

Creative Europe – MEDIA Sub-Programme

GUIDE FOR EXPERTS

ON ASSESSMENT OF

PROMOTION OF EUROPEAN AUDIOVISUAL WORKS ONLINE

Call for proposals EACEA 23/2019

managed by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency

1. INTRODUCTION

The European Commission's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (the Agency) is responsible for the implementation of the Actions of the Creative Europe-MEDIA sub programme. The Agency is in charge of the selection of projects to be funded, it assesses projects with the assistance of independent experts to ensure that only those of the highest quality are selected for funding. Thus, the final decision on the selection or rejection of applications is taken by the Agency.

This Guide for Experts provides instructions and guidance for experts when assessing applications, in order to ensure a standardised and high quality assessment.

The Guide for Experts provides information on:

- the role and appointment of experts;
- the principles of the assessment;
- the assessment process in practice;
- information on how to assess the award criteria for each action and field.

2. THE MEDIA SUB-PROGRAMME: SUPPORT FOR ONLINE DISTRIBUTION

The general objectives of the MEDIA sub-programme of Creative Europe are to strengthen the competitiveness and distribution of the audiovisual industry in Europe and thus contribute to growth and jobs as well as to cultural and linguistic diversity.

The online environment represents a growing window of exposure for European works. Therefore, improving the presence, discoverability and attractiveness of European works online represents a key priority of the Creative Europe MEDIA sub-programme.

Within the specific objective of promoting transnational circulation, two of the priorities of the MEDIA Sub-programme shall be to:

- support transnational marketing, branding and distribution of audiovisual works on all other non-theatrical platforms;
- promote new distribution modes in order to allow the emergence of new business models.

The MEDIA Sub-programme shall provide support for the following measures:

- establishing systems of support for the distribution of non-national European films through theatrical distribution and on other platforms, as well as for international sales activities, in particular the subtitling, dubbing and audio description of audiovisual works;
- innovative actions testing new business models and tools in areas likely to be influenced by the introduction and use of digital technologies.

The Promotion of European Audiovisual Works Online scheme shall provide support to:

Action 1: Actions such as digital promotion, marketing, branding, tagging and development of new offers by existing VOD services offering a majority of European¹ films. The aim of the action is to improve the visibility, discoverability and global audience of European audiovisual works;

Action 2: Collaboration across borders between European VOD services;

Action 3: Innovative strategies and online tools for the circulation, distribution and promotion of European audiovisual works, including audience development initiatives focusing on innovative and participatory strategies reaching out to wider audiences with European films.

3. EXPERTS

3.1 Role of experts

The assessment and selection of grant applications is organised on the basis of impartiality and equal treatment of all applicants.

The role of experts allows providing a fair, impartial, and consistent assessment of project applications according to the objectives and the policy priorities of the Programme.

The assessment is a key part in the selection procedure. Based on the experts' assessment, a list of grant applications ranked in quality order is established, which serves as a basis for the Agency to take the grant award decision, following the proposal of the Evaluation Committee.

Based on the experts' comments, the Agency provides feedback to the applicants on the quality of their application (cf. section 4).

3.2 Appointment of experts, code of conduct and conflict of interest

Experts are appointed on the basis of their skills and knowledge in the areas and the specific field(s) of the audiovisual sector in which they are asked to assess applications.

To ensure their independence, the names of the experts are not made public.

Experts are required to perform the assessment to the highest professional standards and within the deadline agreed with the Agency.

Through the appointment by the Agency experts are bound to a code of conduct as set out in the appointment letter or contract with the expert.

All information related to the assessment process is strictly confidential. Therefore, experts are not allowed to disclose any information about the applications submitted and results of the assessment and selection to the public. They must not have a conflict of interest² in relation to

¹ 'European' refers to all countries participating in the MEDIA Sub-programme according to Article 8 of the Regulation establishing the Creative Europe Programme Regulation (EU) No 1295/2013.

² Financial Regulation Art. 57(2): « ... a conflict of interests exists where the impartial and objective exercise of the functions of a financial actor or other person, ..., is compromised for reasons involving family, emotional life, political or national affinity, economic interest or any other shared interest with a recipient.»

the proposals on which they are requested to give their opinion. To this end, they sign a confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration prior to beginning their work and adhere to it during and after the evaluation.

4. ASSESSMENT OF APPLICATIONS

4.1 Preparation for assessment

Before the start of the assessment, the experts are briefed by the Agency on the Programme and the action under assessment, as well as on the assessment process.

Experts are provided with the reference documents for the assessment and get access to the Online Evaluation Expert Tool (OEET), in which they perform the assessment using the standard quality assessment forms.

Before starting the assessment of applications, experts must:

- have a sound knowledge of the Support for Online Distribution Guidelines³ which provides all necessary information to potential applicants on the actions for which they can apply for a grant;
- have an in-depth understanding of the award criteria applicable to the applications under assessment (cf. section 4.3);
- be familiar with all the reference documents and tools provided by the Executive Agency.

Experts have to read the whole application carefully before completing the assessment form. It is recommended to read several applications before assessing any one of them in full: this allows experts to benchmark answers in different sections of the applications.

Each expert works individually and independently, gives scores and comments for each criterion and summarises his/her assessment in the assessment form.

The eligibility criteria are assessed by the Agency in the first phase of the selection process. Only eligible projects are sent to experts for evaluation. Each eligible project is sent to two experts for an independent evaluation.

4.2 Assessment forms

Experts carry out their assessment in English, using the Online Expert Evaluation Tool (OEET). The applications to be assessed as well as the evaluation forms are accessible through OEET. Experts are provided with technical instructions for the use of OEET by the Agency as part of their briefing.

Experts examine the issues to be considered under each award criterion, enter their scores for each applicable criterion and provide comments on each award criterion and on the application as a whole (cf. section 4.3).

³ https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/creative-europe/funding/promotion-european-works-online-eacea-302018_en

On completion of the assessment, experts validate the individual assessment in the Online Expert Evaluation Tool, thereby confirming that they have no conflict of interest with respect to the assessment of that particular proposal.

4.3 Assessment of award criteria and scoring

Experts assess applications only against the award criteria defined in the Guidelines. These award criteria are listed and further explained in Annex 1 of this Guide.

Each of the award criteria is defined through several elements which must be taken into account by experts when analysing an application. These elements form a list of points to be considered before giving a score for the given criterion. They are intended to help experts arrive at the final assessment of the criterion in question.

In order to give clear guidance to experts as to how individual elements of analysis should be assessed, further information is provided in the above mentioned annexe.

When assessing applications against award criteria experts make a judgement on the extent to which applications meet the defined criteria. This judgement must be based on the information provided in the application. Experts cannot assume information that is not explicitly provided. Information relevant for a specific award criterion may appear in different parts of the application and experts take all of them into account when scoring the award criterion.

An application can receive a maximum of 100 points for all criteria relevant for the action. The two tables below show the relative marks of each criterion:

Action 1: Support to Promotion, marketing and branding activities of VOD services

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
1	Relevance and European added value	This criterion evaluates the relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis-à-vis the objectives of the call for proposals.	40
2	Quality of the activities	This criterion evaluates the adequacy of the methodology to the objectives, the quality and coherence of the promotion and marketing strategies, the innovative aspects, the feasibility and cost-efficiency.	40
3	Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	This criterion assesses the impact of the support on the visibility and the audience of European audiovisual works and the strategies for developing the sustainability of the action.	15
4	Organisation of the project team and/or the grouping	This criterion will take into account the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the objectives of the action.	5

Action 2: Collaboration across borders between European VOD services

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
--	-----------------	--------------------	--------------------

1	Relevance and European added value	This criterion evaluates the relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis-à-vis the objectives of the call for proposals.	40
2	Quality of the activities	This criterion evaluates the adequacy of the methodology to the objectives, the quality coherence of the implemented activities, the innovative aspects, the feasibility and cost-efficiency.	35
3	Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	This criterion assesses the impact of the support on the quality and competitiveness of the VOD services involved in the grouping and the strategies for developing their sustainability.	15
4	Organisation of the project team and/or the grouping	This criterion will take into account the extent of the partnership, the exchange of knowledge within the partnership and the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis a vis the objectives of the action.	10

Action 3: Support to innovative strategies and online tools for the circulation, distribution and promotion of European audiovisual works, including audience development initiatives focusing on innovative and participatory strategies reaching out to wider audiences with European films.

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
1	Relevance and European added value	This criterion evaluates the relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis-à-vis the objectives of the call for proposals.	30
2	Quality of the activities	This criterion evaluates the adequacy of the methodology to the objectives and the business model, innovative aspects, the marketing strategy, the feasibility and cost- efficiency.	40
3	Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	This criterion assesses the dissemination of the project's results in view of ensuring the share of information / transparency, the impact of the action on the potential audience of European audiovisual works and the strategies for developing the sustainability of the action.	20
4	Organisation of the project team and/or the grouping	This criterion will take into account the extent of the partnership, the exchange of knowledge within the partnership and the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis a vis the objectives of the action.	10

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 as coherent approach as possible is implemented, across experts as well as across schemes. 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.

N.B. Although indicated on the scoring scale, experts should avoid "0" which relates to "no evidence". For obvious particular case, experts should contact the agency staff à priori.

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.

As their comments will be used by the Executive Agency to provide feedback to applicants, experts must pay particular attention to clarity, consistency and appropriate level of detail. All evaluation reports are to be written in English.

The Executive Agency monitors the quality of expert assessments and can require the expert to revise the assessment should the necessary quality standard not be met.

Experts must assess all applications in full, regardless of the score given to any award criterion.

4.5 Possible problems with applications

Experts are under no circumstances allowed to contact applicants directly. In case of any problems arising during the assessment, experts contact the Agency. The Agency decides whether the applicant will be asked to provide additional information or clarifications or if the application should be assessed in the form it was submitted.

Also, if experts notice during the assessment that the same or similar text appears in two or more applications submitted, as well as any other indications of possible double submissions and overlaps, they inform the Agency about that immediately.

4.6 Panel of experts and Consolidated assessment and final score

Once all applications have been assessed by two experts, the experts meet in Brussels to fulfil the following further evaluation steps:

First phase of the Expert panel: Consolidation of each assessment between the two experts.

In this phase, the two experts having assessed the project compare their evaluations and reach to an agreement for a consolidated score. In case the two experts fail to agree on the consolidation, the project will be discussed collectively by the expert panel in the second phase.

Second phase of the Expert panel:

During the second phase of the Expert panel, the following evaluation steps will be carried out by all experts:

- discuss the projects for which the consolidation has failed, and that need to be discussed further;
- validate scores of all projects that have been subject to consolidation process;
- discuss any issues/questions related to projects;
- confirm the ranking of all projects.

At the end of the two phases of the Expert panel, the approved consolidated assessment forms the basis of the final score of the eligible applications.

5. Feedback to applicants

As explained in the Guidelines, the Agency notifies the applicant in writing of the selection result once the grant award decision is taken, providing the relevant information on the assessment scores and comments.

In case of a request for further information or appeal by an applicant, the Agency may request the expert involved in the assessment to provide additional elements of information on the assessment as necessary.

Annexes:

1. Award criteria
2. Reference documents on policy priorities in the field of the audiovisual
3. Code of Conduct of Experts

Action 1: Support to promotion, marketing and branding activities of VOD services

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
1	Relevance and European added value	This criterion evaluates the relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis-à-vis the objectives of the call for proposals.	40

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The added-value of the project compared to the current activities of the VOD service **(15 points)**, please refer to Section III.1.1 of the Application form.
What is the added-value of the project compared the current activities and the market positioning of the VOD service? Is this added-value clearly described? Can the project bring new audiences to the platform?
- The relevance of the project vis-à-vis the objectives and the targeted projects of the call for proposals, in particular the objective to improve the visibility, discoverability and global audience of European works **(15 points)**, please refer to Section III.1.2 of the Application form.
Are the objectives of the project clearly described? What is the relevance of the project regarding the objectives pursued by the Action 1, in particular the objective "to improve the visibility, discoverability and global audience of European works"?
- The extent, European dimension and scope of the programmes in the catalogue **(10 points)**, please refer to Part D2 of the Eform and Section III.1.3 of the application form.
Are the extent, European dimension and scope of the catalogue satisfying (size, geographical and linguistic diversity, genre diversity, etc.)? Has the catalogue the market potential to "increase the global audience of the platform"?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
2	Quality of the activities	This criterion evaluates the adequacy of the methodology to the objectives, the quality and coherence of the promotion and marketing strategies, the innovative aspects, the feasibility and cost-efficiency.	40

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The adequacy of the methodology to the objectives pursued by the project, including the market analysis, the target audience, the timing of the activities **(15 points)**, please refer to the Introduction and Sections I, III.2.1 and III.2.5 of the Application form.
Is the proposed methodology clearly described (choice of the target audience, choice of the tools, list and timing of the activities...)? Is the market analysis justifying this methodology coherent and convincing? Is this methodology adequate to the objectives pursued by the project?
- The quality and the innovative aspects of the promotion, marketing and other strategies in order to increase the global audience of the VOD service and to valorise its European catalogue, as well as the techniques and tools deployed **(15 points)**, please refer to Sections III.2.2 and III.2.5 of the Application form.
Are these strategies (including the techniques and the tools deployed) clearly described and coherent? Are the innovative aspects well highlighted and satisfying? Are these strategies adequate in order to increase the global audience of European Audiovisual works?
- The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the project **(10 points)** please refer to Part D2 of the Eform (“Information on the budget and financing plan) and Sections III.2.3 and III.2.4 of the Application form + Annex 2 (budget).
Is the project cost-efficient in relation to the objectives to be reached? Are all the costs (in particular personnel costs) justified with regards to the project’s objectives?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
3	Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	This criterion assesses the impact of the support on the visibility and the audience of European audiovisual works and the strategies for developing the sustainability of the action.	15

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The methodology proposed for assessing the impact and results of the project, for sharing of best practices and for optimising the visibility of the EU support **(10 points)**, *please refer to Sections III.3.1 and III.3.2 of the Application form.*
Is the methodology (including the list of indicators) for assessing the impact of the promotion, marketing or branding campaigns well developed? Is there a coherent plan for the publication of the results and for sharing of best practices? Is the visibility of the EU support guaranteed?
- The methodology proposed for defining appropriate mid-term strategies in order to ensure the sustainability of the VOD service **(5 points)**, *please refer to Section III.3.3 of the Application form.*
Will the project have an impact on the mid-term sustainability of the VOD service? Does the project fit into a coherent strategy for the sustainability of the VOD service?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
4	Organisation of the project team and/or the grouping	This criterion will take into account the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the objectives of the action.	5

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

The ability of the team to execute the project has already been assessed at the Selection stage. It should not be called into question when assessing this criterion.

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:
please refer to Section III.4.1 of the application form.

Is the distribution of the roles, tasks and responsibilities clearly described and satisfying with regard to the objectives of the project?

Action 2: Collaboration across borders between European VOD services

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
1	Relevance and European added value	This criterion evaluates the relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis a vis the objectives of the call for proposals.	40

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The added-value of the project compared to the current position of the VOD services involved in the grouping **(15 points)**, *please refer to Section III.1.1 of the Application form.*
What is the added-value of the project compared the current position of the VOD services involved in the grouping? Is this added-value clearly described?
- The relevance of the project vis-à-vis the objectives and the targeted projects of the call for proposals, in particular the objective to increase the quality and competitiveness of the VOD services involved in the grouping **(10 points)**, *please refer to III.1.2 of the Application form.*
Are the objectives of the project clearly described? What is the relevance of the project regarding the objectives pursued by the Action 2, in particular the objective " to increase the quality and competitiveness of the VOD services involved in the grouping"?
- The scope, size, cross-border dimension of the grouping **(15 points)**, *please refer to Section III.1.3 of the Application form.*
Are the scope, size and cross-border dimension of the grouping relevant regarding the objectives pursued by the Action 2?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
2	Quality of the activities	This criterion evaluates the adequacy of the methodology to the objectives, the quality and coherence of the implemented activities, the innovative aspects, the feasibility and cost-efficiency	35

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The adequacy of the methodology to the objectives pursued by the project, including the market analysis, the terms of the collaboration, the timing of the activities **(15 points)**,
please refer to Sections I, III.2.1 and III.2.5 of the Application form.
Is the proposed methodology clearly described (choice of the target audience, choice of the tools, list and timing of the activities...)? Is the market analysis justifying this methodology coherent and convincing? Is this methodology adequate to the objectives pursued by the project?
- The quality and the innovative aspects of the implemented activities in order to increase the quality and competitiveness of the VOD services involved in the grouping **(15 points)**,
please refer to Sections III.2.2 and III.2.5 of the Application form.
Are these activities adequate in order to increase the quality and competitiveness of the VOD services involved in the grouping? Are the innovative aspects well highlighted and satisfying?
- The feasibility and cost-effectiveness of the project **(5 points)**
please refer to Part D2 of the Eform ("Information on the budget and financing plan) and Sections III.2.3 and III.2.4 of the Application form + Annex 2 (budget).
Is the project cost-efficient in relation to the objectives to be reached? Are all the costs (in particular personnel costs) justified with regards to the project's objectives and expected results?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
3	Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	This criterion assesses the impact of the support on the quality and competitiveness of the VOD services involved in the grouping and the strategies for developing their sustainability	15

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The proposed methodology for assessing the impact and results of the project, for sharing of best practices, sharing of benefits of the actions with more European services and for optimising the visibility of the EU support **(10 points)**,
please refer to Sections III.3.1 and III.3.2 of the Application form.
Is the methodology (including the list of indicators) for assessing the impact of the project well developed? Is there a coherent plan for the publication of the results and for sharing of best practices and benefits of the actions with more European services? Is the visibility of the EU support guaranteed?
- The proposed methodology for defining appropriate mid-term strategies in order to ensure the sustainability of the VOD services involved in the grouping **(5 points)**,
please refer to Section III.3.3 of the Application form.
Will the project have an impact on the mid-term sustainability of the VOD services involved in the grouping? Does the project fit into a coherent strategy for the sustainability of the VOD services involved in the grouping?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
4	Quality of the project team and the grouping	This criterion will take into account the extent of the partnership and the exchange of knowledge within the partnership vis a vis the objectives of the action	10

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

The ability of the team to execute the project has already been assessed at the Selection stage. It should not be called into question when assessing this criterion.

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

please refer to Section III.4.1 of the application form.

Does the partnership bring an added value to the action? Are the coherence and complementarity of the partnership satisfying with regard to the tasks division, the decision making process and the exchange of knowledge?

Action 3: Support to innovative strategies and online tools for the circulation, distribution and promotion of European audiovisual works, including audience development initiatives focusing on innovative and participatory strategies reaching out to wider audiences with European films.

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
1	Relevance and European added value	This criterion evaluates the relevance of the content of the action including European dimension vis a vis the objectives of the call for proposals.	30

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The added-value of the project compared to the current situation of the audiovisual markets **(15 points)**, please refer to Sections II.1.1 and II.2.5 of the Application form.
Are the objectives of the project clearly described? What is the added-value of the project in terms of innovative strategies for distributing and promoting European audiovisual works? 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? What is the relevance of such developments regarding the objectives pursued by the Action 3?
- European dimension of the audiovisual works and of the partnership, the cross-border and cross-language distribution **(15 points)**, please refer to Section II.1.2 of the Application form.
Is the European dimension of the project regarding the origin of the audiovisual works covered? Is the cross-border and cross-language distribution (subtitle/dubbing policy, partnerships, geo-blocking policy, targeted territories, etc.) satisfying?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
2	Quality of the activities	This criterion evaluates the adequacy of the methodology to the objectives and the business model, innovative aspects, the marketing strategy, the feasibility and cost-efficiency.	40

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- 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 **(15 points)**,
please refer to the Introduction and Sections I, II.2.1 and II.2.5 of the Application form.
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...)? Is the market analysis justifying this methodology satisfying? Is this methodology adequate to the objectives pursued by the project?
- 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 **(15 points)**,
please refer to Sections II.2.2 and II.2.5 of the Application form.
Are the innovative aspects of the project clearly described? Does the project present interesting and innovative approaches that are coherent with the on-going evolution and the needs of the audiovisual markets? Are the proposed strategies adequate to the objectives pursued by the project?
- The coherence of the Business model, the feasibility and cost-efficiency of the project **(10 points)**,
please refer to Part D2 of the Eform (“Information on the budget and financing plan) and Sections II.2.3, II.2.4 and II.2.5 of the Application form + Annex 2 (budget).
Is the Business model clearly described, coherent and realistic? Are the main challenges faced by the project clearly identified and efficiently addressed? Is the action cost-efficient in relation to the objectives to be reached?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
3	Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	This criterion assesses the 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

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

- The impact on the potential audience of European audiovisual works and/or the potential circulation's level of European audiovisual works **(5 points)**,
please refer to Sections II.3.1 and II.2.5 of the Application form.
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?
- The capacity to improve the efficiency of relationships between the various sectors of the European audiovisual industry (producers, distributors, sales agents, festivals, cinemas, VOD services, TV broadcasters...) **(5 points)**,
please refer to Sections II.3.2 and II.2.5 of the Application form.
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?
- The methodology proposed for collecting, analysing and disseminating data in order to share the results, to guarantee the transparency of the project, to propose an exchange of knowledge and best practises and to optimise the visibility of the EU support **(10 points)**,
please refer to Section II.3.3 of the Application form.
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? Is the visibility of the EU support guaranteed?

	Criteria	Definitions	Max. points
4	Quality of the project team and the grouping	This criterion will take into account the extent of the partnership and the exchange of knowledge within the partnership vis a vis the objectives of the action	10

Elements of analysis of the award criteria:

The ability of the team to execute the project has already been assessed at the Selection stage. It should not be called into question when assessing this criterion.

In order to decide the score to attribute, the experts will have to check the following aspects and answer to the following questions:

please refer to Sections II.4.1 and II.4.2 of the application form.

Does the team/partnership bring an added value to the action? Are the coherence and complementarity of the team/partnership satisfying with regard to the tasks division, the decision making process, the exchange of knowledge...?

The Legal basis of Creative Europe:

http://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/index_en.htm

Promotion of European Works Online:

https://eacea.ec.europa.eu/creative-europe/funding/promotion-european-works-online-eacea-232019_en

CODE OF CONDUCT FOR EXPERTS**ARTICLE 1 – PERFORMANCE OF THE CONTRACT**

1. The expert works independently, in a personal capacity and not on behalf of any organisation.
2. The experts must:
 - (a) carry out their tasks in a confidential and fair way, in accordance with the EACEA guidelines for submission of proposals and the related evaluation, selection and award procedures
 - (b) assist the contracting party or relevant service to the best of their abilities, professional skills, knowledge and applying the highest ethical and moral standards
 - (c) follow any instructions and time-schedules given by the contracting party or relevant service and deliver consistently high quality work.
3. The expert may not delegate another person to carry out the work or be replaced by any other person.
4. If a legal entity involved in a proposal approaches the expert during the evaluation of this proposal, s/he must immediately inform the contracting party or relevant service.

ARTICLE 2 – OBLIGATIONS OF IMPARTIALITY

1. The expert must perform their work **impartially**. To this end, the expert is required to:
 - (a) take all necessary measures to prevent any situation of conflict of interest;
 - (b) inform without delay the contracting party or relevant service of any conflicts of interest arising in the course of their work including of any proposal competing with the proposal where the expert may have a conflict of interest;
 - (c) confirm there is no conflict of interest for each proposal s/he is evaluating by signing a declaration in the electronic evaluation system.
2. **Definition of the conflict of interest:** Such situation arises where the impartial and objective performance of the Contract is compromised for reasons involving economic interest, political or national affinity, familial or emotional ties, or any other shared interest.

For a given proposal, a conflict of interest exists if an expert:

- (a) was involved in the preparation of the proposal
- (b) stands to benefit directly or indirectly if the proposal is accepted
- (c) has a close family or personal relationship with any person representing an applicant or participating legal entity
- (d) is a director, trustee or partner or is in any way involved in the management of an applicant legal entity
- (e) is employed or contracted by one of the applicant legal entities⁴ or any named subcontractors

⁴ However, the contracting party or relevant service may decide to invite an expert who is employed or contracted by one of the applicant legal entities or any named subcontractors to take part in the panel review session, if the expert works in a different department/laboratory/institute from the one where the

(f) is a member of an Advisory Group set up by the Commission to advise on the preparation of EU work programmes related to, or in an area related to, the call for proposals in question

(g) is a National Contact Point

(h) is a member of a Programme Committee

In the following situations the contracting party or relevant service will decide whether a conflict of interest exists, taking account of the objective circumstances, available information and related risks.

when an expert:

(i) was employed by one of the applicant or participating legal entities in the last three years

(ii) is involved in a contract or grant agreement, grant decision or membership of management structures (e.g. member of management or advisory board etc.) research collaboration with an applicant or participating legal entity or a fellow researcher, or had been so in the last three years

(iii) is in any other situation that could cast doubt on their ability to participate in the evaluation of the proposal impartially, or that could reasonably appear to do so in the eyes of an external third party.

3. Consequences of a situation of conflict of interest:

If a conflict becomes apparent at any stage of the evaluation, the expert must immediately inform the contracting party or relevant service staff. If a conflict is confirmed, the expert must stop evaluating the proposal concerned. Any comments and scores already given by the expert will be discounted. If necessary, the expert will be replaced.

If it is revealed during an evaluation that an expert has knowingly concealed a conflict of interest, the expert will be immediately excluded, and sanctions will apply (see Articles 14, 15, 16 and 18 of the Contract or in the Financial Regulation and its implementing rules).

ARTICLE 3 – OBLIGATIONS OF CONFIDENTIALITY

1. The contracting party and the expert must treat confidentially⁵ any information and documents, in any form (i.e. paper or electronic), disclosed in writing or orally in relation to the performance of the Contract.

work is to be carried out, and if the constituent bodies operate with a high degree of autonomy, and if such a role is justified by the requirement to appoint the best available experts and by the limited size of the pool of qualified experts. In this case, the expert must not take part in any detailed panel discussion (or electronic forum) of the proposal involving the legal entity concerned or in any hearings concerning the proposal.

In exceptional duly justified cases, experts in the circumstances described above may also participate in the consensus group for the proposal in question, provided valid reasons are given. The contracting party or relevant service will inform the other experts in the group of the affiliation of the expert concerned.

⁵ In this context, the term 'confidentiality' should not be taken as equating to the security classification 'EU CONFIDENTIAL'. The procedures related to 'EU CONFIDENTIAL' documents apply only to information and material the unauthorised disclosure of which would harm the essential interests of the EU of one of its Member States (Commission provisions on security (Commission Decision 2001/844/EC, ECSC, Euratom of 29 November 2001 amending its internal rules of procedure (OJ L 317, 3.12.2001, p. 1).

2. The expert undertakes to observe strict **confidentiality** in relation to their work. To this end, the expert:

- (a) must not use confidential information or documents for any purpose other than fulfilling their obligations under the Contract without prior written approval of the contracting party
- (b) must not disclose, directly or indirectly, confidential information or documents relating to proposals or applicants, without prior written approval of the contracting party.

In particular, the expert:

i. must not discuss any proposal with others, including other experts or contracting party or relevant service staff not directly involved in evaluating the proposal, except during the formal discussion at the meetings moderated by or with the knowledge and approval of the responsible contracting party or relevant service staff

ii. must not disclose:

- any detail of the evaluation process and its outcomes or of any proposal submitted for evaluation for any purpose other than fulfilling their obligations under the Contract without prior written approval of the contracting party
- their advice to the contracting party or relevant service on any proposal to the applicants or to any other person (including colleagues, students, etc.)
- the names of other experts participating in the evaluation.

iii. must not communicate with applicants, beneficiaries or any person linked to the applicant or participating legal entity on any proposal:

- during the evaluation or on-site visits, except in hearings or on-site visits between experts and the applicants or beneficiary organised by the contracting party or relevant service as part of the evaluation process;
- after the evaluation.

3. If the proposals are made available electronically to the expert who then works from their own or other suitable premises, s/he will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent, and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files upon completing the evaluation as instructed.

4. If the evaluation takes place in premises controlled by the contracting party or relevant service, the expert:

- (a) must not remove from the premises proposals, copies or notes on evaluation, either on paper or in electronic form
- (b) will be held personally responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of any documents or electronic files sent, and for returning, erasing or destroying all confidential documents or files on completing the evaluation as instructed.

5. If the expert seeks further information (for example through the internet, specialised databases, etc.) to complete their examination of the proposals, s/he:

- (a) must respect the overall rules for confidentiality for obtaining such information
- (b) must not contact applicants, beneficiaries or any person linked to the applicant legal entity
- (c) must not contact third parties without prior written approval of the contracting party.

6. These confidentiality obligations are binding on:

(a) the contracting party (see Regulation No 31 (EEC), 11 (EAEC), laying down the Staff Regulations of Officials

and the Conditions of Employment of Other Servants of the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community⁶10

(b) the expert during performance of the Contract and for five years starting from the date of the last payment made to the expert unless:

- i. the contracting party agrees to release the expert from the confidentiality obligations earlier
- ii. the confidential information becomes public through other channels
- iii. disclosure of the confidential information is required by law.

⁶ OJ 45, 14.6.1962, p. 1385.