awareness campaign includes activities and information materials in various formats which are targeted on raising the awareness of specialists, specific target groups or the general public on the topic of restorative justice.</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 planned awareness campaign is well thought out, innovative and realistic. Justification has been provided on why these activities best convey the message of restorative justice, ensure media coverage of the topic and help raise awareness.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – the planned awareness campaign is generally thought out, but only focuses on a narrow target group; the selection of methods and target groups has not been justified.</p>	<p>3</p>

<p><u>0 points</u> – an awareness campaign has not been included in the project or it is not thought out.</p>	
<p><b>5. Sustainability and innovation of the project</b></p>	<p><b>10</b></p>
<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><b>NB: the evaluation of the feasibility of the activities from the point of view of follow-up funding is provided separately in article 5.2.</b></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. In the method-testing project application, the plan for the continuation of the intervention has been 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. The method-testing project application does not plan the continuation of the method in sufficient detail to unambiguously evaluate the feasibility of the project, however, the further dissemination of the experience and results gained during the project and/or follow-up action(s) in support of the project objective have been planned.</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>4</p>
<p>5.2. Perspective of the follow-up financing of the project activities after the expiry of the Norwegian 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 intervention) 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 intervention) after the end of the project or these are clearly unrealistic.</p>	<p>2</p>
<p>5.3. Innovation and added value of the project</p>	<p>4</p>

<p><i>The scores are given in the range of 4–0 – score level (4, 2, 0).</i></p> <p><b>4 points</b> – the project identifies at least one innovative element that is likely to bring added value to the objectives of the call for applications of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism in expanding the use of approaches and methods based on restorative justice.</p> <p><b>2 points</b> – the project identifies at least one (partially) innovative element that can bring some added value to the objectives of the call for applications of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism in expanding the use of approaches and methods based on restorative justice.</p> <p><b>0 points</b> – the project does not identify any innovative elements that could give added value to the objectives of the call for applications of the Norwegian Financial Mechanism in expanding the use of approaches and methods based on restorative justice or the added value does not appear in the project description.</p>	
<p><b>6. Economic efficiency and co-financing of the project</b></p>	<p><b>9</b></p>
<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> <p><b>6 points</b> – 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 resourced and the planned costs are based on actual market prices.</p> <p><b>4 points</b> – 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><b>2 points</b> – 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><b>0 points</b> – 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><b>6</b></p>
<p>6.2. Consideration of co-financing</p> <p><i>For central and local government institutions there is no mandatory minimum co-financing rate, for non-governmental organisations the co-financing shall amount to a minimum of 10% of the eligible costs and to all other applicants</i></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>

<p><i>it is a minimum of 15% for other applicants. Volunteering 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 the co-financing.</p> <p><u>1 point</u> – ways and means to cover co-financing are superficially described.</p> <p><u>0 points</u> – there are no further explanations of how to cover co-financing.</p>	
<p><b>7. Risk factors</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>
<p>7.1. Assessment and mitigation of risk factors</p> <p>The risk categories specified in the application form shall be assessed.</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> – 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, mitigation activities have not been planned for all identified risks or the 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>	<p>3</p>
<p><b>Maximum general score</b></p>	<p><b>65</b></p>