

Annex No. 4 – SELECTION CRITERIA

Development Programme

Call No. 2

BASIC DATA

Registration No.:	
Applicant:	
Project name:	
Location where the project is being implemented (NUTS III – district):	
Requested amount (subsidy):	CZK ____

Methodology for awarding points

The Selection Criteria are divided into an Applicant's Economic Evaluation and a evaluation conducted by an external evaluator (compliance with strategic objectives, the applicant's experience and professional qualifications, the project's technical solution, sustainability (ensured sales of production)).

Selection criteria – the technical portion is divided into sections and sub-sections. Each sub-section can be evaluated from zero to the number of points specified in the "Score" column. Points marked with "+" in sub-sections 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.2 and 3.3 shall be summarised within a given sub-section.

The sum of the sub-sections represents the total score for a given section. Points awarded in different sections shall be listed in section 7 and their sum shall represent the project's total evaluation.

Each section allows for comments on scores in a given section. Comments for each section shall be provided. The evaluator shall specify the reasons behind the scoring in each sub-section's comments. The space for comments can be expanded if necessary.

1. Applicant's economic evaluation – to be filled by CzechInvest

1. Applicant's economic evaluation	Score	Information source												
<p>1.1 The applicant's rating</p> <p>The applicant's rating includes the applicant's evaluation as of the date of the application based on a two-year history (the two most recent closed accounting periods according to tax returns) and the current quarter. It is designed to reflect the applicant's actual financial and non-financial situations during the monitored period.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="188 499 1050 728"> <thead> <tr> <th>Rating</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B+</td> <td>12</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B-</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C+</td> <td>3</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Rating	Score	A	15	B+	12	B	9	B-	6	C+	3	/ 15	Financial statements (FS)
Rating	Score													
A	15													
B+	12													
B	9													
B-	6													
C+	3													
<p>1.2 An evaluation of the applicant's relationships to other economically related entities</p> <p>This sub-section evaluates entities within an economically connected group (parent companies, subsidiaries and other entities) and their relationships to problematic entities (negative information such as bankruptcy, winding up, execution, debtors) and the importance of these occurrences.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="188 963 1050 1155"> <thead> <tr> <th>The applicant's relationships</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Comply</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Comply with reservations</td> <td>3</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Do not comply</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	The applicant's relationships	Score	Comply	6	Comply with reservations	3	Do not comply	0	/ 6					
The applicant's relationships	Score													
Comply	6													
Comply with reservations	3													
Do not comply	0													
<p>1.3 An economic and financial evaluation of the project's feasibility</p> <p>The project's financial feasibility is aimed at the project itself and its feasibility, namely with respect to the use of the applicant's own resources (including credits) to finance the project. It assess whether a submitted project's expenses are based on reality (the formation of operative CF).</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="188 1388 1050 1545"> <thead> <tr> <th>The project's feasibility</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Complies</td> <td>9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Complies with reservations</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Does not comply</td> <td>0</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	The project's feasibility	Score	Complies	9	Complies with reservations	4	Does not comply	0	/ 9	The project's financial feasibility (PFF)				
The project's feasibility	Score													
Complies	9													
Complies with reservations	4													
Does not comply	0													
<p>Total score:</p>	/ 30													

Note:

1. If an applicant is rated below C+, the project shall be excluded from further evaluation.

Filled out by: _____ Date: __/__/2009

2. Compliance with strategic objectives	Score	Information source
2.1 The project's impact on employment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increasing employment levels +5 p. ▪ Maintaining existing levels of employment +1 p. 	/ 6	Business plan (BP), full application (FA),
2.2 Compliance with horizontal priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The project pursues sustainable development +1 p. ▪ The project maintains equal opportunities +1 p. 	/ 2	BP, FA
2.3 The project's benefits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Decreasing waste per production unit +3 p. ▪ Decreasing emissions per production unit +3 p. ▪ Decreasing energy consumption per production unit +3 p. 	/ 9	BP, FA
Total score:	/ 17	
Comments:		

3. The applicant's experience and professional qualifications	Score	Information source
<p>3.1 Does the applicant have any experience in the area for which the project is submitted?</p> <p>For each uninterrupted year of active existence on the market under the given NACE under which the project is being submitted 0.5 p</p>	/ 4	BP Company's history chapter
<p>3.2 Do the applicant and its management have sufficient professional qualifications and experience with the implementation of projects of a similar scope?</p> <p>(QMS ISO 9001, EMS ISO 14001, OHSAS 18001, HACCP certificates, implemented technological projects)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provided diplomas, certificates +3 p ▪ Provided information about the implementation of technological projects of a similar scope +1 p. ▪ Not specified 0 p. 	/ 4	BP Implemented projects chapter
<p>3.3 The company's future outlook</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The company has a identified a realistic future development strategy +2p ▪ The company has a realistically defined SWOT analysis +1 p. ▪ The company operates on the market with the prospect of additional growth +1 p. 	/ 4	BP
<p>3.4 The project supports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The production of company's own products with a higher added value +4 p. ▪ The production of company's own products +1 p. 	/ 4	BP, FA
<p>Total score:</p>	/ 16	
<p>Comments:</p>		

4. The project's technical solution	Score	Information source
<p>4.1 A comparison of the existing and the proposed technology (How significant is the technological gain? Is it state-of-the-art technology? Is it adequate for the submitted project?)</p>	/ 15	BP
<p>4.2 To what extent are the expenses proposed for the project's implementation necessary?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project's budget is sufficiently detailed and is adequately informative 5 p. - The project's budget is sufficiently detailed but it is not documented with price proposals 3 p. - There are serious doubts about the project's budget 0 p. <p>Note: The above values (5, 0) are boundary and the specific score awarded by an external evaluator shall be within the range. The following expenses are necessary for the project's implementation (specify):</p>	/ 5	BP
Total score:	/ 20	
Comments:		

5. Sustainability (ensured production sales)	Score	Information source
<p>5.1. To what extent will the project's implementation positively affect the applicant's business activities? Evaluated pursuant to the increase in the sale of the applicant's own products and receipts from the sale of goods in the year following the project's finalisation and receipts for the last closed fiscal period before the project was implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase in sales by 20% and more 5 p. - Increase in sales by 10%, but less than 20% 3 p. - Increase in sales by less than 10% 1 p. 	/ 5	<p>BP A table showing the development of basic indicators</p>
<p>5.2. The stability of consumers' portfolios (ensured sales)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The average duration of the applicant's relationship with key consumers¹ is more than 24 months 5 p. - The average duration of the applicant's relationship with key consumers is between 12 and 24 months 3 p. - The average duration of the applicant's relationship with key consumers is less than 12 months 1 p. 	/ 5	<p>BP An overview of consumer relationships</p>
<p>5.3. The marketability of the production The quality and conclusive evidence provided in the business plan, the marketing strategy defining the forms of distribution, competitive advantages and disadvantages and threats, etc. are evaluated.</p>	/ 4	<p>BP</p>
<p>5.4. The project's impact on the competitiveness of the company (a comparison of the assumption in the PB and possible impacts)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project's benefits at the international level 3 p. - The project's benefits at the national level 2 p. - The project's benefits at the regional and local levels 1 p. 	/ 3	<p>BP</p>
<p>Total score:</p>	/ 17	
<p>Comments:</p>		

¹ Key consumer means one or two consumers who jointly take at least 75% of the applicant's production

6. The sum scores awarded by an external evaluator and recommendation	Score
2. Compliance with strategic objectives	/ 17
3. The applicant's experience and professional qualifications	/ 16
4. The project's technical solution	/ 20
5. Sustainability (ensured production sales)	/ 17
Total:	/ 70

Reasons for recommending:	Reasons for rejecting :
---------------------------	-------------------------

Place:

Signature:

Date:

Total score (to be filled out by CzechInvest):

1 The applicant's economic evaluation	/ 30
Σ (2- 5). Evaluation by an external evaluator (The average of two external evaluators)	/ 70
GRAND TOTAL	/ 100