Assessment Sheet (V. 29.11.2021)
Market Access
Swiss MEDIA Compensating Measures

### INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT

Title of the proposal:	
Expert name:	

### The Access to Market scheme - Targeted projects

The Swiss MEDIA compensating measures encourage Access to Markets actions taking place in and outside Switzerland.

The operational objectives of the Access to Markets Support scheme are to facilitate business to business exchanges, having as expected results and impact:

- to improve the European/international dimension and effectiveness of existing large industry markets and to increase the systemic impact of smaller initiatives
- to encourage the deployment of innovative tools taking advantage of the opportunities created by developing digital technologies
- to increase the visibility of professionals and A/V works from European countries with a low production capacity and to enhance cultural diversity;
- to encourage the development of networks and increase the number of European co-productions and a greater diversification of talents and sources of funding;
- to improve the competitiveness and circulation of European A/V works on international markets;
- to ensure that Europe's AV industry is taking full advantage of digitisation;
- to foster talent, creativity and innovation.

Please note that this scheme is not intended to cater for the individual action(s) of a single company in support of their own products.

### Three types of actions can be supported

### Action 1. Business to business (physical) markets for European audiovisual professionals

Business-to-business actions aiming at improving the conditions governing access for European professionals, projects and works to professional audiovisual markets (on site and online) within and outside the countries participating in the MEDIA sub-programme such as co-production and financing initiatives and events and/or trade event and markets for finished works.

### • Action 2. Online tools encouraging business to business exchanges

- Creation and development of a database and/or a network of databases of European programmes and/or professionals of the audiovisual industry, intended for professionals.
- Creation and development of innovative online tools for the European A/V industry using the latest digital technologies and targeted at professionals.

The content of such actions shall be preferably made available in several European languages and at least in the English language. For clarity reasons, please note that VOD and digital cinema distribution platforms, digitisation of audiovisual works are excluded.

### Action 3. Business to business promotional activities of European works

- The implementation of business-to-business promotional activities within and outside the countries participating in the MEDIA sub-programme, organised by pan European networks or organisations representing at least 15 MEDIA countries, aimed at facilitating the distribution and circulation of European audiovisual and/or cinematographic works and the networking of European professionals.

## **Assessment**

An application can receive a maximum of 100 points for all criteria relevant for the action. It must reach a minimum of 70 points to be supported.

The assessment form is adapted depending on the type of action (also called "module"). Please make sure to fill in only the one which corresponds to the type of action of the project.

The questions in the assessment sheet are in English, but **please answer in the language of the application** (German, French or Italian) **if possible**. However, if this is not your mother tongue, you may also write in English.

ACTION 1 - Business to business (physical) markets for European audiovisual		
professionals		
1. Relevance and European added value	Max.	
1. Relevance of the content of the action including the innovative aspects and the International and European dimension vis-à-vis the objectives of the call for proposals and the needs of the industry	30	
1a) To what degree is the proposed action in line with the objectives of the call?	10	
Clarity and consistency of the action with regards to the objectives of the call		
1b) How well does it meet a <b>need of the industry</b> and include <b>innovative</b> aspects?	10	
<ul> <li>Adequacy to the needs of the industry</li> <li>Innovative aspects</li> </ul>		
1c) To which extent does it demonstrate a <b>clear added value</b> and a good <b>positioning</b> compared to similar activities and how do you evaluate its <b>European/international dimension</b> ?	10	•••
<ul> <li>Added value and quality of the positioning of the action</li> </ul>		
International / European dimension		

2. Quality of the content and activities	Max.	
2. Adequacy of the methodology to the objectives including the format, the target group, selection methods, synergy and collaboration with other projects, the tools including the use of digital technologies relevant to new business models, the feasibility and cost efficiency	30	
2a) How appropriate is the methodology  Adequacy of the methodology to the objectives taking into account  Choice of format/content/ target group  Tools including the use of digital technologies relevant to new business models  Strategy of selection of projects/ invitation of decision makers  Strategy to facilitate the distribution and circulation  Visibility of low production capacity professionals and/or works  Fostering of talent and creativity	10	
<ul> <li>2b) Is the proposed budget cost efficient and justified? Is there a strategy to raise co-financing and a business model?</li> <li>Global cost efficiency of the action taking into account         <ul> <li>Forecast budget in relation with the number of participants, projects and days</li> <li>Co-financing strategy</li> <li>Business model</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	
<ul> <li>2c) How do you evaluate the quality and the feasibility of the proposed action?</li> <li>Quality and feasibility taking into account consistency between budget, objectives and proposed content</li> <li>Relevance to existing synergies and collaboration within the A/V industry</li> </ul>	10	

3. Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	Max.	
3. Impact of the support on the financing, the international circulation and global audience of the projects and works and/or the structuring effect on the European audiovisual industry	30	
3a) How do you evaluate the <b>systemic impact</b> of the proposed action for the targeted projects and participants?	10	
Systemic impact for the targeted projects and participants, in terms of facilitation of co- production, financing, visibility, international circulation, global audience reach, based on  track record adequacy and level of assistance/follow up after the event		
3b) What are the prospects in terms of the <b>structuring effect</b> for the European A/V industry? In case of international action, what are the prospects for the European A/V industry within the targeted markets?	10	
<ul> <li>Effectiveness in terms of structuring effects on the European audiovisual industry</li> <li>Added value to help enter the targeted markets / reinforce the co-production/the international circulation.</li> </ul>		
3c) How well is demonstrated the <b>impact</b> on the A/V industry/professionals at an International and European level (including low production capacity countries and regional level)?	10	
<ul> <li>Impact and structuring effect at International, European level including low production capacity countries or regional level</li> </ul>		

4. Distribution of the roles and responsibilities of the team vis-à-vis the objectives of the action	
<ul> <li>4a) How relevant is the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the objectives of the action? In case of a multi-beneficiaries proposal: Is the role and added value of each member of the grouping clear and adequate?</li> <li>Relevance of the distribution of roles and responsibilities of team in the field of the action (i.e. event organisation/ technical experience/ audiovisual expertise/ digital expertise)</li> <li>In case of multi-beneficiaries: added value and clarity of role of each member of grouping.</li> </ul>	
TOTAL Points 100	

Evaluation summary / Reasons for recommendation	
<del></del>	

As an indication, would you recommend the rejection or the selection of the project? (please note that projects must reach the threshold of minimum 70 point out of 100 to be supported)

Recommendation for selection	
Recommendation for rejection	

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:

# 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, for example on the basis of the budget (please indicate which items you consider overestimated).

ACTION 2 - Online tools encouraging business to business exchanges		
1. Relevance and European added value	Max.	
1. Relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis a vis the objectives of the call for proposals	30	
<ul> <li>1a) The added-value of the project compared to the current situation of the audiovisual markets</li> <li>Are the objectives of the project clearly described?</li> <li>What is the added-value of the project in terms of innovative strategies for distributing and promoting European audiovisual works?</li> <li>How does the project address the complementarity between off-line and online distribution platforms and/or the transnational availability of European audiovisual works within the digital environment and/or new approaches to audience development in the digital age?</li> <li>What is the relevance of such developments regarding the objectives of the call for proposals?</li> </ul>	15	
<ul> <li>1b) European dimension of the audiovisual works and of the partnership, the cross-border and cross-language distribution.</li> <li>Is the European dimension of the project regarding the origin of the audiovisual works covered?</li> <li>Is the cross-border and cross-language distribution (subtitle/dubbing policy, partnerships, geo-blocking policy, targeted territories, etc.) satisfying?</li> </ul>	15	

2. Quality of the content and activities	Max.	
2. Adequacy of the methodology to the objectives and the business model, innovative aspects, the marketing strategy, the feasibility and cost-efficiency.	40	
<ul> <li>2a) The adequacy of the methodology to the objectives pursued by the project, including: the market analysis, the choice of distribution platforms and/or characteristics of the tools to be used, the target audience and target territories, the choice of audiovisual works, the timing of activities.</li> <li>Is the proposed methodology clearly described (choice of the distribution platforms covered, characteristics of the tools to be used, choice of the target audience and target territories, choice of audiovisual works, cooperation between the different segments of the value chain, list and timing of the activities)?</li> <li>Is the market analysis justifying this methodology satisfying?</li> <li>Is this methodology adequate to the objectives pursued by the project?</li> </ul>	15	
<ul> <li>2b) The quality, complementarities and innovative aspects of the project, including: promotion and marketing activities, new approaches to audience development, strategies to reach audiences on different distribution platforms and/or territories covered, strategies to build new synergies within the audiovisual industry, as well as the techniques and tools deployed</li> <li>Are the innovative aspects of the project clearly described?</li> <li>Does the project present interesting and innovative approaches that are coherent with the on-going evolution and the needs of the audiovisual markets?</li> <li>Are the proposed strategies adequate to the objectives pursued by the project?</li> </ul>	15	
<ul> <li>2c) The coherence of the business model, the feasibility and cost-efficiency of the project.</li> <li>Is the business model clearly described, coherent and realistic?</li> <li>Are the main challenges faced by the project clearly identified and efficiently addressed?</li> <li>Is the action cost-efficient in relation to the objectives to be reached?</li> </ul>	10	

3. Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	Max.	
3. Dissemination of the project's results in view of ensuring the share of information / transparency and the impact of the support on the potential audience of European audiovisual works and the strategies for developing the sustainability of the action.	20	•••
3a) The <b>impact</b> on the potential audience of European audiovisual works and/or the potential circulation's level of European audiovisual works.	5	
To what extent the project could improve the potential audience of European audiovisual works and/or the potential circulation's level of European audiovisual works?		
3b) The capacity to <b>improve the efficiency of relationships between the various sectors</b> of the European audiovisual industry (producers, distributors, sales agents, festivals, cinemas, VOD services, TV broadcasters)	5	
<ul> <li>To what extent the project could adapt the relationships between the various sectors of the European audiovisual industry in order to increase the audience/circulation of European audiovisual works in the digital environment?</li> </ul>		
3c) The methodology proposed for <b>collecting, analysing and disseminating data</b> in order to <b>share the results,</b> to guarantee the <b>transparency</b> of the project, to propose an <b>exchange of knowledge</b> and best practises.	10	
<ul> <li>Is the methodology for collecting, analysing and disseminating the results well developed and integrated in the project? To what extent would it facilitate the spread of the good practices related to the project towards the whole industry?</li> </ul>		

4. Quality of the project team	Max.	
4. Distribution of the roles and responsibilities of the team vis a vis the objectives of the action	10	
<ul> <li>4a) Distribution of the roles and responsibilities of the team vis a vis the objectives of the action.</li> <li>Does the team bring an added value to the action?</li> <li>Are the coherence and complementarity of the team/partnership satisfying with regard to the tasks division, the decision making process, the exchange of knowledge?</li> </ul>	10	
TOTAL Points	100	

Evaluation summary / Reasons for recommendation	1

As an indication, would you recommend the rejection or the selection of the project?

Recommendation for selection	
Recommendation for rejection	

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:

## 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).

ACTION 3 - Business to business promotional activities of European wor	ks	
1. Relevance and European added value	Max.	
Relevance of the B2B promotional activity with regards to the objectives of the call, the added value in terms of visibility and circulation of European works on European and international markets as well as the innovation and deployment of digital	30	
1a) How <b>relevant</b> is the proposed business to business promotional activity with regards to the objectives of the call?	10	
Relevance of the business to business promotional activity with regards to the objectives of the call.		
1b) To which extent does it demonstrate a clear <b>added value</b> in terms of visibility and circulation of European works on European and international markets?	10	
Added value in terms of visibility and circulation of European works on European and international markets.		

1c) To which extent does it demonstrate <b>innovation</b> in the deployment of digital technologies?	10	
• Innovation in the deployment of digital technologies		
<ul> <li>Innovation in the deployment of digital technologies.</li> </ul>		
2. Quality of the content and activities	Max.	
2. Quality and feasibility, effectiveness of the strategy to reinforce the distribution and circulation	30	•••
of European works on European and international markets and the cost efficiency of the action		
2e) Herry officiality is the attractions and month adelegate facilitate the distribution and singulation of	10	
2a) How effective is the <b>strategy and methodology</b> to facilitate the distribution and circulation of European works on European and international markets, impact in terms of visibility of low	10	•••
production capacity professionals and/or works as well as fostering of talent and creativity?		
Effectiveness of the strategy and methodology to facilitate the distribution and circulation of		
European works on European and international markets, impact in terms of visibility of low		
production capacity professionals and/or works as well as fostering of talent and creativity.		
2b) Is the proposed <b>budget</b> cost efficient and justified taking into account the <b>co-financing</b> strategy in	10	
relation with the number of targeted projects and new market opportunities? Is there a strategy to		
raise co-financing and a business model?		
Cost efficiency of the action taking into account		
the forecast budget, including salaries for personnel and project management: consistency		
between budget allocated to the staff remuneration and the size and scope of the event		
(nature of activities proposed, number of participants, number of days, number of projects);		
the co-financing strategy in relation with the number of targeted projects and new market      analytic of target of financial system in the strategy to raise as		
opportunities, diversity of funds, financial sustainability and proactive strategy to raise co- financing.		
Business model		

<ul> <li>2c) How do you evaluate the quality and the feasibility of the proposed action?</li> <li>Quality and feasibility taking into account         <ul> <li>consistency between budget, objectives and impact</li> <li>relevance to existing synergies and collaborations within the A/V industry.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	10	:
3. Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	Max.	
3. Systemic impact in terms of increased visibility, circulation and audience reach, the effectiveness in terms of structuring effects on the European audiovisual	30	•••
3a) How do you evaluate the <b>systemic impact</b> of the proposed action for the targeted projects and participants?  Systemic impact for the targeted projects and participants, in terms of increased visibility, circulation, audience reach, based on:  • track record  • adequacy  • level of follow up	10	
participants?  Systemic impact for the targeted projects and participants, in terms of increased visibility, circulation, audience reach, based on:  • track record  • adequacy	10	

3c) How well is demonstrated the impact and structuring effects at European/international level including low production capacity countries or regional level?  • Impact and structuring effect at International, European level including low production capacity countries or regional level	10	

4. Organisation of the project team	Max.	
4. Distribution of the roles and responsibilities of the team vis-à-vis the objectives of the action	10	•••
<ul> <li>4a) How relevant is the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the objectives of the action? In case of a multi-beneficiaries proposal: Is the role and added value of each member of the grouping clear and adequate?</li> <li>Relevance of the distribution of roles and responsibilities of team in the field of the action (i.e. event organisation/ international expertise / audiovisual expertise/ digital expertise)</li> <li>In case of multi-beneficiaries: added value and clarity of role of each member of grouping.</li> </ul>	10	
TOTAL Points	100	•••

Evaluation summary / Reasons for recommendation	

As an indication, would you recommend the rejection or the selection of the project?		
Recommendation for selection		
Recommendation for rejection		
•		
For multi-year projects only: If you recommend the selection, is it for the whole multi-ye	ar project o	r for a shorter
period of time (e.g. single edition/year))?	ar project, c	i ioi a siloite
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:		
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).

#### 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.

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.

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.