

Please answer in the language of the application (German, French or Italian), if possible. However, if these are not your mother tongue, **you may also write in English.**

As **horizontal priorities**, we ask you to take into account the principles of a **more sustainable industry and of diversity**, either in the project/content or in the way of managing the activities (if applicable).

Experts are expected to give comments on each award criterion and, in their comments, refer explicitly to the elements of analysis under the relevant criterion. The comments on each award criterion have to reflect and justify the score given for it (there is an **explication of the scores range** at the end of this document).

At the end of the assessment, experts give overall comments on the application as a whole. In the comments, experts must provide a thorough analysis of the application highlighting its relative strengths and weaknesses.

| AWARD CRITERIA | Elements of analysis of award criteria relevant for all projects | Weighting of the criterion | Please write your text into this column. |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Relevance of the content of the activity vis-à-vis the needs and trends of the industry, international/European dimension, the level of innovation, partnerships with the audiovisual industry. | | |
| Relevance and European added value (maximum 30 points) | 1a) Relevance of the content of the activity including its international/European dimension vis-à-vis the objectives of the Call for proposals and the needs and trends of the industry. Aspects to be taken in consideration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity and consistency of the action with regards to the objectives of the Call. • Adequacy of the action with regards to the needs of the industry, especially regarding digital distribution, business creation and young audiences reach (if applicable) • European / international added value of the action | /15 | |

| | | | |
|----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | <p>1b) The level of innovation of the project in relation to the existing training offer.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity of the added value and quality of the unique positioning of the action compared to similar training actions | /10 | |
| | <p>1c) The co-operation between players from different groups of countries as well as the partnerships with the audiovisual industry.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of a financial partnership/co-financing from the audiovisual sector (public funds or private companies) • Evidence of any pedagogical partnerships the audiovisual industry, including with other training actions • Evidence of partnerships with festivals or coproduction markets within Europe and internationally • The participation of decisions makers at pitching sessions, organized at the end of a training and networking activity • Evidence of partnerships which facilitate the development, co-financing, circulation and exhibition of works. | /5 | |
| 2. | <p>Adequacy of the content and the methodology of the proposed action to the objectives (format, cost-effectiveness, integration of innovative aspects, target group).</p> | | |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--|
| Quality of the activities (maximum 40 points) | 2a) Adequacy of the content of the action, and the proposed methodology, and pedagogical approach to the specific type of action and to the target group. | /10 | |
| | <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of the subjects, skills taught and learning outcomes, mentoring activities • Adequacy of the content, methodology and pedagogical approach to the specific type of action and to the target group (size, type of professionals, level of skills and professionals experience) | | |
| | 2b) Adequacy of the format and participants, the selection procedure, the scholarship policy, the professional benefits and the long and short terms effects on the participants | /10 | |
| | <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of the format: duration, type and number of modules, workshops, one-to-one meetings, on-line sessions, on-line consulting, MOOC etc. • Adequacy of the participants (number of participants, professional profile, level of experience, specific targeted nationalities) and the professional benefits for participants, as well as the long and short term impact in their future professional career. • Adequacy of the promotion and the call for applications strategies. • Adequacy of the selection of participants process. • Adequacy of the scholarships' allocation* | | |

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | <p>policy and other ways of financial assistance provided to the participants.</p> <p>* = Scholarships should represent at least 10% of the total number of participants. They must be granted to participants coming from the following low capacity countries: Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Georgia, Hungary, Iceland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, North Macedonia, Republic of Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia and Ukraine or to participants being from a country not providing scholarships for this kind of training or participants in any other proven situation of need for financial support.</p> | | |
| | <p>2c) Cost-effectiveness of the proposed action.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Estimated budget for the number of participants, projects and days. • Adequacy of the budget in the context of the goals and benefits of the training action. • Allocated resources appropriate and justified according to market rates. | /10 | |
| | <p>2d) Adequacy of the integration of innovative aspects.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of latest technologies (especially digital promotion tools and data analytics) in the implementation of the action? • Level of innovation in the format and methodology of the action. | /5 | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Level of innovation in content development and storytelling (new formats for all platforms), talent development, access to finance | | |
| | <p>2e) Adequacy of the action to the reinforcing of the capacity of professionals from low production capacity countries</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequacy of the content of the action, the proposed methodology, the pedagogical approach. | /5 | |
| 3. | Mechanisms to disseminate good practice and results, impact (on participating professionals, single companies, the audiovisual sector, the digital distribution of works, on access to international networks and markets of individuals and companies). | | |
| Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability (maximum 20 points) | <p>3a) Adequacy of the mechanisms put in place to disseminate results beyond the action.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dissemination of project results Dissemination of good practice, business models and results beyond participants and follow up of projects and participants beyond the training. Adequacy of the follow up of the professional career of participants and development of selected projects, beyond the action. | /10 | |
| | <p>3b) Impact on participating professionals and on selected projects, on companies and on the audiovisual sector.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitation of networking and peer to peer collaboration Impact on individual learning outcomes, skills and career development Impact on projects (international co-production | /10 | |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|--|
| | <p>and circulation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on companies (development of business models and good practices) • Gained knowledge and accessibility to international markets and networks by the participating professionals • Increased competitiveness and growth of the European audiovisual industry | | |
| 4. | Quality of the team (in terms of international technical and pedagogical expertise) | | |
| Organisation of the project team (maximum 10 points) | <p>4a) The roles and responsibilities of the team.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevance of the distribution of roles and responsibilities of the team in the field of the action (i.e. event organisation/technical experience/audiovisual expertise). | /5 | |
| | <p>4b) The pedagogical expertise vis-à-vis the specific objectives of the training action.</p> <p>Aspects to be taken in consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedagogical expertise of trainers, experts, coaches and tutors involved in the action | /5 | |

| | | |
|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Total points | /100 | Threshold to be eligible for funding: 70 points (Depending on availability of budget) |
|---------------------|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Evaluation summary / Reasons for recommendation

Please give us five to seven positive and/or negative arguments which support the selection or rejection. These arguments should be in a form that can be given to the applicants as a justification of the decision. In a rejection obviously the negative arguments should prevail, but you may (and should) as well give positive aspects.

For multi-year projects only: If you recommend the selection, is it for the whole multi-year project, or for a shorter period of time (e.g. single edition/year)?

| | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Recommendation for selection for the whole multi-year project | |
| Recommendation for selection for a shorter period of time (please specify) | |

If you recommend the selection:

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| <p>Amount of support recommended by the expert The support recommended by the expert cannot be higher than the support requested by the applicant company. A reduced amount must be justified on the basis of the budget (please indicate which items you consider overestimated).</p> | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|

Scores

Within the maximum number of points per award criterion, ranges of scores are defined that correspond to a fixed definition of the expected quality standard so that an as coherent approach as possible is implemented, across experts as well as across actions. The score cannot include decimals. The standards on a **10 points scale** are as follows:

- 9-10 Very good – the application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question convincingly and successfully. The answer provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no concerns or areas of weakness.
- 7-8 Good – the application addresses the criterion well, although some small improvements could be made. The answer gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed.
- 5-6 Acceptable – the application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses. The answer gives some relevant information, but there are areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.
- 3-4 Fair – the application addresses the criterion, but there are many weaknesses. The answer gives some relevant information, but there are several areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.
- 1-2 Very weak – the application fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. The answer does not address the question asked, or gives very little relevant information.
- 0 No evidence – the application fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated. Experts should avoid "0" which relates to "no evidence". For obvious particular case, experts should contact MEDIA Desk Suisse.

N.B. Some criteria are to be rated on a **scale of 15 points or 25 points**. In those cases, you may find useful to use the standard scale and then multiply the score by the corresponding factor, further refine to the next whole number (if applicable). For example: 8/10 points in the standard scale corresponds to 12/15 (factor: x1.5) or 20/25 (factor: x2.5).