



Co-funded by
the European Union



german
cooperation

DEUTSCHE ZUSAMMENARBEIT

Implemented by

giz

Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Guidelines for Applicants

Call for Proposals

EU4CAET Grant Facility – Financing Window

Call No. 1



EU4CAET

Guidelines for Applicants

Call for Proposals

EU4CAET Grant Facility – Financing Window

Call No. 1

February 2026



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Contents

1. Purpose of the Guidelines	4
2. Overview of the EU4CAET Grant Facility – Financing Window	4
3. Expected outputs of funded projects	5
4. Who can apply.....	5
5. What types of projects can be financed	6
6. Financial support under the Financing Window	6
7. What can be financed and what is not eligible	7
8. How to apply.....	7
8.1 Application package	7
8.2 Submission method and format.....	7
8.3 Submission deadline and timeline	8
8.4 Questions and clarifications	8
9. Required proposal documentation	9
9.1 Project Proposal form.....	9
9.2 Technical design and project documentation	9
9.3 Financial capacity statement.....	10
9.4 Ownership or right of use	10
9.5 Permits and approvals	11
9.6 Proof of partnership (if applicable)	11
10. Eligibility and project readiness	11
10.1 Eligibility of applicants.....	11
10.2 Eligibility of projects.....	11
10.3 Project readiness requirement	12
10.4 Common reasons for ineligibility	12
11. Evaluation criteria and scoring methodology	13
11.1 Logic of the evaluation framework	13
11.2 Structure of scores and thresholds.....	13
11.3 Technology-specific weighting factors	13



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

11.4 Evaluation procedure and scoring consistency	14
11.5 Ranking, cut-off point and notification	15
11.6 Technology-specific evaluation matrices	15
12. Decision, contracting and next steps.....	17
12.1 Notification of evaluation results	17
12.2 Contracting of selected projects.....	18
12.3 Reference to the Standard Contract.....	18
12.4 No pre-contractual commitments	19
12.5 Additional review requirements for grants exceeding EUR 100.000.....	19
13. Guidance for completing the Project Proposal Form	19
13.1 SECTION 1 – Applicant information.....	20
13.2 SECTION 2 – Project identification	24
13.3 SECTION 3 – Project concept, relevance and expected results	26
13.4 SECTION 4 – Social impact, gender inclusion and community involvement.....	34
13.5 SECTION 5 – Implementation concept.....	37
13.6 SECTION 6 – Replication potential	41
13.7 SECTION 7 – Legal ownership / right of use	44
13.8 SECTION 8 – Permits and approvals for PV, EV and public lighting.....	47
13.9 SECTION 9 – Technical readiness.....	49
13.10 SECTION 10 – Technical parameters and project readiness information	51
13.11 SECTION 11 – Review and acceptance of the draft contract.....	54
13.12 SECTION 12 – Declaration by the Applicant.....	55
13.13 – Indicative List of Annexes	56
Annexes	60
Annex I – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Photovoltaic (PV) Projects	61
Annex II – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Heat Pump Projects	71
Annex III – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Biomass Heating Projects.....	82
Annex IV – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Public Lighting Projects.....	93
Annex V – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for EV Charger Projects.....	104



1. Purpose of the Guidelines

These Guidelines for Applicants are intended to support municipalities and other eligible applicants in preparing high-quality project proposals under the EU4CAET Grant Facility – Financing Window.

The Guidelines complement the Call for Proposals and the Project Proposal Form by:

- explaining the purpose and logic of the Financing Window;
- clarifying who can apply and which types of projects are eligible;
- providing practical guidance on how to complete the Project Proposal Form;
- explaining the evaluation process, evaluation criteria and scoring methodology, including technology-specific evaluation matrices.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to read these Guidelines carefully before preparing and submitting their project proposals. Compliance with the instructions set out in the Guidelines will significantly increase the clarity, completeness and competitiveness of the submitted proposals.

2. Overview of the EU4CAET Grant Facility – Financing Window

The EU4CAET project, co-financed by the European Union (EU) and the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and implemented by GIZ in Bosnia and Herzegovina, supports municipalities and local actors in accelerating the energy transition through targeted technical assistance and project financing.

One of the key instruments of the project is the Grant Facility. Through its Financing Window, the Grant Facility provides partial, non-reimbursable grants to support the implementation of community-led sustainable energy projects that are technically mature and ready for implementation.

The Financing Window is designed to:

- support investments that increase renewable energy generation and energy efficiency in public infrastructure;
- reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality;
- strengthen institutional and technical capacities at the local level; and
- promote active involvement of citizens, local communities and private-sector actors in the energy transition.

Grants under this Financing Window are awarded through competitive Calls for Proposals. This document relates to the First Call for Proposals (Call No. 1), coordinated by the Association Center for Development and Support (CRP), acting as Fund Manager on behalf of GIZ.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

3. Expected outputs of funded projects

Projects supported under the Financing Window are expected to deliver concrete, measurable and verifiable results. At the end of implementation, each funded project should demonstrate that the supported investment has been successfully completed, is operational and delivers the intended energy, environmental and community benefits.

Specifically, each funded project is expected to result in:

- completed project design and procurement phases (which are already a prerequisite for eligibility), followed by the successful implementation of the investment in the selected technology or technologies;
- commissioned and fully operational systems, such as photovoltaic (PV) plants, biomass heating systems, heat pump systems, electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure or smart public lighting systems, implemented in line with applicable legislation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and relevant technical standards;
- measurable energy savings and/or renewable energy generation, contributing to greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reductions;
- documented co-benefits, including improved comfort and functionality of public buildings, improved quality of public services (e.g. lighting or mobility), enhanced social inclusion and active citizen engagement in the energy transition;
- complete technical and financial documentation, including invoices, certificates, permits, acceptance and commissioning protocols, required for verification, auditing and reporting purposes under the Grant Facility.

Applicants should ensure that their project proposals clearly demonstrate how these expected outputs will be achieved and how they will be documented during implementation.

4. Who can apply

Eligible applicants under this Call for Proposals are:

- municipalities and cities in Bosnia and Herzegovina; and/or
- partnerships involving municipalities or cities and other entities, such as Renewable Energy Communities (RECs), private-sector entities and/or citizens, jointly developing a sustainable energy project in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Where the applicant is a Renewable Energy Community (REC) or another form of partnership, at least one founding member must be a municipality or a city. In such cases, the municipality or city assumes responsibility for conducting public procurement procedures related to the implementation of the investment, in accordance with applicable public procurement legislation and the rules of the Grant Facility.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Projects must be implemented on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina and fully comply with all eligibility, legal, technical and financial requirements set out in the Call for Proposals and these Guidelines.

5. What types of projects can be financed

The Financing Window supports community-led sustainable energy projects focusing on one of the eligible technologies listed below. Projects must be fully prepared for implementation at the time of submission and must demonstrate clear energy, environmental and community benefits.

Eligible technologies under this Call are:

- Photovoltaics (PV), implemented exclusively through Renewable Energy Communities (RECs);
- Biomass heating systems in public buildings;
- Heat pump systems for heating and/or cooling in public buildings;
- Electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure as part of municipal or community projects;
- Smart and energy-efficient public lighting systems.

Except for photovoltaic projects, which must be implemented through a REC, all other eligible technologies may be submitted as community-led projects implemented by municipalities or cities with active involvement of citizens, local communities or partner organisations, without the obligation to establish a REC.

6. Financial support under the Financing Window

The Financing Window provides partial co-financing of eligible project costs in the form of a non-reimbursable grant. The grant is intended to complement municipal and partner financing and to enable the implementation of technically prepared projects that are ready for execution but lack full funding.

Key financial parameters under this Call are:

- grant share between 50% and 80% of total eligible project costs;
- own contribution of 20–50%, to be secured by the applicant from municipal budgets and/or other confirmed sources;
- maximum grant amount per project of up to EUR 99.999 for projects not originating from the Technical Assistance Unit and up to EUR 170.000 for projects developed with Technical Assistance Unit support.

Grants are disbursed on a cost-reimbursement basis. Grant funds are, thus, not paid in advance but reimbursed after eligible costs have been incurred and verified. Payments are made directly to suppliers or contractors, not to the project owners. Applicants must therefore ensure sufficient liquidity or bridging arrangements during implementation.



7. What can be financed and what is not eligible

Grants under the Financing Window are intended to co-finance costs directly linked to the implementation of the investment in one of the eligible technologies.

Eligible costs include, but are not limited to, the purchase, delivery, installation and commissioning of equipment, construction and installation works necessary for system operation, supervision and commissioning services, and adaptations to existing systems required for integration.

Costs not directly linked to the implementation of the eligible technology are not eligible. These include project design and preparation costs, capacity-building activities, general municipal operating costs, vehicle purchases and any costs incurred prior to the submission of the application. Such costs must be covered from other sources.

8. How to apply

8.1 Application package

Applications under this Call must be submitted as a **complete Application Package**. Incomplete applications or applications that do not comply with the formal submission requirements will be rejected during the administrative and eligibility screening.

The Application Package consists of the following documents:

1. Call for Proposals document;
2. Project Proposal Form;
3. Guidelines for Applicants;
4. Standard Grant Contract (Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility);
5. Financial Capacity Statement (using the prescribed format).

Applicants are strongly advised to carefully review all documents included in the Application Package before preparing their proposal. Particular attention should be paid to the provisions related to milestones, verification and disbursement set out in the Standard Grant Contract.

All supporting documents related to this Call, including templates, annexes and the consolidated Questions and Answers (Q&A), are published on the CRP website: <https://crp.org.ba/eu4caet-grant-sema-za-energetsku-tranziciju>

8.2 Submission method and format

Project proposals must be submitted **by post**.

Each proposal must include:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- one (1) original hard copy of the completed Project Proposal Form, duly signed and stamped;
- one (1) original hard copy of the Financial Capacity Statement, duly signed and stamped;
- all required supporting documentation submitted **exclusively in electronic format** on a USB drive.

To avoid unnecessary duplication and excessively large application packages, hard-copy versions of supporting documentation are **not required**.

The submission language may be **English or one of the official languages of Bosnia and Herzegovina**.

The proposal must:

- be signed by an authorised representative of the applicant;
- be submitted in a sealed envelope;
- clearly indicate on the envelope: “**EU4CAET – Grant Facility – Financing Window – Call No. 1 – [Name of Applicant]**”;
- be sent to the following address: **Association Center for Development and Support (CRP) Turalibegova 36, 75000 Tuzla, Bosnia and Herzegovina**.

8.3 Submission deadline and timeline

The key dates under this Call are as follows:

- Publication of the Call: **02 February 2026**
- Q&A period: **02 February 2026 – 24 March 2026 (until 16:00 h)**
- Deadline for submission of project proposals: **30 March 2026, by 16:00 h**

Project proposals must **physically arrive** at the submission address by the stated deadline. Proposals received after the deadline will not be considered, regardless of the postage date.

The Grant Facility reserves the right to extend the submission deadline. Any such extension will be communicated through an official notification published on the CRP website and/or other appropriate communication channels.

8.4 Questions and clarifications

During the Q&A period, applicants may submit questions and requests for clarification exclusively via email to: **eu4caet-grants@crp.org.ba**

Questions submitted after **24 March 2026 at 16:00 h** will not be considered.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

CRP will compile and publish anonymised questions and answers on a **weekly basis** on its website. Individual replies to applicants will not be provided. Applicants are responsible for regularly checking the published Q&A and integrating relevant clarifications into their proposals.

9. Required proposal documentation

To be considered eligible, applicants must submit **complete and coherent documentation** demonstrating that the project is fully prepared for implementation.

All documents listed below are mandatory unless explicitly stated otherwise.

9.1 Project Proposal form

Applicants must submit a completed, signed and stamped Project Proposal Form, including the **Implementation Concept**, which should clearly describe:

- project objectives and expected results;
- target groups and beneficiaries;
- key activities and implementation schedule;
- roles and responsibilities of all involved parties;
- risk identification and mitigation measures.

The Project Proposal Form must be consistent with the technical and financial documentation submitted as annexes. Any discrepancies between narrative, technical designs and financial figures may negatively affect the evaluation.

9.2 Technical design and project documentation

Applicants must submit full technical documentation for the proposed investment, prepared in accordance with applicable legislation in Bosnia and Herzegovina and relevant entity and/or cantonal regulations.

Depending on the nature of the project and selected technology, this documentation may include:

- architectural design;
- structural design;
- installation designs (electrical, mechanical, etc.);
- Bill of Quantities (BoQ), presenting a detailed and itemised list of works, materials, equipment and services;
- cost breakdown or cost estimate, aligned with the BoQ and compliant with local construction and procurement practice.

For specific technologies, additional documentation is required:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- **Heat pumps:** energy audit or equivalent energy performance assessment demonstrating baseline consumption, expected savings and system sizing;
- **Biomass heating:** energy audit or heat demand analysis including fuel demand calculations and efficiency assumptions.

Additional mandatory documents may include:

- waste management plan;
- fire and explosion safety plan;
- approvals from competent authorities for projects implemented on protected buildings or in protected areas;
- any other technical studies or analyses required by applicable legislation.

9.3 Financial capacity statement

Applicants must submit a signed Financial Capacity Statement confirming that sufficient financial resources are secured, or reliably available, to cover the required own contribution.

The Financial Capacity Statement must be submitted using the prescribed format and should be supported, where applicable, by relevant evidence such as:

- confirmation of budget allocation within the municipal budget or financial plan;
- decision or resolution of the municipal council approving the allocation of funds;
- bank statements or other evidence of available funds;
- confirmation of secured co-financing from partners;
- any other document demonstrating the applicant's financial capacity to implement the project without risks to continuity or completion.

9.4 Ownership or right of use

Applicants must provide clear evidence of ownership or a legally valid right to use the building(s) or site where the investment will be implemented.

The right of use must:

- be legally documented;
- cover a period consistent with the expected operational lifetime of the investment (minimum 5 years);
- ensure uninterrupted access for installation, operation, maintenance and verification activities.

Supporting documents may include ownership certificates, lease or usage agreements, memoranda of understanding, municipal decisions or notarised statements of consent.



9.5 Permits and approvals

Applicants must submit all permits and approvals required for the proposed technology and project location, issued in accordance with applicable legislation.

This requirement applies in particular to projects involving:

- photovoltaic systems;
- EV charging infrastructure;
- public lighting systems.

Failure to submit the required permits and approvals will result in the rejection of the proposal during the eligibility screening.

9.6 Proof of partnership (if applicable)

Where the project is implemented through a partnership, applicants must submit formal proof that the partnership is legally established and authorised to jointly implement the project.

Acceptable documents may include registration documents of a Renewable Energy Community, cooperation agreements, memoranda of understanding, municipal council decisions or other legally valid instruments demonstrating partnership arrangements.

10. Eligibility and project readiness

10.1 Eligibility of applicants

To be eligible under this Call, applicants must fall into one of the following categories:

- municipalities or cities in Bosnia and Herzegovina; or
- partnerships involving municipalities or cities and other entities (such as Renewable Energy Communities, private-sector entities and/or citizens) established in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Where the applicant is a Renewable Energy Community (REC) or another form of partnership, at least one founding member must be a municipality or a city. In such cases, the municipality or city is responsible for conducting public procurement procedures related to the implementation of the investment, in line with applicable public procurement legislation and the rules of the Grant Facility.

Only applicants that fully meet these requirements will be considered eligible for further evaluation.

10.2 Eligibility of projects

To be eligible, proposed projects must:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- be implemented on the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina;
- focus on **one eligible technology only**, as listed in Section 5 of these Guidelines;
- comply with all legal, technical and financial requirements set out in the Call for Proposals and these Guidelines;
- demonstrate clear community benefit and contribution to local energy transition objectives.

Projects that do not meet all eligibility criteria will be rejected during the eligibility screening and will not proceed to technical evaluation.

10.3 Project readiness requirement

A key principle of the Financing Window is that **only projects that are fully ready for implementation** can be financed.

At the time of submission, applicants must demonstrate that:

- the project design phase has been fully completed;
- full technical documentation has been prepared in accordance with applicable legislation;
- quantities, specifications and costs are clearly defined and supported by a Bill of Quantities;
- all required permits and approvals relevant to the selected technology and project location have been obtained (where applicable);
- the applicant has secured the required own contribution and can demonstrate financial capacity;
- ownership or long-term right of use of the building(s) or site is clearly documented.

Projects that lack key documents, approvals or evidence of readiness will be rejected during the eligibility screening, regardless of their potential technical or environmental merit.

10.4 Common reasons for ineligibility

Applicants should pay particular attention to avoiding the following frequent causes of rejection:

- incomplete Application Package or missing mandatory documents;
- submission of draft, preliminary or concept-level technical documentation;
- missing or invalid permits for technologies where permits are required;
- unclear ownership or insufficient right-of-use documentation;
- insufficient or unsubstantiated own contribution;
- proposing ineligible costs or technologies.

Ensuring full compliance with eligibility and readiness requirements is a prerequisite for technical evaluation.



11. Evaluation criteria and scoring methodology

11.1 Logic of the evaluation framework

Project proposals submitted under this Call for Proposals are evaluated using a structured, transparent and technology-specific evaluation framework.

The evaluation framework is designed to:

- ensure objective comparison of projects using the same technology;
- support a balanced allocation of funds across different eligible technologies;
- reflect the relative strategic priorities of technologies within the Grant Facility;
- reward technically sound, cost-efficient and implementation-ready investments;
- recognise social value, gender inclusion and community involvement through bonus points.

Each proposal is assessed against **three distinct levels of criteria**:

1. **Technical criteria**, assessing technical performance, feasibility and financing structure;
2. **Quality criteria**, assessing strategic relevance, economic impact and overall proposal quality;
3. **Social criteria**, assessed as bonus points for additional social value.

11.2 Structure of scores and thresholds

The maximum achievable **raw score** is **115 points**, structured as follows:

- Technical criteria: up to **60 points**;
- Quality criteria: up to **40 points**;
- Social criteria (bonus points): up to **15 points**.

For the purpose of eligibility and ranking:

- proposals must achieve a **minimum score of 50 points out of 100**, calculated **excluding bonus points**, to be considered for funding;
- bonus points do not affect eligibility thresholds but may improve the final ranking among eligible proposals.

11.3 Technology-specific weighting factors

To ensure a balanced allocation of funds across different eligible technologies and to reflect their relative strategic priorities within the Grant Facility, **technology-specific weighting factors** are applied.



After the initial scoring based on the evaluation criteria set out in these Guidelines, the total score achieved for each proposal is **adjusted by applying the weighting factor corresponding to the relevant technology**, as follows:

Technology	Weighting Factor
Photovoltaics	100%
Heat pumps	80%
Biomass heating	80%
Public lighting	75%
EV chargers	70%

The application of these weighting factors results in an **adjusted final score**, which is used exclusively for:

- ranking proposals; and
- determining funding decisions.

The weighting factors **do not affect**:

- eligibility requirements;
- minimum quality thresholds; or
- the assessment of compliance with legal, technical and financial criteria.

11.4 Evaluation procedure and scoring consistency

Each project proposal is evaluated **independently by at least two evaluators**.

Where significant discrepancies occur between individual scores, the Grant Facility applies internal consolidation procedures to ensure consistency, objectivity and fairness of the evaluation.

The Grant Facility reserves the right to:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- request clarifications, additional explanations or supplementary documentation from applicants at any stage of the evaluation process; and
- undertake any other actions necessary to obtain complete and accurate information required for a thorough and objective assessment.

Failure to provide requested clarifications or documentation within the specified timeframe may result in the **disqualification** of the project proposal.

11.5 Ranking, cut-off point and notification

Considering the available budget and the overall quality of submissions, the Grant Facility will:

- define a **cut-off point** for funding; and
- prepare a **Proposal Evaluation Report**, including recommended grant amounts per project.

All applicants will be formally notified of:

- their total score and scores per evaluation criterion;
- whether their project has been selected for funding.

Applicants may submit a written complaint (appeal) within **five (5) calendar days** from the date of publication or notification of the evaluation results.

Complaints must be submitted following the same submission method and delivery requirements as project proposals. Complaints submitted after this deadline will not be considered.

11.6 Technology-specific evaluation matrices

The detailed evaluation matrices for each eligible technology, including criteria descriptions and maximum scores, are presented in the following sections of these Guidelines:

- Photovoltaics (PV)
- Heat Pumps
- Biomass Heating
- Public Lighting
- EV Chargers

Each matrix follows the common three-level structure described above (Technical, Quality and Social criteria), while reflecting the specific technical and strategic characteristics of the respective technology.



The summary table below presents an overview of the evaluation criteria and maximum scores, distinguishing between one set of criteria applicable to Photovoltaic (PV) projects and a corresponding set applicable to all other eligible technologies.

Category	Eligible Technologies			
	PV		Heat pumps Biomass Heating Public Lighting EV Chargers	
	Criteria	Max Score	Criteria	Max Score
Technical	1. KWp Installed	10	1. KW Installed	10
	2. CO ₂ Reduction (tCO ₂ /year)	10	2. CO ₂ Reduction (tCO ₂ /year)	10
	3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)	10	3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)	10
	4. Equipment Efficiency	10	4. Equipment Efficiency	10
	5. Finance Provided	10	5. Finance Provided	10
	6. REC	10	6. Community Led	10
	Subtotal (Technical, max 60)	60	Subtotal (Technical, max 60)	60
Quality	7. Relevance of project	10	7. Relevance of project	10
	8. Economic Impact	10	8. Economic Impact	10
	9. Replication Potential	10	9. Replication Potential	10
	10. Quality of the Proposal	10	10. Quality of the Proposal	10
	Subtotal (Quality, max 40)	40	Subtotal (Quality max 40)	40
Social (bonus points)	11. Social Impact	5	11. Social Impact	5
	12. Gender Inclusion	5	12. Gender Inclusion	5
	13. Community Involvement	5	13. Community Involvement	5
	Subtotal (Social, max 15)	15	Subtotal (Social, max 15)	15
Final Score	Final Score	115	Final Score	115

Detailed scoring, interpretation of criteria and assignment of points are carried out exclusively in accordance with the Technology-Specific Evaluation Matrices contained in the Annexes to these Guidelines.

The Annexes provide:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- full scoring bands for each evaluation criterion;
- quantitative thresholds and qualitative descriptors corresponding to each score;
- clarification of scoring logic and interpretation; and
- a clear indication of the documentation and evidence required to substantiate each score.

Applicants are strongly encouraged to consult the relevant Annex corresponding to their selected technology, as the Annexes constitute the authoritative reference for the detailed application of evaluation criteria, scoring bands, thresholds and evidence requirements.

The Technology-Specific Evaluation Matrices are provided in the following Annexes:

- Annex I – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Photovoltaic (PV) Projects
- Annex II – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Heat Pump Projects
- Annex III – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Biomass Heating Projects
- Annex IV – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Public Lighting Projects
- Annex V – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for EV Charger Projects

In case of any inconsistency between the summary tables and the Annexes, the provisions of the Annexes shall prevail.

12. Decision, contracting and next steps

This section outlines the steps following the completion of the evaluation process and provides applicants with an overview of what to expect in case their project proposal is selected for funding. It is intended to inform applicants about the decision-making and contracting process, while detailed rights and obligations are governed exclusively by the Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility.

12.1 Notification of evaluation results

After the completion of the evaluation and approval process, all applicants will be formally notified of the outcome of their project proposal.

The notification will include:

- information on whether the project proposal has been selected for funding or not;
- the total score achieved by the proposal, as well as scores per evaluation criterion; and

Applicants whose proposals have not been selected will receive a notification for information purposes only. Submission of a project proposal does not create any entitlement to funding.



12.2 Contracting of selected projects

Applicants whose project proposals are selected for funding will be invited by the Association Center for Development and Support (CRP), acting as Fund Manager of the EU4CAET Grant Facility, to enter into a contract.

The contract is based on the standard contractual template included in the Application Package, entitled:

“Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility”
(hereinafter: *the Contract*).

The Contract constitutes the only legally binding document governing the implementation of the funded project and the use of grant funds.

The Contract will, among others:

- define the approved project scope, objectives and indicators;
- specify the total eligible project cost, approved grant amount, own contribution and grant percentage;
- establish milestones, deadlines and corresponding verification requirements;
- regulate the disbursement mechanism, including reimbursement of eligible costs based on verified milestone completion;
- set out obligations related to procurement, reporting, visibility, sustainability and audits; and
- include provisions on contract amendment, etc.

The Contract must be signed by the authorised representative(s) of the selected applicant(s) within the deadline indicated in the invitation sent by CRP.

12.3 Reference to the Standard Contract

Applicants are strongly encouraged to carefully review the **Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility** already at the application stage.

By submitting a project proposal under this Call, applicants acknowledge that, in case of selection, the implementation of the project will be subject to the terms and conditions defined in the Contract, including provisions related to:

- milestone-based implementation and disbursement;
- verification of incurred costs;
- public procurement procedures;
- reporting and documentation requirements;
- visibility and communication obligations; and
- sustainability and minimum operational period of the investment.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

The Guidelines for Applicants are provided for explanatory and guidance purposes only and do not replace, modify or override the provisions of the Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility.

12.4 No pre-contractual commitments

Only the signature of the Contract by all contractual parties creates a legally binding commitment of grant funds.

Costs incurred prior to the signature of the Contract, as well as any commitments made before the contract enters into force, are not eligible for financing under the EU4CAET Grant Facility.

Applicants shall not initiate procurement procedures, sign contracts with suppliers, or undertake any financial commitments related to the proposed investment before the Contract is duly signed.

12.5 Additional review requirements for grants exceeding EUR 100.000

For project proposals requesting a grant amount **exceeding EUR 100.000**, applicants are hereby informed that **additional review and approval steps apply** in accordance with **Article 5 of the Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility and Annex V – Special Provisions for Grants > EUR 100.000**.

These additional requirements are **not part of the scoring process** and **do not affect the evaluation criteria or ranking of proposals**. However, they constitute a **mandatory procedural condition** for contracting and implementation of selected projects above this threshold.

In particular, projects with grant amounts above EUR 100.000 are subject to:

- enhanced procurement oversight, including the participation of a **CRP-appointed expert as a voting member of the Procurement Committee**;
- **additional technical and procurement documentation review and approval** at specific stages of the project cycle, as defined in Annex V of the Contract.

Applicants are therefore strongly advised to **familiarise themselves in advance** with the provisions of Article 5 of the Contract and Annex V, which form an integral part of the contractual framework for grants exceeding EUR 100.000.

Failure to comply with these provisions after selection may result in delays in procurement, contracting, or disbursement.

13. Guidance for completing the Project Proposal Form

This chapter provides applicants practical guidance on how to complete the Project Proposal Form in a clear, consistent and evaluation-oriented manner. The guidance follows the structure of the



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Project Proposal Form section by section and explains the purpose of each section, the type and level of information expected, its relevance for the evaluation criteria, and common issues to avoid.

13.1 SECTION 1 – Applicant information

This section provides basic administrative and identification information about the applicant and the proposed project. While this section is not scored, it is essential for eligibility verification, legal checks and the correct classification of the project for evaluation purposes.

Incomplete or inconsistent information in this section may lead to delays during eligibility screening or requests for clarification.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 1.1 Project Title

a) Purpose of this section

The project title is used to clearly identify the proposed investment and to communicate its main focus in a concise manner throughout the evaluation, contracting and implementation phases.

b) What to include

Applicants should provide a clear and descriptive title that reflects:

- the selected technology (e.g. PV, heat pump, biomass heating);
- the type of facility or site (e.g. school, public building, public lighting system); and
- the community or municipality where the project will be implemented.

The title should be short, specific and consistent with the technical documentation and annexes.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Although not scored separately, the project title supports the overall clarity and quality of the proposal and contributes indirectly to:

- Quality of the proposal (Criterion 10).

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- using generic titles such as “Energy Project” or “Renewable Energy Investment”;
- including acronyms or internal project names without explanation;
- using a title that does not match the selected technology or project scope.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 1.2 Project Owner (Applicant)



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

a) Purpose of this section

This section is used to identify the legal entity submitting the application and to verify its eligibility under the Call for Proposals, including the applicable applicant and partnership structure.

b) What to include

Applicants must clearly indicate:

- the full legal name of the applicant entity;
- the applicant type (Municipality/City or Renewable Energy Community – REC);
- where applicable, the legal status of the REC (legally established or in the process of establishment);
- the partnership structure, by ticking the option that best reflects the composition of the partnership.

In case of a REC or partnership-based application, applicants must additionally provide:

- the official name of the REC or partnership;
- a list of REC/partnership members;
- the authorised representative(s) (name and position); and
- the relevant supporting documentation, attached as annexes.

Only legally valid and verifiable documents should be submitted (e.g. registration documents, cooperation agreements, municipal council decisions).

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Information provided in this section is directly relevant for:

- eligibility screening;
- Technical criterion related to REC or community-led structure (Criterion 6, where applicable);
- assessment of partnership quality under Quality criteria.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- unclear or inconsistent naming of the applicant across different documents;
- selecting a partnership structure without providing supporting documentation;
- submitting informal or unsigned partnership statements;
- indicating REC status without evidence of legal establishment or formal initiation.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 1.3. Applicant Address & ID



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

a) Purpose of this section

This subsection enables formal identification of the applicant for administrative, legal and contracting purposes.

b) What to include

Applicants should provide complete and accurate address details, including:

- street and number;
- municipality/city;
- postal code; and
- official registration number or identification number.

All information must correspond to official registration records.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This information is used for eligibility and administrative verification and is not scored.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- providing incomplete address details;
- using unofficial or outdated registration data;
- inconsistencies between this section and annexed legal documents.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 1.4 Contact Person

a) Purpose of this section

The contact person serves as the primary point of communication between the applicant and the Grant Facility during evaluation, contracting and implementation.

b) What to include

Applicants should designate a person who:

- has been directly involved in project preparation;
- is authorised to communicate on behalf of the applicant; and
- is available throughout the proposal evaluation period.

Provide full and accurate contact details (name, position, email and phone).

c) Link to evaluation criteria



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Not scored, but critical for communication efficiency and clarification requests.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- nominating a contact person with no involvement in the project;
- providing generic or shared email addresses without a responsible individual;
- incorrect or unreachable contact details.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 1.5 Project Location

a) Purpose of this section

This section identifies where the proposed investment will be implemented and is used to verify territorial eligibility and consistency with the technical documentation.

b) What to include

Applicants should clearly specify:

- the municipality or city of implementation;
- the exact site or building (address or geolocation); and
- the entity (FBiH, RS or Brčko Distrikt BiH).

The location must correspond to the ownership/right-of-use documentation and technical designs submitted.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Relevant for:

- eligibility verification;
- assessment of project readiness and feasibility under Technical criteria.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- vague descriptions of project location;
- mismatch between stated location and technical annexes;
- selecting the wrong entity.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 1.6 Project Duration

a) Purpose of this section



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

The project duration provides an indicative timeframe for implementation and is used to assess feasibility and planning realism.

b) What to include

Applicants should indicate:

- the planned start date; and
- the planned end date, using the required date format (dd/mm/yyyy).

The proposed duration should be realistic and consistent with the scope of works and procurement requirements.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes indirectly to assessment of project feasibility and implementation readiness.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- unrealistically short implementation periods;
- dates inconsistent with procurement or construction timelines;
- missing or incorrectly formatted dates.

13.2 SECTION 2 – Project identification

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 2

a) Purpose of this section

This section defines the technical scope and financial size of the proposed project. It enables evaluators to clearly identify the selected technology, assess the scale of the investment, and verify the internal consistency between technical parameters, expected impacts and the requested grant amount.

The information provided in this section serves as a reference point for the assessment of technical performance, economic impact and overall project credibility.

b) What to include

Applicants should ensure that all information in this section is fully consistent with the feasibility study, technical design and Bill of Quantities.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Technology type

Select only one technology corresponding to the project. Please note that:

- Photovoltaics (PV) projects are eligible only if implemented through a Renewable Energy Community (REC);
- All other technologies must be implemented as community-led projects, in line with the Call requirements.

Installed capacity

Indicate the total installed capacity of the system:

- in kWp for PV projects;
- in kW for all other technologies.

The stated capacity must correspond exactly to the approved technical design.

Expected CO₂ reduction (tCO₂/year)

Applicants must provide a quantified estimate of the expected annual CO₂ emission reductions resulting from the project. The calculation of expected CO₂ emission reductions shall be carried out in accordance with the applicable entity-level regulations on energy performance of buildings in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

For projects implemented on the territory of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, calculations shall be based on the Rulebook on Minimum Energy Performance of Buildings (Official Gazette of the Federation of BiH, No. 81/19).

For projects implemented on the territory of Republika Srpska, calculations shall be based on the Rulebook on Minimum Requirements for Energy Performance of Buildings of Republika Srpska (Official Gazette of RS, No. 30/2015 and 47/2022).

For projects implemented in Brčko District of Bosnia and Herzegovina, applicants may apply either of the above-mentioned rulebooks, provided that the selected methodology is applied consistently throughout the calculation.

Total estimated project cost

Enter the total eligible project cost in BAM, as defined in the Bill of Quantities and technical documentation. This amount represents the basis for calculating the grant share and own contribution.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Estimated grant amount

Indicate the grant amount requested under this Call, ensuring full compliance with:

- the minimum and maximum grant percentages;
- the maximum absolute grant amounts defined in the Call; and
- the applicable co-financing rules.

Own co-financing and partner contributions

Clearly state the amount and percentage of the applicant's own contribution and list the individual financial contributions of all project partners, where applicable.

If third-party contributions are foreseen (e.g. citizens, NGOs, private sector entities or other public institutions not acting as project partners), list them clearly or tick *"No additional contributions"*.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This section contributes directly to the assessment of:

- Technical criteria, in particular installed capacity and CO₂ reduction;
- Economic Impact, through project cost, grant amount and co-financing structure;
- Quality of the proposal, notably coherence between technical, environmental and financial information.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Providing CO₂ reduction figures without explaining the calculation approach.
- Using unclear or non-transparent assumptions for emission factors or baseline consumption.
- Referring to "standard" or "generic" CO₂ calculations without justification.
- Mismatch between installed capacity, expected energy output and stated CO₂ reductions.
- Requesting a grant amount that exceeds the allowed thresholds or percentages.
- Arithmetic inconsistencies between total cost, grant amount and own contribution.

13.3 SECTION 3 – Project concept, relevance and expected results

Section 3 is one of the **most important parts of the application**, as it provides the main narrative evidence used for scoring under relevance, economic impact, social impact, gender inclusion and community involvement criteria.

Applicants should use Sections 3 and 4 to **explain and justify** their project, not merely to restate technical data or checkbox selections from previous sections. The emphasis should be on **logic**,



quantified effects, local relevance and concrete examples, clearly demonstrating why the project deserves support under this Call.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 A) Background and problem statement

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection establishes the **baseline situation** and explains the concrete problem the project addresses. Evaluators use this information to understand the necessity of the project and to assess its relevance and justification.

b) What to include

Applicants should clearly describe:

- the current technical, operational or energy-related situation;
- the specific problem or challenge faced (e.g. high energy costs, outdated systems, unreliable services, environmental or safety issues);
- why existing systems, infrastructure or services are insufficient.

The description should be factual and focused on the **local context**. Where relevant, reference existing data, audits or studies.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes mainly to:

- **Relevance of the project**
- **Quality of the proposal**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Describing general national problems without linking them to the specific municipality or site.
- Vague statements without explaining causes or consequences.
- Mixing problem description with proposed solutions.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 B) Project objective and community relevance

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection assesses how well the project responds to **local community needs and public policy objectives**, beyond internal municipal operations.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

b) What to include

Applicants should clearly explain:

- the main objective of the project;
- why the project is relevant for the **local community**, not only for municipal administration;
- how the project relates to local strategies, plans or policy objectives (energy, climate, mobility, social inclusion, public services);
- whether the project is a stand-alone technical investment or part of a broader community-oriented initiative.

Concrete examples are encouraged (e.g. improved access to affordable heating, safer streets, accessible EV charging, improved public services).

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes to:

- **Relevance of the project**
- **Social impact**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Focusing only on internal cost savings.
- Listing strategies without explaining the connection to the project.
- Generic statements such as “the project benefits the community” without explanation.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 C) Key interventions and proposed solution

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection explains **what will be implemented** and how the proposed solution addresses the identified problem.

b) What to include

Applicants should describe:

- the main technical interventions (e.g. installation of PV, biomass boiler, heat pump, chargers, LED lighting);
- system capacity and key components;
- integration with existing infrastructure;
- relevant safety or operational considerations;
- main implementation steps (procurement, installation, commissioning).



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

The description should be consistent with the technical documentation but written in clear, non-technical language.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes to:

- **Quality of the proposal**
- **Technical criteria** (consistency and feasibility)

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Copying text directly from technical designs.
- Overly technical language without explanation.
- Describing activities not reflected in the feasibility study or BoQ.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 D) Expected results (Project outcomes)

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection evaluates the **tangible outcomes** of the project and the changes it will generate.

b) What to include

Applicants should describe expected results related to:

- operational and service improvements;
- energy and environmental performance;
- financial or efficiency effects.

Where possible, results should be **quantified** or clearly explained in terms of scale and impact.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes to:

- **Economic impact**
- **Social impact**
- **Quality of the proposal**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Listing activities instead of outcomes.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- Repeating indicators without explanation.
- Presenting results that are not supported by data or assumptions.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 E) Target groups and expected benefits

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection demonstrates **who benefits from the project and how**, which is central to assessing community value.

b) What to include

Applicants should clearly describe:

- direct and indirect beneficiaries;
- estimated number of beneficiaries, where possible;
- social benefits (comfort, safety, accessibility, inclusion);
- environmental benefits (reduced emissions, improved air quality);
- economic benefits (lower costs, improved efficiency);
- whether benefits are supported by the feasibility study and whether they are long-term.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes to:

- **Social impact**
- **Community involvement**
- **Relevance of the project**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Naming beneficiaries without explaining benefits.
- Not distinguishing between direct and indirect beneficiaries.
- Ignoring vulnerable or priority groups, where relevant.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 F) Expected annual financial effects of the project

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection provides the basis for evaluating the **economic impact** of the project.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

b) What to include

Applicants should provide:

- expected annual financial savings (BAM/year);
- expected annual revenues, if applicable;
- equivalent economic value if no direct revenues or savings exist;
- key assumptions used (energy prices, operating hours, utilisation rates).

Figures must be consistent with the feasibility study.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes directly to:

- **Economic impact**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Presenting lump sums without assumptions.
- Mixing investment costs with annual effects (i.e. annual financial savings and/or annual revenues).
- Using unrealistic price or demand assumptions.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 G) Coverage of consumption / Energy savings

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection quantifies the **relative contribution** of the project to energy demand or savings.

b) What to include

Applicants should:

- select whether coverage of consumption or energy savings applies;
- provide percentage values;
- define the baseline and assumptions.
- (EV charging projects are exempt.)

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes to:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- Economic impact
- Technical criteria

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Missing baseline definition.
- Inconsistent figures compared to Section 2.
- Confusing coverage and savings concepts.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 H) Job creation

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection captures the **employment effects of the project**, including both **direct jobs** created through project implementation and operation, as well as **indirect or induced jobs** that may arise within the wider local community as a result of the investment.

The objective is not only to count formal employment positions directly linked to the project, but also to recognise the broader **local economic stimulation** generated by the project, such as increased demand for local services, maintenance, supply chains, or community-based activities.

b) What to include

Applicants should describe and, where possible, quantify:

- **Direct jobs** created by the project:
 - installation, construction, commissioning works;
 - operation, maintenance or management of the system;
 - jobs within the REC, municipality, contractor or service providers.
- **Indirect jobs** generated in the local economy, such as:
 - engagement of local installers, technicians, engineers or service companies;
 - increased demand for local suppliers (materials, transport, logistics);
 - maintenance and servicing activities over the system's lifetime;
 - administrative, monitoring or coordination roles related to community energy activities.
- **Induced or community-level effects**, where relevant:
 - short-term employment linked to awareness activities, community engagement or training;
 - opportunities for local SMEs or cooperatives to participate in energy-related services;
 - strengthening of local skills and know-how that may lead to future employment opportunities.

For each category, applicants should indicate:



- estimated number of jobs;
- whether jobs are temporary or permanent;
- expected duration (for temporary jobs);
- entity responsible for employment (contractor, municipality, REC, service provider, etc.).

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes primarily to:

- **Economic Impact**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Counting the same job multiple times under different categories.
- Claiming indirect or induced jobs without explaining the causal link to the project.
- Overestimating job numbers without realistic assumptions.
- Omitting the distinction between temporary and permanent employment.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 3 I) Reinvestment plan

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection assesses whether the project creates **sustainable, long-term value for the local community beyond the initial investment period**.

The focus is on how financial savings and/or revenues generated by the project are **strategically reinvested** to support further community priorities, rather than being absorbed into general budgets without a clear purpose. A strong reinvestment plan demonstrates that the project is not a one-off technical intervention, but part of a **broader, forward-looking community energy and development approach**.

Evaluators will consider whether the reinvestment mechanism is:

- **clearly defined** (what is reinvested and how much);
- **purpose-oriented** (linked to energy transition, public services, social or environmental priorities);
- **institutionally credible** (who decides, under which procedure); and
- **realistic and implementable** within the local governance context.

Projects that present a transparent and measurable reinvestment plan are considered more resilient, scalable and aligned with the objectives of the Grant Facility.

b) What to include



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Applicants should describe:

- the share (%) of savings or revenues to be reinvested;
- specific reinvestment purposes;
- timeline and decision-making mechanism.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

Contributes to:

- **Economic impact**
- **Relevance of the project**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Vague statements without percentages or timelines.
- No clarity on who decides on reinvestment.
- Proposing reinvestment without realistic savings.

13.4 SECTION 4 – Social impact, gender inclusion and community involvement

This section allows applicants to demonstrate the **added social value** of their project beyond technical performance and financial indicators. While the criteria covered here are assessed as **bonus points**, they play an important role in differentiating projects of similar technical quality and in highlighting projects that deliver broader community benefits.

Applicants are encouraged to focus on **concrete, credible and locally relevant impacts**, rather than general statements or policy language.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 4 A) Social impact

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection assesses whether and how the project generates **tangible social benefits** for the local or target community, beyond serving purely technical or administrative needs.

The emphasis is on identifying **who benefits**, **how benefits are delivered**, and **whether the project contributes to improved quality of life, public services or social inclusion**, especially for vulnerable or underserved groups.

b) What to include

Applicants should clearly describe:



- **Who benefits from the project, such as:**
 - local residents;
 - users of public services (schools, kindergartens, health centres, public transport users);
 - vulnerable or disadvantaged groups (e.g. low-income households, elderly, children, persons with disabilities).
- **How the project improves living conditions or public services, for example:**
 - improved comfort, safety or accessibility;
 - reduced energy costs enabling better public service provision;
 - safer streets, cleaner air, improved mobility or service reliability.
- **Use of financial savings or revenues, where applicable:**
 - whether operational savings or revenues are reinvested into social, educational or community-oriented purposes;
 - concrete examples of reinvestment (e.g. support to social services, further EE measures, community facilities).
- **Awareness, education or outreach activities, such as:**
 - information sessions for citizens;
 - educational activities in schools or public institutions;
 - visibility actions that increase understanding of energy transition benefits.

Applicants should focus on **realistic and verifiable impacts**, supported where possible by the feasibility study or project documentation.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes to:

- **Social Impact (bonus points)**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Describing general societal benefits without linking them to the specific project.
- Claiming social impact without identifying beneficiaries.
- Confusing internal municipal benefits with community-level social benefits.
- Repeating objectives instead of describing actual outcomes.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 4 B) Gender inclusion

a) Purpose of this subsection



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

This subsection assesses whether gender equality and inclusion are **meaningfully considered and applied** within the project, rather than treated as a formal requirement.

The focus is on **practical involvement and decision-making**, not on abstract commitments or policy references.

b) What to include

Applicants should explain:

- **Gender balance in the project team or governance**, including:
 - involvement of women in planning, management, procurement or implementation;
 - representation in REC governance bodies or decision-making structures.
- **Meaningful roles of women**, such as:
 - leadership or coordination roles;
 - technical, managerial or community-facing responsibilities.
- **Gender-sensitive elements**, where applicable:
 - objectives addressing women as users or beneficiaries;
 - inclusive communication or consultation practices.
- **Evidence in project documentation**, such as:
 - team composition;
 - governance structures;
 - references in project descriptions or implementation plans.

Simple, concrete descriptions are preferred over generic statements.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes to:

- **Gender Inclusion (bonus points)**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Stating general support for gender equality without showing implementation.
- Mentioning women only as beneficiaries, without involvement in the project.
- Overstating gender impacts that are not supported by project activities.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Section 4 C) Community involvement

a) Purpose of this subsection



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

This subsection evaluates the **depth and quality of community and stakeholder involvement** in the project lifecycle.

The focus is on **active participation and influence**, not only on information-sharing or formal consultations.

b) What to include

Applicants should describe:

- **Who is involved**, such as:
 - citizens;
 - local stakeholders (schools, utilities, NGOs, neighbourhood groups);
 - REC members or partner organisations.
- **At which stages involvement takes place**:
 - project design and concept development;
 - decision-making processes;
 - implementation, operation or monitoring.
- **Types of engagement activities**, including:
 - meetings, consultations, workshops;
 - working groups or steering committees;
 - participatory decision-making mechanisms.
- **How community input influences the project**, for example:
 - changes to project design;
 - selection of buildings or locations;
 - operational or governance arrangements.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes to:

- **Community Involvement (bonus points)**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Confusing information campaigns with participation.
- Listing meetings without explaining their purpose or outcomes.
- Describing planned involvement without indicating commitment or mechanisms.
- Claiming community support without evidence or concrete actions.

13.5 SECTION 5 – Implementation concept

This section explains **how the project will be implemented in practice**, who will be responsible for which tasks, and how potential risks will be managed. It demonstrates the applicant's



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

operational capacity, readiness for implementation and ability to deliver the project within the planned timeframe and budget.

Evaluators will look for a **clear, realistic and internally consistent implementation logic**, aligned with the technical documentation and procurement requirements.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 5.1 Planned Key Activities

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection provides an overview of the **main implementation steps** of the project. It allows evaluators to understand the overall logic and sequence of activities without going into technical detail.

The focus is on **what will be done**, not on how it is technically designed.

b) What to include

Applicants should list the **core implementation activities**, such as:

- preparation and launch of procurement procedures;
- installation and construction works;
- system testing, connection and commissioning;
- community engagement or awareness activities, where applicable;
- training or capacity-building activities, if relevant to the project.

Activities should be described:

- in logical order;
- in clear, non-technical language;
- aligned with the project duration and schedule.

Avoid listing minor tasks or technical specifications already covered in the technical documentation.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes mainly to:

- **Quality of the Proposal**
- **Economic Impact** (indirectly, through implementation feasibility)

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Copying technical descriptions from the feasibility study or design.



- Listing procurement items instead of activities.
- Providing an unrealistic or incomplete activity sequence.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 5.2 Implementation Schedule

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection demonstrates whether the proposed timeline is **realistic, coherent and feasible**, taking into account procurement procedures, installation works and reporting requirements.

It helps evaluators assess whether the project can be completed within the planned duration.

b) What to include

Applicants should provide:

- an indicative timeline for each key phase (e.g. months or date ranges);
- a logical sequence of phases, starting from tender preparation through final reporting;
- adjustments to phases if certain steps are not applicable to the selected technology.

The schedule does **not** need to be a detailed Gantt chart, but it should clearly show that the applicant understands the procedural steps involved.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes mainly to:

- **Quality of the Proposal**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Overlapping phases that are not realistically simultaneous.
- Ignoring time needed for procurement or commissioning.
- Providing dates that contradict the planned project duration.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 5.3 Roles and Responsibilities

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection assesses whether responsibilities for implementation are **clearly defined and appropriately allocated** among the involved actors.

Clear role distribution reduces implementation risks and demonstrates organisational readiness.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

b) What to include

Applicants should briefly explain:

- who acts as overall project manager;
- who is responsible for procurement procedures;
- who supervises installation and on-site works;
- who provides technical expertise or oversight;
- who leads community engagement or communication activities, if applicable.

Roles should be assigned to specific entities (municipality, REC, partner, contractor), not described in general terms.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes mainly to:

- **Quality of the Proposal**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Describing roles vaguely (“the municipality will coordinate everything”).
- Assigning multiple critical roles to one actor without justification.
- Omitting responsibility for procurement or supervision.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 5.4 Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection evaluates the applicant’s ability to **anticipate, manage and mitigate realistic project risks**.

The goal is not to list every possible risk, but to demonstrate **practical risk awareness and preparedness**.

b) What to include

Applicants should identify **3–5 key risks** that could realistically affect the project, such as:

- technical or site-related risks;
- procurement delays;
- administrative or permitting issues;
- financial or co-financing risks;
- community acceptance or coordination risks.



For each risk, applicants should indicate:

- likelihood (low / medium / high);
- potential impact (low / medium / high);
- concrete mitigation measures.

Mitigation measures should be specific and actionable.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes mainly to:

- **Quality of the Proposal**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Listing generic risks without mitigation measures.
- Marking all risks as “low”.
- Describing mitigation actions that are not under the applicant’s control.

13.6 SECTION 6 – Replication potential

This section assesses the extent to which the proposed project can serve as a **model for replication, learning and scaling**, either within the same municipality or by other municipalities and communities.

Replication does not mean that the project must be identical in every future case. Instead, evaluators look for **transferable concepts, documented logic and practical experience** that can be reused or adapted elsewhere.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 6.1 Transferability of the technical solution

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection evaluates whether the **technical solution is transferable** beyond the specific project site and whether it is based on principles that can be reused in similar contexts. The focus is on understanding whether the project represents a **one-off, site-specific solution** or a **repeatable technical concept** suitable for broader application.

b) What to include

Applicants should explain:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- Whether the solution is:
 - highly site-specific (e.g. unique constraints, special building type), or
 - based on standardized or modular approaches.
- Which technical elements could realistically be reused, such as:
 - design principles and sizing logic;
 - equipment types or configurations;
 - layouts, technical specifications or system architecture.
- Any **local constraints** that may limit replication, for example:
 - grid connection capacity;
 - space or structural limitations;
 - regulatory or permitting conditions.
- Whether the feasibility study clearly explains:
 - system sizing;
 - grid or system integration;
 - cost logic and key assumptions.

Applicants are encouraged to be realistic and transparent; acknowledging constraints does not reduce scores if the replication logic is clearly explained.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes directly to:

- **Replication Potential**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Claiming full replicability without explaining why.
- Ignoring site-specific constraints.
- Repeating technical descriptions instead of explaining transferability.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 6.2 Documentation and learning value

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection assesses whether the project generates **useful documentation and practical knowledge** that could support replication by other municipalities, RECs or community-led initiatives. The emphasis is on **learning value**, not only on formal technical completeness.

b) What to include

Applicants should describe:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- What documentation is or will be available, such as:
 - technical designs and drawings;
 - Bills of Quantities and cost structures;
 - installation procedures;
 - operation and maintenance plans.
- Whether **lessons learned** are identified or expected, including:
 - permitting and approval processes;
 - procurement challenges;
 - coordination with utilities or contractors;
 - operational or maintenance insights.
- Whether this documentation could realistically be:
 - shared with other municipalities or communities;
 - reused as reference material or templates.

Applicants may also mention plans to present or disseminate this knowledge through workshops, exchanges or other communication activities.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes directly to:

- **Replication Potential**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Listing documents without explaining their usefulness for replication.
- Confusing internal reporting with transferable documentation.
- Assuming replication value without showing learning outcomes.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 6.3 Potential for scaling or wider rollout

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection evaluates whether the project has the potential to be **scaled up or rolled out more widely**, either within the same municipality or across other municipalities and communities. Evaluators look for a **clear and credible pathway** for scaling or replication, even if implementation is planned in later phases.

b) What to include

Applicants should explain:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- Whether and how the project could be:
 - expanded to additional buildings or sites;
 - replicated across other municipal facilities;
 - adapted by other municipalities or RECs.
- Whether there is a **clear replication pathway**, including:
 - technical feasibility;
 - financial logic (e.g. reinvestment, future funding);
 - institutional arrangements or partnerships.
- Whether the project is intended to function as:
 - a pilot project;
 - a reference model;
 - a benchmark for future community energy investments.

Applicants may also describe any planned actions to encourage replication, such as:

- preparation of blueprints or templates;
- peer-to-peer exchange events;
- cooperation with other municipalities or networks.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection contributes directly to:

- **Replication Potential**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Claiming scalability without explaining how it would be achieved.
- Confusing ambition with realistic planning.
- Omitting financial or institutional aspects of replication.

13.7 SECTION 7 – Legal ownership / right of use

This section confirms that the applicant has the **legal authority to implement and operate the proposed investment** on the relevant building or site. It is a **mandatory eligibility requirement** and a precondition for contracting and disbursement under the Grant Facility.

Projects that fail to demonstrate clear ownership or a legally valid long-term right of use **cannot be financed**, regardless of their technical or economic quality.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 7.1 Ownership status of the building / site

a) Purpose of this subsection



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

This subsection verifies whether the applicant:

- is the **legal owner** of the building or site where the investment will be implemented, or
- holds a **formal, legally valid right of use** that allows installation, operation, maintenance and verification of the equipment.

The objective is to ensure that the investment can be implemented without legal obstacles and remains operational for its expected lifetime.

b) What to include

Applicants must clearly indicate **one applicable option**:

- the applicant is the legal owner of the building/site; or
- the applicant is not the owner but holds a valid right of use; or
- another legally valid arrangement (to be clearly specified).

The selected option must be fully supported by documentation provided in Section 7.2.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection is used for:

- **Eligibility verification** (It does not carry scoring points but is a pass/fail condition.)

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Selecting an ownership status without providing supporting documents.
- Using informal arrangements without legal validity.
- Leaving the ownership status unclear or inconsistent with annexes.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 7.2 Documentation attached

a) Purpose of this subsection

This subsection verifies that the applicant has submitted **documentary evidence** proving ownership or right of use, as required under the Call. All documents listed here must be included in the **Annex of the Project Proposal**.

b) What to include

If the applicant is the owner, at least one of the following must be provided:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- land registry extract; or
- another official ownership document (to be specified).

If the applicant is not the owner, one or more legally valid documents must be provided, such as:

- formal statement by the owner confirming the applicant's right of use together with a land registry extract of the owner (not older than 12 months from the date of publication of the Call);
- legally valid agreement with the property owner;
- lease or usage agreement;
- Memorandum of Understanding or Cooperation Agreement;
- notarised declaration or statement of consent together with a land registry extract of the owner (not older than 12 months from the date of publication of the Call);
- municipal decision granting long-term usage rights;
- other legally valid documents confirming the right of use (to be specified).

Documents must clearly identify:

- the building or site concerned;
- the parties involved; and
- the scope of the granted rights.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This subsection is used for:

- **Eligibility verification**
- **Legal and contractual checks prior to contracting**

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Submitting unsigned or draft documents.
- Providing documents that do not explicitly cover the project site.
- Referring to future or conditional ownership arrangements.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: Duration of the right of use

a) Purpose of this subsection

Where the applicant is not the owner, this field confirms that the **duration of the right of use matches or exceeds the expected operational lifetime** of the investment. This ensures long-term functionality and protection of the financed assets.



b) What to include

Applicants must indicate:

- a specific end date for the right of use, or
- an unlimited / permanent right of use.

The stated duration must be consistent with the supporting legal documents.

c) Common mistakes to avoid

- Right of use shorter than the expected operational lifetime.
- Missing dates or unclear validity periods.
- Mismatch between declared duration and annexed documents.

13.8 SECTION 8 – Permits and approvals for PV, EV and public lighting

a) Purpose of this section

This section serves to verify the **legal, regulatory and administrative readiness** of the proposed investment for implementation. It does not assess the ambition or strategic relevance of the project, but rather its **practical feasibility and compliance with applicable legislation**.

The objective is to demonstrate that all relevant permits, consents and approvals required for the implementation of the project are **either already obtained** or **clearly not required under applicable law**, and that no unresolved regulatory obstacles exist that could delay, suspend or prevent project implementation after grant award.

This section is particularly important because the Grant Facility supports **implementation-ready projects**, not concepts or projects still dependent on uncertain permitting processes.

b) What to include

Applicants shall:

- **Carefully review and complete only the subsections relevant to their technology, i.e.:**
 - Photovoltaics (PV),
 - Electric Vehicle (EV) chargers,
 - Public lighting.

Biomass heating and heat pump projects **do not complete this section** and should proceed directly to Section 9.

- For **each listed permit, consent or approval**, clearly indicate whether it is:



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- available,
 - not available, or
 - not required.
- If a permit or approval is marked as **available**, applicants must specify:
 - the name of the document,
 - reference number,
 - issuing authority,
 - date of issuance.
- If a permit or approval is marked as **not required**, applicants must provide a **short, clear and legally grounded explanation** (e.g. project size, building type, applicable thresholds under national legislation).
- Where an option **“is not available”** is selected in this section, **no further explanation is required or expected**. Such a selection clearly indicates that the required document has **not yet been obtained**, and therefore that the project is **not fully ready for implementation at the time of application**. Applicants should be aware that selecting **“not available”** may:
 - affect the assessment of technical readiness,
 - trigger eligibility screening outcomes, and
 - lead to rejection if the missing item is mandatory under this Call.

Only options marked as **“available”** or **“not required”** (where duly justified by law or project scope) demonstrate implementation readiness.

Particular attention should be paid to:

- grid connection consents and approvals from utility operators (PV and EV projects),
- urban planning and construction permits,
- environmental and heritage-related approvals,
- technical confirmations (for PV projects: roof structural safety, fire safety compliance, electrical protection schemes, equipment certifications).

All permits and approvals marked as “available” **must be included in the Annex to the Project Proposal**.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This section **does not explain or interpret evaluation criteria**. Instead, it provides **objective evidence** used by evaluators to assess the project against the following criteria:

- **Readiness and feasibility of the project**, by confirming whether all mandatory permits and approvals are available at the time of application;
- **Quality and maturity of project preparation**, by demonstrating that the project has passed all required regulatory and administrative stages;



- **Regulatory and administrative risk assessment**, by allowing evaluators to identify any outstanding approvals that could delay or jeopardise implementation.

Selections marked as “**not available**” are treated as factual indicators of incomplete readiness and are assessed accordingly.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Marking permits as “not required” without providing any explanation.
- Indicating that a permit is “available” but failing to include the document in the Annex.
- Assuming that permits can be easily obtained after grant approval without evidence.
- Completing permit subsections that do not apply to the selected technology.
- Inconsistencies between this section and the technical documentation (e.g. feasibility study or BoQ implying permits that are marked as “not required”).

13.9 SECTION 9 – Technical readiness

This section demonstrates that the proposed project is technically mature and ready for immediate implementation. It is a **critical eligibility and scoring-related section**, as it confirms that the project has passed the design and procurement preparation stages and can realistically proceed to contracting and implementation without major delays.

Incomplete technical readiness or unclear documentation may lead to lower technical scores, requests for clarification, or rejection at the eligibility screening stage.

a) Purpose of this section

The purpose of this section is to verify that the project has reached a sufficient level of technical maturity, including:

- completion (or near-completion) of the main project design,
- preparation of procurement documentation (including detailed BoQ and technical specifications),
- availability of all key technical studies required for implementation.

Evaluators use this section to assess **implementation readiness, feasibility, and risk**, and to confirm that the project can start immediately after contracting.

b) What to include

Applicants should clearly and accurately indicate the status of technical preparation of:



Main project design

- Confirm whether the full main project design is completed.
- If completed, specify the exact document title, reference number, responsible entity, and date of approval/completion.
- If partially completed, explain precisely which elements are still pending and why they do not prevent implementation.

Procurement preparation

- Confirm whether the procurement preparation phase is completed, including draft tender dossier, detailed BoQ, and technical specifications.
- If still in progress, indicate a realistic expected completion date and briefly explain remaining steps.

Technical documentation submitted

- Tick all technical documents included in the Annexes.
- For each selected document type, provide:
 - document title,
 - reference number,
 - issuing or preparing entity,
 - date of completion or approval.

Applicants should ensure that the selected documents are **consistent with the proposed technology**, site conditions, and permitting requirements outlined in previous sections.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This section contributes directly to the following evaluation criteria:

- **Technical criteria**
- **Quality of the proposal**

Incomplete or weak technical readiness may negatively affect scores under **Technical criteria** and **Quality of the proposal**.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

Applicants are strongly advised to avoid the following frequent issues:

- Marking “Yes” for completed designs while submitting only concept-level or outdated documentation.
- Failing to include key technical documents in the Annexes after ticking them in the checklist.



- Providing vague explanations such as “design almost finished” without specifying pending elements.
- Listing technical documents that are not aligned with the selected technology (e.g. PV documents for a heat pump project).
- Inconsistencies between technical readiness claims and information provided in Sections 2, 5, or 8.
- Omitting procurement documentation details, especially the Bill of Quantities.

A clear, honest, and well-documented Technical Readiness section significantly increases the credibility and competitiveness of the proposal.

13.10 SECTION 10 – Technical parameters and project readiness information

a) Purpose of this section

This section is a **core technical and scoring section** of the application. Its purpose is to confirm that the proposed project is technically sound, properly dimensioned, and ready (or nearly ready) for implementation. The information provided here is used directly to assess technical performance, cost efficiency, equipment quality, and overall project maturity.

Applicants are required to provide **quantitative, verifiable technical data** derived from feasibility studies, main designs, energy audits, or equivalent technical documentation. The section also differentiates between **REC-based PV projects** and **community-led projects** for other technologies.

Incomplete, inconsistent, or unsupported technical data in this section will significantly reduce the technical score and may lead to rejection during eligibility or readiness screening.

b) What to include

Applicants must complete **only the subsection corresponding to the technology for which they are applying**. All other technology-specific subsections must be left blank.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 10.1 Technical Parameters – Technology-specific part

Depending on the selected technology, applicants must provide:

- **Installed capacity (kW / kWp).** Use values exactly as defined in the feasibility study or main technical design.
- **CO₂ Reduction (tCO₂/year).** The calculation of expected CO₂ emission reductions shall be carried out in accordance with the applicable entity-level regulations on energy performance of buildings in Bosnia and Herzegovina.



For projects implemented on the territory of the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, calculations shall be based on the Rulebook on Minimum Energy Performance of Buildings (Official Gazette of the Federation of BiH, No. 81/19).

For projects implemented on the territory of Republika Srpska, calculations shall be based on the Rulebook on Minimum Requirements for Energy Performance of Buildings of Republika Srpska (Official Gazette of RS, No. 30/2015 and 47/2022).

For projects implemented in Brčko District of Bosnia and Herzegovina, applicants may apply either of the above-mentioned rulebooks, provided that the selected methodology is applied consistently throughout the calculation.

- **Cost efficiency (BAM/kW or BAM/pcs).** Use the total eligible investment cost divided by:
 - installed capacity (kW) for PV, biomass, heat pumps and EV chargers, or
 - number of luminaires replaced (pcs) for public lighting.

Values must match the Bill of Quantities and cost estimates.

- **Equipment efficiency parameters**, depending on technology:
 - PV: panel efficiency (%) and guaranteed annual degradation rate
 - Biomass: boiler efficiency (%) in accordance with EN 303-5 or equivalent
 - Heat pumps: COP declared under EN 14511 at the relevant test condition
 - EV chargers: authentication methods, IP protection, integrated protection functions, communication & interoperability, energy metering
 - Public lighting: luminaire efficacy (lm/W) and lighting control/dimming system

All values must be **supported by manufacturer datasheets, certified test reports, or design documentation**, submitted as annexes.

Renewable Energy Community (REC) – PV projects only

Applicants proposing PV projects must complete the full REC readiness checklist, answering **Yes/No** questions and attaching supporting evidence where applicable. This part assesses:

- legal establishment and governance,
- operational readiness,
- transparency of decision-making and benefit sharing,
- strategic and organisational maturity of the REC.

Ref. to Project Proposal Form: 10.2 Project Readiness Information – Community-LED projects

Applicants for biomass heating, heat pumps, EV chargers and public lighting must complete the **Community-LED readiness checklist**, confirming:



- progression beyond conceptual stage,
- existence of technical preparation and approvals,
- procurement and implementation readiness,
- clear identification of community beneficiaries and target groups,
- evidence of community outreach and engagement.

Only projects demonstrating a sufficient level of readiness should answer “Yes” to later-stage questions.

c) Link to evaluation criteria

This section **directly contributes** to the assessment of the following evaluation criteria:

- Technical criteria:
 - Installed capacity
 - CO₂ emission reductions
 - Cost efficiency
 - Equipment efficiency
 - REC maturity and readiness (for PV) and Community-LED project readiness (for Biomass heating, Heat pumps, EV chargers and Public lighting)
- Quality criteria:
 - Quality of the proposal

Scores awarded under Section 10 have a **significant impact on the total technical score** and, after technology-specific weighting, on the final ranking of proposals.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Filling in **multiple technology subsections** instead of only the selected one.
- Providing estimated or indicative values **not supported by technical documentation**.
- Mixing installed capacity and nominal capacity inconsistently across sections.
- Reporting cost efficiency values that do not match the BoQ or feasibility study.
- Claiming advanced equipment features (e.g. interoperability, protection functions, telemanagement) without documentary evidence.
- For PV projects: marking REC-related questions as “Yes” without submitting proof of legal, organisational, or operational readiness.
- For community-led projects: indicating full readiness without documented engagement activities.



13.11 SECTION 11 – Review and acceptance of the draft contract

a) Purpose of this section

This section confirms that the applicant has **reviewed and understood** the Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility provided as part of the Application Package and is aware of the contractual framework that will apply if the project is selected for funding.

The purpose is to:

- ensure transparency regarding implementation, verification, disbursement and contractual obligations;
- identify any **requests for clarification** before contract signature; and
- reduce risks of misunderstandings or delays during contracting and implementation.

This section is **not an evaluation criterion** and does not carry scoring points.

b) What to include

Applicants must indicate **one of the two options**:

Yes – Acceptance confirmed

Select this option if the applicant:

- has reviewed the Contract in full, and
- confirms acceptance of its terms and conditions as provided.

No additional explanation is required if this option is selected.

No – Clarification requested

Select this option only if the applicant has reviewed the Contract and has **specific questions or concerns requiring clarification**.

If “No” is selected, applicants must clearly and concisely describe:

- the **specific article(s) or section(s)** of the draft contract concerned;
- the **nature of the question or concern** (e.g. clarification of obligations, interpretation of a clause); and
- whether **clarification or interpretation** is requested.

Applicants should be precise and avoid general or open-ended comments.



c) Important notes for applicants

- This section is intended **exclusively for clarification purposes** and **does not constitute a negotiation of contract terms**.
- The Grant Facility may respond by providing clarification or interpretation, but **is not obliged to amend** the draft contract.
- Comments submitted under this section **do not influence project scoring or selection decisions**.
- Failure to raise questions or concerns at this stage may be interpreted as **acceptance of the contract as drafted**.

Applicants are therefore strongly encouraged to carefully review the Contract for recipients of grants under the EU4CAET Grant Facility before submitting their proposal.

d) Common mistakes to avoid

- Using this section to request **changes to contract terms** instead of clarification.
- Referring to the contract in general terms without citing **specific articles or clauses**.
- Submitting lengthy legal opinions or negotiating positions.
- Leaving the section blank without ticking either “Yes” or “No”.

13.12 SECTION 12 – Declaration by the Applicant

a) Purpose of this section

This section serves as a **formal and legally binding declaration** by the applicant confirming the accuracy, completeness, and authenticity of the information provided in the project proposal and its annexes.

By signing this declaration, the applicant:

- formally confirms compliance with the requirements of the Call for Proposals;
- acknowledges key implementation, verification and disbursement rules of the Grant Facility; and
- accepts responsibility for the information submitted.

This declaration is a **mandatory procedural requirement**. Proposals without a properly completed and signed declaration will be considered **ineligible**.

b) What to include

Applicants must ensure that:

- the declaration text is **read in full and clearly understood** by the authorised representative;



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- all statements listed under Section 12.1 are accepted without reservation;
- the declaration is signed by a **legally authorised representative** of the applicant (municipality, city, or authorised representative of the partnership / REC);
- the signature is accompanied by the **official stamp/seal** of the applicant;
- place and date are clearly indicated.

No additional explanations or attachments are required under this section.

c) Common mistakes to avoid

- Missing signature or signature by a person **not legally authorised** to represent the applicant.
- Missing official stamp/seal.
- Leaving the place or date fields blank.
- Modifying the wording of the declaration text.
- Assuming that submission of the declaration implies approval of the project.

13.13 – Indicative List of Annexes

a) Purpose of this section

This indicative list of annexes is provided **solely as a supporting tool** to facilitate a clear and structured overview of the documentation submitted with the application.

The list **does not prescribe a mandatory structure** nor does it limit applicants in defining the scope, number, or organisation of annexes. Applicants remain fully responsible for selecting and submitting **all documentation they consider relevant and necessary** to demonstrate the technical, legal, financial, and institutional readiness of the proposed project.

Applicants may:

- submit annexes in a different structure or grouping,
- merge or separate documents as appropriate, and
- include additional annexes not listed below, where relevant.

The primary objective of this indicative list is to support **clarity, completeness, and ease of review**, rather than to impose formal or rigid documentation requirements.

b) General principles for annex submission

Applicants should observe the following principles when preparing annexes:

- Only documents relevant to the selected technology (PV, biomass, heat pumps, EV charging, public lighting) and project context should be submitted.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

- Where a document is required (e.g. ownership, permits, technical design), it should be complete, valid, and consistent with the information provided in the Project Proposal Form.
- Annexes should be clearly titled and, where possible, referenced in the corresponding sections of the Project Proposal Form.
- The same document should not be submitted multiple times under different annexes unless clearly justified.

Submission of unnecessary or irrelevant annexes does not increase evaluation scores and may complicate the assessment process.

c) Structure and logic of annexes

ANNEX A – Partnership & Institutional Documentation

This annex group demonstrates the **institutional setup, governance structure, and formal cooperation arrangements**, including Renewable Energy Communities (REC), municipal partnerships, or other legally valid cooperation frameworks.

It is particularly relevant for:

- PV projects involving RECs;
- multi-actor projects; and
- projects where implementation responsibilities are shared.

ANNEX B – Legal Ownership / Right of Use

This annex confirms the applicant's **legal right to use the project site** for the full operational lifetime of the investment.

Applicants must clearly demonstrate:

- ownership of the site **or**
- a legally valid, long-term right of use.

The duration of the right of use must be sufficient to ensure **long-term sustainability** of the investment.

ANNEX C – Permits and Approvals

This annex documents the **regulatory and administrative readiness** of the project.

Applicants should attach:



- only those permits and approvals **required by applicable legislation** for the selected technology and location;
- confirmations where permits are already obtained; or
- documents demonstrating that certain permits are **not required**.

This annex directly supports the assessment of **regulatory and administrative risk**.

ANNEX D – Technology-Specific Documentation

This annex contains **technology-dependent approvals and confirmations**, such as safety, electrical, or infrastructure-related documents.

Applicants must submit documentation **only for the technology applied for**, ensuring consistency with Sections 8–10 of the Project Proposal Form.

ANNEX E – Technical Readiness Documentation

This annex demonstrates the **technical maturity and implementation readiness** of the project.

It typically includes:

- main technical designs and studies;
- detailed technical calculations and analyses;
- procurement-ready documentation (BoQ, specifications, draft tender dossier).

This annex is central to the evaluation of:

- readiness and feasibility of the project;
- quality and maturity of project preparation.

ANNEX F – Financial Documentation

This annex confirms the applicant's **financial capacity and budgetary readiness**, including:

- secured budget allocations;
- co-financing commitments; and
- evidence of available funds.

Financial annexes must be consistent with the financial data provided in the Project Proposal Form.

ANNEX G – Additional Supporting Documents

This annex allows applicants to submit **complementary evidence** strengthening the project's social, institutional, or risk-management aspects.



Submission of documents under this annex is optional and should be limited to materials that:

- add clear value to the evaluation; or
- substantiate specific claims made in the proposal.

d) Final note

Applicants are strongly encouraged to **cross-check this annex list against all previous sections** of the Project Proposal Form before submission to ensure full alignment and completeness.



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Annexes



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Annex I – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Photovoltaic (PV) Projects

Indicative scoring guidance and sources of verification

This section is intended to help applicants understand how evaluation criteria are assessed and which documents are typically used to verify the information provided.

Technical Criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
1. kWp Installed	Higher installed MW gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
2. CO ₂ Reduction in tCO ₂ /year	Higher CO ₂ reduction gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kWp)	Lower gets higher scores	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
4. Equipment efficiency	Higher equipment efficiency and quality gets higher score	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
5. Finance Provided	Higher finance provided higher score	Statement, project proposal
6. REC	REC management estab., statement REC 5	Statement, project proposal
Quality criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
7. Relevance of project	Evaluate the alignment of the project with municipal needs, strategic priorities, and the objectives of the Call. Projects with clearly justified needs and strong consistency between problems, solutions, and expected economic benefits receive higher scores.	Feasibility study, project proposal
8. Replication potential	Evaluate whether the project design, tools, or approaches are easily adaptable and supported with documentation for reuse in other municipalities.	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies
9. Quality of the proposal	Review the completeness, coherence, and structure of the proposal, focusing on presence and quality of key components.	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget)
10. Economic Impact	Higher economic benefits receive better scores, encouraging municipalities to prioritize impactful investments	Feasibility study, Project Application
Social criteria - BONUS	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
11. Social Impact	Determine if the project improves community well-being, access to services, inclusivity, or supports vulnerable groups.	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan
12. Gender Inclusion	Check for meaningful participation of women in planning, leadership, or project execution, and inclusion of gender considerations in design.	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis
13. Community involved	Evaluate if the project includes input from community stakeholders or partners and provides benefits or shared responsibilities.	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria

This subsection defines the technical criteria used to assess the performance, cost-efficiency, technical readiness and financing structure of the proposed investment.

Technical criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
1	KW Installed		
	0,1-10 kWp	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	10,1 - 20 kWp	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	20,1 - 30 kWp	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	30,1 - 40 kWp	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	40,1 - 50 kWp	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	50,1 - 60 kWp	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	60,1 - 70 kWp	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	70,1 - 80 kWp	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	80,1 - 90 kWp	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	> 90,1 kWp	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
2	CO₂ Reduction in tCO₂/year		
	0,1 -8,4 tCO ₂ /year	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	8,5 – 16,8 tCO ₂ /year	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	16,9 – 25,2 tCO ₂ /year	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	25,3 – 33,6 tCO ₂ /year	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	33,7 – 42,0 tCO ₂ /year	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	42,1 – 50,4 tCO ₂ /year	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	50,5 – 58,8 tCO ₂ /year	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	58,9 – 67,2 tCO ₂ /year	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	67,3 – 75,6 tCO ₂ /year	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	>75,7 tCO ₂ /year	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
3	Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)		
	2.400,1-2.500 BAM/kWp	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

	2.300,1-2.400 BAM/kWp	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2.200,1-2.300 BAM/kWp	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2.100,1-2.200 BAM/kWp	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2.000,1-2.100 BAM/kWp	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.900,1-2.000 BAM/kWp	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.800,1-1.900 BAM/kWp	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.700,1-1.800 BAM/kWp	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.600,1-1.700 BAM/kWp	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	<1.600 BAM/kWp	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
4	Equipment efficiency		
	<i>*Degradation values refer to average annual degradation after the first year of operation, based on manufacturer performance warranty and datasheet.</i>		
	Very Low to Low	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 17-17,9% - Degradation* ≤1%/year
	Low	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 18-18,9% - Degradation* ≤0,85%/year
	Low to Moderate	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 19-19,9% - Degradation* ≤0,75%/year
	Moderate-Low	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 20-20,4% - Degradation* ≤0,65%/year
	Moderate	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 20,5-20,9% - Degradation* ≤0,60%/year
	Moderate-High	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 21-21,4% - Degradation* ≤0,55%/year
	High	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 21,5-21,9% - Degradation* ≤0,50%/year
	Very High	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 22-22,4% - Degradation* ≤0,45%/year



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

	Near Maximum	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency 22,5–22,9% - Degradation* ≤0,40%/year
	Highest Efficiency	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application, Main project design - Panel efficiency ≥23% - Degradation* ≤0.30%/year
5	Finance Provided		
	20-23%	1	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	23,1-26%	2	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	26,1-29%	3	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	29,1-32%	4	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	32,1-35%	5	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	35,1-38%	6	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	38,1-41%	7	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	41,1-44%	8	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	44,1-47%	9	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	47,1-50%	10	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
6	REC		
	Intent Stated Only	1	Statement of intent included in the project application – General description of the planned REC
	Initial Community Outreach	2	Meeting minutes, expressions of interest – Informal consultations with citizens and/or stakeholders
	Formal establishment process initiated	3	Decision of founders or municipality – Draft founding agreement – Clear decision to establish the REC
	Legal preparation in progress	4	Draft statute and founding documents – Defined legal form (cooperative, association, etc.)
	REC legally established	5	Proof of official registration (court / municipality) – REC exists as a legal entity
	Basic REC organization	1	REC established and minimally operational – Internal meetings held – Basic roles and responsibilities defined
	Strategy or action plan in place	2	Adopted REC strategy or action plan – Clearly defined objectives (energy production, sharing, social impact) – Explanation of the project's relevance for the local community



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

Governance and membership model defined	3	Clear membership rules and decision-making procedures – Transparent governance structure – Defined benefit-sharing model
Operational capacity and readiness	4	Internal rules and procedures adopted – Business and/or financial plan available – Clearly assigned responsibilities for project implementation
Mature and fully functional REC	5	Complete internal documentation (statute, bylaws, strategy, business plan) – Active and clearly described members and stakeholders – Project fully integrated into the REC's long-term vision – High-quality, coherent project narrative and application – All permits requested by the law RTB project

B. Quality Evaluation Criteria

This subsection assesses the strategic relevance, economic rationale, replicability and overall quality of the project proposal.

Quality Criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
7	Relevance of project		
	Very weak relevance	1	Feasibility study, Project application REC mentioned only formally to meet eligibility – No explanation of why selected buildings are REC members – No defined users or target groups
	Weak relevance	2	Feasibility study, Project application Basic REC concept described – Municipality + other members listed, but roles unclear – Project benefits limited mainly to municipal administration staff – Community benefit weak or symbolic
	Low relevance	3	Feasibility study, Project application Project linked to REC objectives in general terms – Buildings identified (e.g. municipal building, school) – Target groups mentioned but not quantified – Benefits described broadly (e.g. "cost savings", "green energy")
	Partial relevance	4	Feasibility study, Project application Project purpose aligned with REC idea – Municipality clearly acts as lead member – Other REC members justified (school, utility, public service etc.) – Number of users roughly estimated, but limited analysis of local impact
	Moderate relevance	5	Feasibility study, Project application Clear project objective linked to REC mission – Minimum REC structure fulfilled (municipality + ≥2 members) – Users of buildings identified and quantified (employees, students, service users) – Benefits explained and consistent with feasibility study
	Good relevance	6	Feasibility study, Project application Project clearly supports REC mission and vision – PV benefits extend beyond administration to citizens and service users – Schools, public facilities, or utilities play an active role – Clear local benefits (reduced public costs, improved public services)



	High relevance	7	Feasibility study, Project application Strong alignment between REC strategy and project design – Municipality leads but REC members actively involved – Clear explanation of how local people benefit (students, households, service users) – Contribution to local energy transition well articulated
	Very high relevance	8	Feasibility study, Project application Project responds to clearly identified local needs – High number of indirect beneficiaries (students, citizens, vulnerable users) – Strong social, environmental, and economic benefits – REC seen as a tool for community development, not just energy savings
	Excellent relevance	9	Feasibility study, Project application Project is central to the REC's long-term role in the municipality – Mission, vision, and project fully integrated – Clear community-wide impact (education, social inclusion, local resilience) – Feasibility study quantifies benefits for different user groups
	Outstanding relevance	10	Feasibility study, Project application Project is a flagship pilot REC initiative – Municipality uses REC as a model for wider replication – Broad local impact beyond buildings' users (awareness, education, social value) – Strong narrative + solid technical justification – Demonstrates how REC creates value for the entire local community
8	Replication potential		
	Very weak replicability	1	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Technical solution depends heavily on local constraints – No attempt to generalize design or costs – No explanation of how project could inform other REC members
	Weak replicability	2	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Some components could be reused (modules, inverters) – Overall system logic not transferable – No standardized documentation or cost structure
	Low replicability	3	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Design documented but highly building-specific – No analysis of applicability to other municipal or public buildings – Economic and institutional aspects not transferable
	Partial replicability	4	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Basic technical concept reusable for similar public buildings – Limited documentation on roof load, sizing logic, self-consumption – No explicit replication narrative
	Moderately Replicable	5	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Project includes adaptable PV design principles – Feasibility study explains sizing, orientation, and consumption logic – Moderate redesign needed for other buildings
	Good replicability	6	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Technical and economic model reusable for small/mid-size municipal buildings – Clear explanation of investment costs, savings logic, and payback – Lessons learned documented (permitting, grid connection, procurement)
	Strong Replicability	7	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Project designed as a municipal REC pilot – Modular technical design and clear cost assumptions – Replicable governance and REC setup logic – Clear guidance for selecting additional buildings



	Very high replicability	8	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Complete replication-ready package – Full technical documentation (layouts, BoQ, structural checks) – Economic model adaptable to other buildings – Clear explanation of community and public-service benefits
	Near-scalable replication model	9	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Project provides templates and tools – ToR for designers and installers – Standardized technical specs and procurement approach – Guidance for municipalities and REC members
	Fully Replicable & Scalable	10	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies Project functions as a scalable REC rooftop PV model – Technical, economic, and institutional replication tools included – Easily expandable across municipal building portfolios – Clear pathway for replication by other municipalities or RECs
9	Quality of the proposal		
	Very Poor Quality	1	- Proposal is incomplete and poorly structured - Missing key components such as objectives, budget, or methodology - No clear feasibility shown
	Extremely Weak	2	- Proposal submitted but lacks clarity - Several key parts missing (e.g., timeline, team roles, risk identification)
	Weak	3	- Basic proposal exists, but many sections lack detail or structure - Difficult to assess viability
	Below Average	4	- Proposal includes most required parts but lacks technical detail or clarity - Some elements are placeholders only
	Moderate Quality	5	- Proposal is understandable and generally well-organized - All main components are present, but some require improvement (e.g., risk matrix, staffing plan, technical specs)
	Moderate to Good	6	- Most elements are well-prepared - Some technical areas or financial details need clarification - Proposal shows medium feasibility
	Good	7	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget) – Most key components are included, but some areas (e.g., risk assessment, technical details, budget clarity) may need improvement.
	Very Good	8	- Nearly all sections complete and logically presented - Timeline, budget, and risk planning are consistent with goals - Well-supported implementation plan
	Excellent	9	- Strong, detailed proposal with professional formatting - Gantt chart, budget breakdown, and risk matrix included - High feasibility and well-documented methodology
	Outstanding Proposal	10	- Fully professional and comprehensive submission - Clear objectives and methodology - Detailed implementation plan (Gantt chart), team structure, risk analysis, and budget - Feasibility and sustainability well demonstrated



10 Economic Impact		
<p>Maximum number of points for economic impact is 10. The final Economic Impact score (1–10) is calculated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assign points (1–10) for each of the four criteria: stated below: payback period, coverage of consumption/ energy savings, job creation, reinvestment plan. 2. Sum the points from all applicable criteria. 3. Divide the sum by the number of criteria used. 4. Round to the nearest whole number and this is the final economic impact score. <p>Example: Payback period: 5 years = 10 points Coverage of consumption: 75% = 9 points Job creation: 15 jobs = 10 points Reinvestment plan: 50% reinvestment, well described = 10 points Total: 10 + 9 + 10 + 10 = 39 Average: 39 / 4 = 9,75 → Total score: 10</p>		
(1) Payback period (investment return time)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period > 13 years
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 12–13 years
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 11–11,99 years
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 10–10,99 years
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 9–9,99 years
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 8–8,99 years
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 7–7,99 years
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 6–6,99 years
	9	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 5–5,99 years
	10	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period ≤5 years
(2) Coverage of consumption (% of the annual energy consumption covered or saved by the project)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved <5%
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 5-9%
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 10-19%
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 20-29%
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 30-39%
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 40-49%
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 50-59%
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 60-69%
	9	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 70-79%



	(3) Job creation (number of new jobs – permanent or temporary)	10	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved $\geq 80\%$
		1	Feasibility study, Project application 0 jobs created
		2	Feasibility study, Project application 1 job created
		3	Feasibility study, Project application 2 jobs created
		4	Feasibility study, Project application 3 jobs created
		5	Feasibility study, Project application 4 jobs created
		6	Feasibility study, Project application 5-6 jobs created
		7	Feasibility study, Project application 7-8 jobs created
		8	Feasibility study, Project application 9-11 jobs created
		9	Feasibility study, Project application 12-14 jobs created
		10	Feasibility study, Project application ≥ 15 jobs created
	(4) Reinvestment plan (quality and concreteness of the plan for reinvesting savings/profits)	1	Feasibility study, Project application No reinvestment plan
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Minimal plan: no specific figures
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Very weak plan: only stated intention to reinvest
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Weak plan: $<10\%$ reinvestment or unclear
		5	Feasibility study, Project application Basic plan: 10–14% reinvestment, minimally described
		6	Feasibility study, Project application Acceptable plan: 15-19% reinvestment, partially described
		7	Feasibility study, Project application Solid plan: 20-24% reinvestment, basic description
		8	Feasibility study, Project application Good plan: 25–29% reinvestment, clearly described
		9	Feasibility study, Project application Very good plan: 30–39% reinvestment, specific projects listed
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Excellent detailed plan: $\geq 40\%$ of savings reinvested in further local projects, with clear timeline and ROI



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

C. Social Evaluation Criteria (Bonus Points)

Social criteria are assessed as bonus points and aim to recognise additional social value, gender inclusion and community engagement beyond the core technical and quality requirements.

Social criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
11	Social impact		
	No identifiable social benefit	0	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Solar plant serves only the building owner (e.g., municipal office, administrative facility) with no impact on citizens or vulnerable groups. - No reinvestment of cost savings into social programs, public services, or community benefits. - No direct or indirect impact on vulnerable groups, disadvantaged communities, or general public welfare. - No public engagement, education, or awareness activities regarding energy transition.
	Project generates clear social benefit for the local or target community.	5	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited but measurable indirect benefits to vulnerable groups (e.g., small reductions in municipal energy costs that improve budget allocation for social services). - Some level of public awareness or outreach related to project benefits and sustainability. - Return to the community - Pollution - Visible effects
12	Gender inclusion		
	No consideration of gender or no women involved.	0	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No women are involved in conceptualization, planning, procurement, or implementation. - Project documents do not reference gender or include gender-sensitive components.
	At least one woman meaningfully involved or project includes gender-sensitive elements.	5	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proof that they have of woman in team directly involvement - Project includes gender-sensitive objectives or outcomes. - members of REC
13	Community involvement		
	No Community Involvement	0	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No evidence of consultation with or inclusion of community members in planning, decision-making, or implementation. - No partnerships or outreach involving local stakeholders
	Active Community Involvement	5	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community members or local stakeholders are actively involved in the conceptualization, planning, procurement, or implementation stages. - Project demonstrates community outreach or partnership with local actors (e.g., schools, NGOs, civil society, neighborhood groups).



Annex II – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Heat Pump Projects

Indicative scoring guidance and sources of verification

This section is intended to help applicants understand how evaluation criteria are assessed and which documents are typically used to verify the information provided.

Technical Criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
1. kW Installed	Higher installed MW gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
2. CO ₂ Reduction in tCO ₂ /year	Higher CO ₂ reduction gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)	Lower gets higher scores	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
4. Equipment efficiency	Higher equipment efficiency and quality gets higher score	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
5. Finance Provided	Higher finance provided higher score	Statement, project proposal
6. Community Led	Community Led involvement in project	Statement, project proposal
Quality criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
7. Relevance of project	Evaluate the alignment of the project with municipal needs, strategic priorities, and the objectives of the Call. Projects with clearly justified needs and strong consistency between problems, solutions, and expected economic benefits receive higher scores.	Feasibility study, project proposal
8. Replication potential	Evaluate whether the project design, tools, or approaches are easily adaptable and supported with documentation for reuse in other municipalities.	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies
9. Quality of the proposal	Review the completeness, coherence, and structure of the proposal, focusing on presence and quality of key components.	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget)
10. Economic Impact	Higher economic benefits receive better scores, encouraging municipalities to prioritize impactful investments	Feasibility study, Project Application
Social criteria - BONUS	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
11. Social Impact	Determine if the project improves community well-being, access to services, inclusivity, or supports vulnerable groups.	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan
12. Gender Inclusion	Check for meaningful participation of women in planning, leadership, or project execution, and inclusion of gender considerations in design.	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis
13. Community involved	Evaluate if the project includes input from community stakeholders or partners and provides benefits or shared responsibilities.	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria

This subsection defines the technical criteria used to assess the performance, cost-efficiency, technical readiness and financing structure of the proposed investment.

DATA Technical criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
1	KW Installed		
	1 - 40 kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	41 - 80 kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	81 - 120 kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	121 - 160 kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	161 - 200 kW	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	201 - 240 kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	241 - 280 kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	281 - 320 kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	321 - 360 kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	> 361 kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
2	CO₂ Reduction in %		
	20 – 22,9%	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	23– 25,9%	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	26 – 28,9%	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	29 – 31,9%	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	32 – 34,9%	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	35 – 37,9%	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	38 – 40,9%	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	41 – 43,9%	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	44 – 46,9%	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	> 47% reduction	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
3	Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)		
	1.810 – 1.899 BAM/kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.720 – 1.809 BAM/kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.630 – 1.719 BAM/kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.540 – 1.629 BAM/kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.450 – 1.539 BAM/kW	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.360 – 1.449 BAM/kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.270 – 1.359 BAM/kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.180 – 1.269 BAM/kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1.001 – 1.179 BAM/kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	≤ 1,000 BAM/kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

4	Coefficient of Performance (COP)		
	Coefficient of Performance (COP) is declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test condition:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A7/W35 for air-to-water heat pumps, - A7/A20 for air-to-air heat pumps, - B0/W35 for ground source (brine-to-water) heat pumps, - W10/W35 for water-to-water heat pumps. 		
	3,00 - 3,19 COP	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,20 - 3,29 COP	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,30 - 3,39 COP	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,40 - 3,49 COP	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,50 - 3,59 COP	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,60 - 3,69 COP	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,70 - 3,79 COP	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
5	3,80 - 3,89 COP	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	3,90 - 3,99 COP	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	≥ 4,0 COP	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <i>Coefficient of Performance (COP) declared according to EN 14511 at the relevant standard test conditions.</i>
	Own Contribution		
	20-23%	1	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	23,1-26%	2	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	26,1-29%	3	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)



	29,1-32%	4	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	32,1-35%	5	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	35,1-38%	6	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	38,1-41%	7	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	41,1-44%	8	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	44,1-47%	9	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	47,1-50%	10	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
6	Community-LED		
	Concept only	1	Project application Project idea described at a conceptual level – Technology mentioned, but no site, scope, or approvals considered
	Initial preparation	2	Project application Identified building/location and technology – Preliminary technical considerations prepared. – No permits or formal approvals initiated.
	Formal preparation initiated	3	Project application Municipal decision or internal approval to implement project – Initial technical documents started (concept design, cost estimate)
	Technical preparation in progress	4	Project application Draft technical solution available – Permits or approvals identified and partially initiated (if required) – Feasibility study or equivalent technical analysis prepared
	Technically ready project	5	Project application All required technical documentation completed – Required permits/approvals obtained or clearly not required – Project can proceed to procurement/implementation
	Basic community reference	1	Project application Community mentioned as beneficiary – General description of expected benefits (comfort, energy savings). – Limited evidence of engagement or consultation
	Defined target groups	2	Project application Clear identification of target groups (citizens, schools, vulnerable groups). – Explanation of how the project benefits them – Some outreach or consultation activities described
	Structured community involvement	3	Project application Documented engagement activities (meetings, consultations, surveys) – Community needs reflected in project design (e.g., addressing heating costs, thermal comfort). – Benefits clearly differentiated (social, economic, environmental).
	Strong community integration	4	Project application Project clearly shaped by community input – Benefits extend beyond direct users to the wider local population – Clear plan for communication, visibility, and continued engagement
	Exemplary community-led municipal project	5	Project application Community engagement is central to the project concept – Municipality acts as facilitator, not only implementer – Clear, well-articulated benefits for multiple community groups – High-quality narrative demonstrating significant effort and ownership



B. Quality Evaluation Criteria

This subsection assesses the strategic relevance, economic rationale, replicability and overall quality of the project proposal.

DATA Quality criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
7	Relevance of project		
	Very weak relevance	1	Feasibility study, Project application Community mentioned only formally – Municipality listed as lead without explanation of community value – No defined users or target groups
	Weak relevance	2	Feasibility study, Project application Basic project idea described – Benefits limited mainly to municipal operations or employees – Community benefit marginal or symbolic
	Low relevance	3	Feasibility study, Project application Project linked to public service improvement in general terms – Heat pump location and technology identified. – Target groups mentioned but not quantified.
	Partial relevance	4	Feasibility study, Project application Project purpose aligned with community needs – Municipality clearly acts as lead. – Target groups identified (citizens, schools, vulnerable households). – Limited analysis of number of people benefiting.
	Moderate relevance	5	Feasibility study, Project application Clear project objective linked to local policy or community need – Users and beneficiaries identified and quantified (residents, students, households). – Benefits consistent with feasibility study (energy savings, comfort, CO ₂ reduction).
	Good relevance	6	Feasibility study, Project application Project clearly improves services used by local people – Benefits extend beyond municipal administration. – Clear social, environmental, or economic benefits (lower heating costs, improved indoor comfort, CO ₂ reduction).
	High relevance	7	Feasibility study, Project application Strong alignment between project design and local community priorities – Community users actively considered in design (building selection, system capacity, access). – Clear contribution to local energy/climate goals.
	Very high relevance	8	Feasibility study, Project application Project responds to clearly identified community needs – High number of direct or indirect beneficiaries. – Strong combined benefits (social, environmental, economic). – Community value clearly articulated, not only technical gains.
	Excellent relevance	9	Feasibility study, Project application Project is central to improving quality of life or public services in the municipality – Mission, vision, and project design fully aligned. – Feasibility study quantifies benefits for different user groups (residents, schools, vulnerable groups).



	Outstanding relevance	10	Feasibility study, Project application Project is a flagship community-led municipal initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong, people-centered narrative. – Broad and lasting impact on the local community. – High visibility, replicable logic, exemplary justification supported by energy savings, CO₂ reduction, and cost-benefit data.
8	Replication potential		
	Very weak replicability	1	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Heat pump solution depends heavily on local constraints (unique building design, heating system integration); no generalized design or cost assumptions. Narrative: Presented as a one-off investment with no learning value for other locations.
	Weak replicability	2	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Some components reusable (heat pump model, controls), but overall system logic (piping, foundation, grid connections) not transferable; no standardized BoQ or specs. Narrative: Replication not discussed; project does not aim to inform other municipal or community sites.
	Low replicability	3	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Design and procurement documented but highly site-specific (roof layout, boiler room, building type); no assessment of applicability elsewhere. Narrative: Lessons on economic or operational aspects not extracted or explained.
	Partial replicability	4	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Basic heat pump setup could be reused in similar municipal buildings; limited documentation on installation steps, sizing, or O&M. Narrative: No explicit replication narrative, but project could inspire similar initiatives with effort.
	Moderately Replicable	5	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project includes adaptable design principles (standard heat pump units, modular piping or electrical integration); feasibility study explains sizing, connection, and basic costs. Narrative: Project implicitly positioned as a reference for similar municipal or public buildings.
	Good replicability	6	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Technical and economic model reusable for small to mid-size municipal buildings; clear cost structure, energy savings assumptions, and O&M approach; lessons learned documented. Narrative: Project presented as a model other municipal departments or communities could follow.
	Strong Replicability	7	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Modular heat pump design, standardized specifications, clear installation assumptions, documented procurement approach. Narrative: Clear guidance on building selection, capacity sizing, and community benefit logic.
	Very high replicability	8	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Complete replication-ready package (heat pump specs, BoQ, installation steps, O&M plan, energy savings calculation). Narrative: Economic and social benefits clearly explained and adaptable to other municipal buildings.



	Near-scalable replication model	9	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Templates and tools provided (ToR for installers, procurement docs, O&M checklist, safety guidance). Narrative: Includes guidance or capacity-building for municipal staff and local stakeholders.
	Fully Replicable & Scalable	10	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project functions as a scalable municipal heat pump model, easily expandable across buildings or regions; full technical, financial, and operational toolkit provided. Narrative: Clear pathway for replication by other municipalities or community-led initiatives; project positioned as a benchmark or pilot for wider rollout.
9	Quality of the proposal		
	Very Poor Quality	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal is incomplete and poorly structured - Missing key components such as objectives, budget, or methodology - No clear feasibility shown
	Extremely Weak	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal submitted but lacks clarity - Several key parts missing (e.g., timeline, team roles, risk identification)
	Weak	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic proposal exists, but many sections lack detail or structure - Difficult to assess viability
	Below Average	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal includes most required parts but lacks technical detail or clarity - Some elements are placeholders only
	Moderate Quality	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposal is understandable and generally well-organized - All main components are present, but some require improvement (e.g., risk matrix, staffing plan, technical specs)
	Moderate to Good	6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most elements are well-prepared - Some technical areas or financial details need clarification - Proposal shows medium feasibility
	Good	7	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget) – Most key components are included, but some areas (e.g., risk assessment, technical details, budget clarity) may need improvement.
	Very Good	8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nearly all sections complete and logically presented - Timeline, budget, and risk planning are consistent with goals - Well-supported implementation plan
	Excellent	9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong, detailed proposal with professional formatting - Gantt chart, budget breakdown, and risk matrix included - High feasibility and well-documented methodology
	Outstanding Proposal	10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fully professional and comprehensive submission - Clear objectives and methodology - Detailed implementation plan (Gantt chart), team structure, risk analysis, and budget - Feasibility and sustainability well demonstrated



10 Economic Impact		
<p>Maximum number of points for economic impact is 10. The final Economic Impact score (1–10) is calculated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assign points (1–10) for each of the four criteria: stated below: payback period, coverage of consumption/ energy savings, job creation, reinvestment plan. 2. Sum the points from all applicable criteria. 3. Divide the sum by the number of criteria used. 4. Round to the nearest whole number and this is the final economic impact score. <p>Example: Payback period: 5 years = 10 points Coverage of consumption: 75% = 9 points Job creation: 15 jobs = 10 points Reinvestment plan: 50% reinvestment, well described = 10 points Total: 10 + 9 + 10 + 10 = 39 Average: 39 / 4 = 9,75 → Total score: 10</p>		
(1) Payback period (investment return time)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period > 13 years
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 12–13 years
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 11–11,99 years
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 10–10,99 years
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 9–9,99 years
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 8–8,99 years
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 7–7,99 years
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 6–6,99 years
	9	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 5–5,99 years
	10	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period ≤5 years
(2) Coverage of consumption (% of the annual energy consumption covered or saved by the project)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved <5%
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 5-9%
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 10-19%
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 20-29%
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 30-39%
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 40-49%
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 50-59%
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 60-69%



		9	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 70-79%
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved $\geq 80\%$
	(3) Job creation (number of new jobs – permanent or temporary)	1	Feasibility study, Project application 0 jobs created
		2	Feasibility study, Project application 1 job created
		3	Feasibility study, Project application 2 jobs created
		4	Feasibility study, Project application 3 jobs created
		5	Feasibility study, Project application 4 jobs created
		6	Feasibility study, Project application 5-6 jobs created
		7	Feasibility study, Project application 7-8 jobs created
		8	Feasibility study, Project application 9-11 jobs created
		9	Feasibility study, Project application 12-14 jobs created
		10	Feasibility study, Project application ≥ 15 jobs created
	(4) Reinvestment plan (quality and concreteness of the plan for reinvesting savings/profits)	1	Feasibility study, Project application No reinvestment plan
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Minimal plan: no specific figures
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Very weak plan: only stated intention to reinvest
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Weak plan: $<10\%$ reinvestment or unclear
		5	Feasibility study, Project application Basic plan: 10–14% reinvestment, minimally described
		6	Feasibility study, Project application Acceptable plan: 15-19% reinvestment, partially described
		7	Feasibility study, Project application Solid plan: 20-24% reinvestment, basic description
		8	Feasibility study, Project application Good plan: 25–29% reinvestment, clearly described
		9	Feasibility study, Project application Very good plan: 30–39% reinvestment, specific projects listed
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Excellent detailed plan: $\geq 40\%$ of savings reinvested in further local projects, with clear timeline and ROI



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

C. Social Evaluation Criteria (Bonus Points)

Social criteria are assessed as bonus points and aim to recognise additional social value, gender inclusion and community engagement beyond the core technical and quality requirements.

DATA Social criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
11	Social impact		
	No identifiable social benefit	0	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heat pump system serves only a single building or internal facility (e.g., municipal office, school, or institution) without wider community access. – No measurable benefit for local residents, vulnerable groups, or public services. – No reinvestment of operational savings or revenues into social programs, public services, or community infrastructure. – No public engagement, awareness, or educational activities related to renewable heating, energy efficiency, or environmental benefits.
	Project generates clear social benefit for the local or target community.	5	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heat pump system provides direct or indirect benefits to the local community or vulnerable groups (e.g., reduced heating or cooling costs for public buildings, affordable access to heating/cooling for social facilities, or shared use for multiple community buildings). – Includes community benefit mechanisms (e.g., subsidized heating/cooling for public or social facilities, reinvestment of savings into local infrastructure or social programs). – Contains public awareness, outreach, or educational activities related to sustainable heating/cooling, energy efficiency, or environmental benefits. – Generates co-benefits with social relevance (e.g., reduced local air pollution, improved indoor comfort, lower energy costs for vulnerable groups). – Provides visible and demonstrable benefits for the community (e.g., heat pumps serving public spaces, communication of benefits to citizens).
12	Gender inclusion		
	No consideration of gender or no women involved.	0	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No evidence of gender considerations in the project design, implementation, or governance. – Project team or governing/implementing body is clearly gender-imbalanced and does not meet a reasonable gender representation principle (e.g., 40/60). – No women involved in decision-making, planning, procurement, operation, or implementation roles related to the community-led heat pump project. – Project documentation does not reference gender equality, inclusive energy access, or gender-sensitive approaches.
	At least one woman meaningfully involved or project includes gender-sensitive elements.	5	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Women and men are represented in line with the 40/60 principle within the project team, steering group, or governance structure responsible for the community-led heat pump project. – Meaningful participation of women in at least one key role (planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, or operation). – Project includes gender-sensitive objectives and outcomes, such as equitable access to heating/cooling services, targeted support for vulnerable or underrepresented groups, or capacity-building activities related to sustainable heat pump use. – Gender considerations are clearly described and reflected in project documents and implementation arrangements.



13	Community involvement		
	No Community Involvement	0	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No evidence of consultation with local residents, user groups, or local stakeholders at any stage of the heat pump project. – Project designed and implemented solely by the municipality, public institution, or project owner without community input. – No partnerships, outreach activities, or communication with local actors related to the heat pump project. – Community has no role in decision-making, governance, allocation of heating/cooling services, or benefit-sharing.
	Active Community Involvement	5	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community members and/or local user groups are actively and meaningfully involved in one or more project phases: conceptualization, site selection, planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, operation, or monitoring. – Project includes structured engagement activities (public meetings, workshops, consultations, co-design processes) related to the heat pump system. – Evidence of partnerships with local stakeholders, such as schools, NGOs, civil society organizations, neighborhood groups, or local businesses. – Community involvement influences project design, governance, access rules, allocation of benefits, or operational decisions, beyond mere information sharing.



Annex III – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Biomass Heating Projects

Indicative scoring guidance and sources of verification

This section is intended to help applicants understand how evaluation criteria are assessed and which documents are typically used to verify the information provided.

Technical Criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
1. KW Installed	Higher installed MW gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
2. CO ₂ Reduction in tCO ₂ /year	Higher CO ₂ reduction gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)	Lower gets higher scores	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
4. Equipment efficiency	Higher equipment efficiency and quality gets higher score	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
5. Finance Provided	Higher finance provided higher score	Statement, project proposal
6. Community Led	Community Led involvement in project	Statement, project proposal

Quality criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
7. Relevance of project	Evaluate the alignment of the project with municipal needs, strategic priorities, and the objectives of the Call. Projects with clearly justified needs and strong consistency between problems, solutions, and expected economic benefits receive higher scores.	Feasibility study, project proposal
8. Replication potential	Evaluate whether the project design, tools, or approaches are easily adaptable and supported with documentation for reuse in other municipalities.	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies
9. Quality of the proposal	Review the completeness, coherence, and structure of the proposal, focusing on presence and quality of key components.	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget)
10. Economic Impact	Higher economic benefits receive better scores, encouraging municipalities to prioritize impactful investments	Feasibility study

Social criteria - BONUS	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
11. Social Impact	Determine if the project improves community well-being, access to services, inclusivity, or supports vulnerable groups.	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

12. Gender Inclusion	Check for meaningful participation of women in planning, leadership, or project execution, and inclusion of gender considerations in design.	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis
13. Community involved	Evaluate if the project includes input from community stakeholders or partners and provides benefits or shared responsibilities.	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria

This subsection defines the technical criteria used to assess the performance, cost-efficiency, technical readiness and financing structure of the proposed investment.

DATA Technical criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
1	KW Installed		
	0,1 - 50 kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	50,1 - 100 kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	100,1 - 150 kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	150,1 - 200 kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	200,1 - 250 kW	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	250,1 - 300 kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	300,1 - 350 kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	350,1 - 400 kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	400,1 - 500 kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	>500,1 kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
2	CO₂ Reduction in %		
	0,1 - 10 %	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	10,1 - 15%	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	15,1 - 20%	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	20,1 - 25%	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	25,1 - 30 %	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	30,1 - 35%	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	35,1 - 40%	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	40,1 - 45%	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	45,1 - 49,9%	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	> 50% reduction	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
3	Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)		
	1.050 – 1.100 BAM/kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

	1.000 – 1.409 BAM/kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	950 – 999 BAM/kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	900 – 949 BAM/kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	850 – 899 BAM/kW	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	800 – 849 BAM/kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	750 – 799 BAM/kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	700 – 749 BAM/kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	650 – 699 BAM/kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	≤ 600 BAM/kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
4	Boiler Efficiency %		
	<i>Boiler efficiency (%) refers to the thermal efficiency measured at nominal heat output (nominal load), expressed relative to the Lower Heating Value (LHV) of the fuel, and shall be evidenced through manufacturer datasheets and/or certified test reports in accordance with EN 303-5 or equivalent standards.</i>		
	75-76,9%	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Low efficiency; outdated system with significant energy losses.
	77-78,9%	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Low efficiency; below current best practice, increased fuel consumption.
	79-80,9%	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Moderate efficiency; acceptable performance with noticeable energy losses.
	81-82,9%	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Moderate efficiency; standard performance for conventional pellet boilers.
	83-83,9%	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Medium efficiency; meets common modern efficiency expectations.
	84-84,9%	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Good efficiency; modern pellet boiler with controlled energy losses.
	85-85,9%	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Very good efficiency; modern system with low energy losses.
	86-86,9%	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application High efficiency; high-quality system approaching best available technology.
	87-87,9%	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Excellent efficiency; near-maximum realistic performance for non-condensing pellet boiler technology.
	≥ 88% efficiency	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Maximum realistic efficiency for state-of-the-art, cost-effective pellet or woodchip boilers.
5	Own Contribution		
	20-23%	1	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	23,1-26%	2	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	26,1-29%	3	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)



	29,1-32%	4	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	32,1-35%	5	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	35,1-38%	6	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	38,1-41%	7	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	41,1-44%	8	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	44,1-47%	9	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	47,1-50%	10	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
6	Community-LED		
	Concept only	1	Project application Project idea described at a conceptual level – Technology mentioned, but no site, scope, or approvals considered
	Initial preparation	2	Project application Identified building/location and technology – Preliminary technical considerations prepared. – No permits or formal approvals initiated.
	Formal preparation initiated	3	Project application Municipal decision or internal approval to implement project – Initial technical documents started (concept design, cost estimate)
	Technical preparation in progress	4	Project application Draft technical solution available – Permits or approvals identified and partially initiated (if required) – Feasibility study or equivalent technical analysis prepared
	Technically ready project	5	Project application All required technical documentation completed – Required permits/approvals obtained or clearly not required – Project can proceed to procurement/implementation
	Basic community reference	1	Project application Community mentioned as beneficiary – General description of expected benefits (comfort, energy savings). – Limited evidence of engagement or consultation
	Defined target groups	2	Project application Clear identification of target groups (citizens, schools, vulnerable groups). – Explanation of how the project benefits them – Some outreach or consultation activities described
	Structured community involvement	3	Project application Documented engagement activities (meetings, consultations, surveys) – Community needs reflected in project design (e.g., addressing heating costs, thermal comfort). – Benefits clearly differentiated (social, economic, environmental).
	Strong community integration	4	Project application Project clearly shaped by community input – Benefits extend beyond direct users to the wider local population – Clear plan for communication, visibility, and continued engagement
	Exemplary community-led municipal project	5	Project application Community engagement is central to the project concept – Municipality acts as facilitator, not only implementer



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clear, well-articulated benefits for multiple community groups – High-quality narrative demonstrating significant effort and ownership
--	--	--	---

B. Quality Evaluation Criteria

This subsection assesses the strategic relevance, economic rationale, replicability and overall quality of the project proposal.

DATA Quality criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
7	Relevance of project		
	Very weak relevance	1	Feasibility study, Project application Community mentioned only formally – Municipality listed as lead without explanation of community value – No defined users or target groups
	Weak relevance	2	Feasibility study, Project application Basic project idea described – Benefits limited mainly to municipal operations or employees – Community benefit marginal or symbolic
	Low relevance	3	Feasibility study, Project application Project linked to public service improvement in general terms – heating system location and technology identified – Target groups mentioned but not quantified.
	Partial relevance	4	Feasibility study, Project application Project purpose aligned with community needs – Municipality clearly acts as lead. – Target groups identified (citizens, schools, vulnerable households). – Limited analysis of number of people benefiting.
	Moderate relevance	5	Feasibility study, Project application Clear project objective linked to local policy or community need – Users and beneficiaries identified and quantified (residents, students, households). – Benefits consistent with feasibility study (energy savings, comfort, CO ₂ reduction).
	Good relevance	6	Feasibility study, Project application Project clearly improves services used by local people – Benefits extend beyond municipal administration. – Clear social, environmental, or economic benefits (lower heating costs, improved indoor comfort, CO ₂ reduction).
	High relevance	7	Feasibility study, Project application Strong alignment between project design and local community priorities – Community users actively considered in design (building selection, system capacity, access). – Clear contribution to local energy/climate goals.
	Very high relevance	8	Feasibility study, Project application Project responds to clearly identified community needs – High number of direct or indirect beneficiaries. – Strong combined benefits (social, environmental, economic). – Community value clearly articulated, not only technical gains.



	Excellent relevance	9	Feasibility study, Project application Project is central to improving quality of life or public services in the municipality – Mission, vision, and project design fully aligned. – Feasibility study quantifies benefits for different user groups (residents, schools, vulnerable groups).
	Outstanding relevance	10	Feasibility study, Project application Project is a flagship community-led municipal initiative – Strong, people-centered narrative. – Broad and lasting impact on the local community. – High visibility, replicable logic, exemplary justification supported by energy savings, CO ₂ reduction, and cost-benefit data.
8	Replication potential		
	Very weak replicability	1	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Heating system solution depends heavily on local constraints (unique building design, heating system integration); no generalized design or cost assumptions. Narrative: Presented as a one-off investment with no learning value for other locations.
	Weak replicability	2	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Some components reusable (heat pump model, controls), but overall system logic (piping, foundation, grid connections) not transferable; no standardized BoQ or specs. Narrative: Replication not discussed; project does not aim to inform other municipal or community sites.
	Low replicability	3	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Design and procurement documented but highly site-specific (roof layout, boiler room, building type); no assessment of applicability elsewhere. Narrative: Lessons on economic or operational aspects not extracted or explained.
	Partial replicability	4	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Basic heating system setup could be reused in similar municipal buildings; limited documentation on installation steps, sizing, or O&M. Narrative: No explicit replication narrative, but project could inspire similar initiatives with effort.
	Moderately Replicable	5	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project includes adaptable design principles (standard heating system units, modular piping or electrical integration); feasibility study explains sizing, connection, and basic costs. Narrative: Project implicitly positioned as a reference for similar municipal or public buildings.
	Good replicability	6	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Technical and economic model reusable for small to mid-size municipal buildings; clear cost structure, energy savings assumptions, and O&M approach; lessons learned documented. Narrative: Project presented as a model other municipal departments or communities could follow.
	Strong Replicability	7	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Modular heating system design, standardized specifications, clear installation assumptions, documented procurement approach. Narrative: Clear guidance on building selection, capacity sizing, and community benefit logic.
	Very high replicability	8	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Complete replication-ready package (heating system specs, BoQ, installation steps, O&M plan, energy savings calculation).



			Narrative: Economic and social benefits clearly explained and adaptable to other municipal buildings.
	Near-scalable replication model	9	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Templates and tools provided (ToR for installers, procurement docs, O&M checklist, safety guidance). Narrative: Includes guidance or capacity-building for municipal staff and local stakeholders.
	Fully Replicable & Scalable	10	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project functions as a scalable municipal heat pump model, easily expandable across buildings or regions; full technical, financial, and operational toolkit provided. Narrative: Clear pathway for replication by other municipalities or community-led initiatives; project positioned as a benchmark or pilot for wider rollout.
9	Quality of the proposal		
	Very Poor Quality	1	- Proposal is incomplete and poorly structured - Missing key components such as objectives, budget, or methodology - No clear feasibility shown
	Extremely Weak	2	- Proposal submitted but lacks clarity - Several key parts missing (e.g., timeline, team roles, risk identification)
	Weak	3	- Basic proposal exists, but many sections lack detail or structure - Difficult to assess viability
	Below Average	4	- Proposal includes most required parts but lacks technical detail or clarity - Some elements are placeholders only
	Moderate Quality	5	- Proposal is understandable and generally well-organized - All main components are present, but some require improvement (e.g., risk matrix, staffing plan, technical specs)
	Moderate to Good	6	- Most elements are well-prepared - Some technical areas or financial details need clarification - Proposal shows medium feasibility
	Good	7	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget) – Most key components are included, but some areas (e.g., risk assessment, technical details, budget clarity) may need improvement.
	Very Good	8	- Nearly all sections complete and logically presented - Timeline, budget, and risk planning are consistent with goals - Well-supported implementation plan
	Excellent	9	- Strong, detailed proposal with professional formatting - Gantt chart, budget breakdown, and risk matrix included - High feasibility and well-documented methodology
	Outstanding Proposal	10	- Fully professional and comprehensive submission - Clear objectives and methodology - Detailed implementation plan (Gantt chart), team structure, risk analysis, and budget - Feasibility and sustainability well demonstrated



10 Economic Impact		
<p>Maximum number of points for economic impact is 10. The final Economic Impact score (1–10) is calculated as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assign points (1–10) for each of the four criteria: stated below: payback period, coverage of consumption/ energy savings, job creation, reinvestment plan. 2. Sum the points from all applicable criteria. 3. Divide the sum by the number of criteria used. 4. Round to the nearest whole number and this is the final economic impact score. <p>Example: Payback period: 5 years = 10 points Coverage of consumption: 75% = 9 points Job creation: 15 jobs = 10 points Reinvestment plan: 50% reinvestment, well described = 10 points Total: 10 + 9 + 10 + 10 = 39 Average: 39 / 4 = 9,75 → Total score: 10</p>		
(1) Payback period (investment return time)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period > 13 years
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 12–13 years
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 11–11,99 years
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 10–10,99 years
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 9–9,99 years
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 8–8,99 years
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 7–7,99 years
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 6–6,99 years
	9	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 5–5,99 years
	10	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period ≤5 years
(2) Coverage of consumption (% of the annual energy consumption covered or saved by the project)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved <5%
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 5-9%
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 10-19%
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 20-29%
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 30-39%
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 40-49%
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 50-59%
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 60-69%



		9	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 70-79%
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved $\geq 80\%$
	(3) Job creation (number of new jobs – permanent or temporary)	1	Feasibility study, Project application 0 jobs created
		2	Feasibility study, Project application 1 job created
		3	Feasibility study, Project application 2 jobs created
		4	Feasibility study, Project application 3 jobs created
		5	Feasibility study, Project application 4 jobs created
		6	Feasibility study, Project application 5-6 jobs created
		7	Feasibility study, Project application 7-8 jobs created
		8	Feasibility study, Project application 9-11 jobs created
		9	Feasibility study, Project application 12-14 jobs created
		10	Feasibility study, Project application ≥ 15 jobs created
	(4) Reinvestment plan (quality and concreteness of the plan for reinvesting savings/profits)	1	Feasibility study, Project application No reinvestment plan
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Minimal plan: no specific figures
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Very weak plan: only stated intention to reinvest
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Weak plan: $<10\%$ reinvestment or unclear
		5	Feasibility study, Project application Basic plan: 10–14% reinvestment, minimally described
		6	Feasibility study, Project application Acceptable plan: 15-19% reinvestment, partially described
		7	Feasibility study, Project application Solid plan: 20-24% reinvestment, basic description
		8	Feasibility study, Project application Good plan: 25–29% reinvestment, clearly described
		9	Feasibility study, Project application Very good plan: 30–39% reinvestment, specific projects listed
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Excellent detailed plan: $\geq 40\%$ of savings reinvested in further local projects, with clear timeline and ROI



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

C. Social Evaluation Criteria (Bonus Points)

Social criteria are assessed as bonus points and aim to recognise additional social value, gender inclusion and community engagement beyond the core technical and quality requirements.

DATA Social criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
11	Social impact		
	No identifiable social benefit	0	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heating system serves only a single building or internal facility (e.g., municipal office, school, or institution) without wider community access. – No measurable benefit for local residents, vulnerable groups, or public services. – No reinvestment of operational savings or revenues into social programs, public services, or community infrastructure. – No public engagement, awareness, or educational activities related to renewable heating, energy efficiency, or local environmental benefits.
	Project generates clear social benefit for the local or target community.	5	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Heating system provides direct or indirect benefits to the local community or vulnerable groups (e.g., reduced heating costs for public buildings, affordable heating for social facilities, or shared heating for multiple community buildings). – Includes community benefit mechanisms (e.g., subsidized heating for public or social facilities, reinvestment of savings into local infrastructure or social programs). – Contains public awareness, outreach, or educational activities related to sustainable heating, energy efficiency, or environmental benefits. – Generates co-benefits with social relevance (e.g., reduced local air pollution, improved indoor comfort, lower energy costs for vulnerable groups). – Provides visible and demonstrable benefits for the community (e.g., heating systems serving public spaces, communication of benefits to citizens).
12	Gender inclusion		
	No consideration of gender or no women involved.	0	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No evidence of gender considerations in the project design, implementation, or governance. – Project team or governing/implementing body is clearly gender-imbalanced and does not meet a reasonable gender representation principle (e.g., 40/60). – No women involved in decision-making, planning, procurement, operation, or implementation roles related to the community-led heating project. – Project documentation does not reference gender equality, inclusive energy access, or gender-sensitive approaches.
	At least one woman meaningfully involved or project includes gender-sensitive elements.	5	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Women and men are represented in line with the 40/60 principle within the project team, steering group, or governance structure responsible for the community-led heating project. – Meaningful participation of women in at least one key role (planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, or operation). – Project includes gender-sensitive objectives and outcomes, such as ensuring equitable access to heating services, targeted support for vulnerable or underrepresented groups, or capacity-building activities related to sustainable heating. – Gender considerations are clearly described and reflected in project documents and implementation arrangements.



13	Community involvement		
	No Community Involvement	0	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No evidence of consultation with local residents, user groups, or local stakeholders at any stage of the heating project. – Project designed and implemented solely by the municipality, public institution, or project owner without community input. – No partnerships, outreach activities, or communication with local actors related to the heating project. – Community has no role in decision-making, governance, allocation of heat, or benefit-sharing.
	Active Community Involvement	5	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community members and/or local user groups are actively and meaningfully involved in one or more project phases: conceptualization, site selection, planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, operation, or monitoring. – Project includes structured engagement activities (public meetings, workshops, consultations, co-design processes) related to the heating system. – Evidence of partnerships with local stakeholders, such as schools, NGOs, civil society organizations, neighborhood groups, or local businesses. – Community involvement influences project design, governance, access rules, allocation of benefits, or operational decisions, beyond mere information sharing.



Annex IV – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for Public Lighting Projects

Indicative scoring guidance and sources of verification

This section is intended to help applicants understand how evaluation criteria are assessed and which documents are typically used to verify the information provided.

Technical Criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
1. kW Installed	Higher installed MW gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
2. CO ₂ Reduction in tCO ₂ /year	Higher CO ₂ reduction gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)	Lower gets higher scores	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
4. Equipment efficiency	Higher equipment efficiency and quality gets higher score	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
5. Finance Provided	Higher finance provided higher score	Statement, project proposal
6. Community Led	Community Led involvement in project	Statement, project proposal
Quality criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
7. Relevance of project	Evaluate the alignment of the project with municipal needs, strategic priorities, and the objectives of the Call. Projects with clearly justified needs and strong consistency between problems, solutions, and expected economic benefits receive higher scores.	Feasibility study, project proposal
8. Replication potential	Evaluate whether the project design, tools, or approaches are easily adaptable and supported with documentation for reuse in other municipalities.	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies
9. Quality of the proposal	Review the completeness, coherence, and structure of the proposal, focusing on presence and quality of key components.	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget)
10. Economic Impact	Higher economic benefits receive better scores, encouraging municipalities to prioritize impactful investments	Feasibility study, Project Application
Social criteria - BONUS	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
11. Social Impact	Determine if the project improves community well-being, access to services, inclusivity, or supports vulnerable groups.	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan
12. Gender Inclusion	Check for meaningful participation of women in planning, leadership, or project execution, and inclusion of gender considerations in design.	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis
13. Community involved	Evaluate if the project includes input from community stakeholders or partners and provides benefits or shared responsibilities.	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria

This subsection defines the technical criteria used to assess the performance, cost-efficiency, technical readiness and financing structure of the proposed investment.

DATA Technical criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
1	KW Installed		
	0,1 - 0,5 kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	0,6 – 1 kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1,1 - 1,5 kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1,6 - 2 kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2,1 - 2,5 kW	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2,6 - 3 kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	3,1 - 3,5 kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	3,6 - 4 kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	4,1 - 4,5 kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	> 4,6 kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
2	CO₂ Reduction in tCO₂/year		
	0,1 - 0,4 tCO ₂ /year	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	0,5 - 0,8 tCO ₂ /year	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	0,9 - 1,2 tCO ₂ /year	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1,3 - 1,6 tCO ₂ /year	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1,7 - 2 tCO ₂ /year	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2,1 - 2,4 tCO ₂ /year	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2,5 - 2,8 tCO ₂ /year	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	2,9 - 3,2 tCO ₂ /year	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	3,3 - 3,6 tCO ₂ /year	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	> 3,7 tCO ₂ /year	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
3	Cost Efficiency (BAM/pcs)		
	550,1 – 580 BAM/pcs	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	520,1 – 550 BAM/pcs	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	490,1 – 520 BAM/pcs	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	460,1 – 490 BAM/pcs	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

	430,1 – 460 BAM/pcs	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	410,1 – 430 BAM/pcs	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	390,1 – 410 BAM/pcs	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	370,1 – 390 BAM/pcs	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	350,1 – 370 BAM/pcs	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	< 350 BAM/pcs	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
4	System Efficiency		
	<i>Scoring is awarded in two categories: (1) luminaire efficacy (0–7 points) and (2) lighting control and management (0–3 points). The maximum total score is 10 points (sum of both categories).</i>		
	<i>Luminaire efficacy refers exclusively to the efficacy of the complete luminaire (lm/W), including LED modules, optics and driver. Efficacy of LED chips alone shall not be considered.</i>		
	120-129 lm/W	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	130-139 lm/W	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	140-144 lm/W	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	145-149 lm/W	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	150-154 lm/W	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	155-159 lm/W	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	≥160 lm/W	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application <u>Luminaire efficacy</u>
	Astronomical ON/OFF (no dimming)	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Astronomical control allowing automatic switching ON/OFF of luminaires based on calculated sunset and sunrise times for the specific geographic location. No dimming functionality is provided. The system does not allow reduction of power levels beyond basic ON/OFF control.



	Time-based control with dimming + presense sensor	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Time-based control combined with predefined dimming functionality, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - astronomical timer with fixed dimming levels - scheduled night-time power reduction with a minimum of 3 dimming levels (e.g. 100% → 70% → 50%) - presense sensor The control logic is predefined and not dynamically adaptive to real-time conditions.
	Sensor-based adaptive dimming or telemanagement	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Advanced control allowing dynamic adjustment or remote management, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sensor-based adaptive dimming (presence, motion or ambient light sensors), or - central management system (CMS / telemanagement) enabling remote configuration, monitoring, diagnostics and reporting The control logic responds to real-time conditions or allows remote management at luminaire or group level.
5	Own Contribution		
	20-23%	1	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	23,1-26%	2	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	26,1-29%	3	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	29,1-32%	4	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	32,1-35%	5	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	35,1-38%	6	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	38,1-41%	7	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	41,1-44%	8	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	44,1-47%	9	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	47,1-50%	10	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
6	Community-LED		
	Concept only	1	Project application Project idea described at a conceptual level – Technology mentioned, but no site, scope, or approvals considered
	Initial preparation	2	Project application Identified building/location and technology – Preliminary technical considerations – No permits or formal approvals initiated
	Formal preparation initiated	3	Project application Municipal decision or internal approval to implement project – Initial technical documents started (concept design, cost estimate)



Technical preparation in progress	4	Project application Draft technical solution available – Permits or approvals identified and partially initiated (if required) – Feasibility study or equivalent technical analysis prepared
Technically ready project	5	Project application All required technical documentation completed – Required permits/approvals obtained or clearly not required – Project can proceed to procurement/implementation
Basic community reference	1	Project application Community mentioned as beneficiary – General description of expected benefits – Limited evidence of engagement or consultation
Defined target groups	2	Project application Clear identification of target groups (citizens, students, users, households) – Explanation of how the project benefits them – Some outreach or consultation activities described
Structured community involvement	3	Project application Documented engagement activities (meetings, consultations, surveys) – Community needs reflected in project design – Benefits clearly differentiated (social, economic, environmental)
Strong community integration	4	Project application Project clearly shaped by community input – Benefits extend beyond direct users to the wider local population – Clear plan for communication, visibility, and continued engagement
Exemplary community-led municipal project	5	Project application Community engagement is central to the project concept – Municipality acts as facilitator, not only implementer – Clear, well-articulated benefits for multiple community groups – High-quality narrative demonstrating significant effort and ownership

B. Quality Evaluation Criteria

This subsection assesses the strategic relevance, economic rationale, replicability and overall quality of the project proposal.

DATA Quality criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
7	Relevance of project		
	Very weak relevance	1	Feasibility study, Project application Community mentioned only formally – Public lighting mentioned only formally – No justification of selected area – No identified users or safety issues
	Weak relevance	2	Feasibility study, Project application Basic project idea described – Basic lighting upgrade described – Benefits limited to municipal cost savings – Community safety impact marginal
	Low relevance	3	Feasibility study, Project application Project linked to public service improvement in general terms – General link to public service improvement



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Location identified (street/zone/area) without prioritization – Users mentioned but not quantified
Partial relevance	4	Feasibility study, Project application Project purpose aligned with community needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Addresses identified lighting needs – Municipality clearly acts as lead – Users identified (pedestrians, drivers, residents) – Limited analysis of beneficiaries
Moderate relevance	5	Feasibility study, Project application Clear project objective linked to local policy or community need <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Clear objective to improve safety, visibility, or energy efficiency – Beneficiaries identified and partially quantified
Good relevance	6	Feasibility study, Project application Project clearly improves services used by local people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Improves lighting in frequently used public areas – Benefits extend beyond municipal administration – Clear safety and energy-efficiency benefits
High relevance	7	Feasibility study, Project application Strong alignment between project design and local community priorities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong alignment with municipal lighting, safety, or energy policies – Area selection justified by risk, traffic, or usage – Contribution to energy/climate targets
Very high relevance	8	Feasibility study, Project application Project responds to clearly identified community needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Responds to documented lighting deficiencies – High number of beneficiaries – Combined safety, energy, and emission-reduction benefits
Excellent relevance	9	Feasibility study, Project application Project is central to improving quality of life or public services in the municipality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Mission, vision, and project design fully aligned – Significant improvement of night-time safety and quality of life – Benefits quantified (coverage, risk reduction, savings) – Priority zones clearly addressed
Outstanding relevance	10	Feasibility study, Project application Project is a flagship community-led municipal initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong, people-centered narrative – Broad and lasting impact on local community – High visibility, replicable logic, and exemplary justification supported by data
8	Replication potential	
Very weak replicability	1	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Layout depends heavily on local constraints; no generalized design or cost assumptions. Narrative: Presented as a one-off investment with no learning value for other sites.
Weak replicability	2	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Some components reusable (standard poles, luminaires), but overall design not transferable; no standardized BoQ or specs. Narrative: Replication not discussed; no aim to inform other municipal/community sites.



	Low replicability	3	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Design documented but highly site-specific (custom layouts, wiring); no assessment for other locations. Narrative: Economic or social lessons not extracted or explained.
	Partial replicability	4	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Basic luminaire setup could be reused in similar public areas; limited documentation on installation or wiring steps. Narrative: No explicit replication narrative, but project could inspire similar initiatives with effort..
	Moderately Replicable	5	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project includes adaptable design principles (standard luminaires, modular poles); feasibility study explains basic sizing, connection, and costs. Narrative: Project implicitly positioned as a reference for similar municipal/community areas.
	Good replicability	6	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Technical and economic model reusable for small to mid-size municipalities; clear cost structure and O&M approach; lessons documented. Narrative: Project clearly presented as a model that other municipal departments or community initiatives could follow.
	Strong Replicability	7	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Standardized lighting design, modular components, clear electrical assumptions, documented procurement. Narrative: Guidance on site selection (visibility, accessibility, safety) and community benefit logic.
	Very high replicability	8	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Complete replication-ready package (specs, BoQ, installation steps, O&M plan, cost logic). Narrative: Economic and social benefits clearly explained and adaptable to other municipalities.
	Near-scalable replication model	9	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Templates and tools provided (ToR for installers, procurement docs, safety checklists). Narrative: Includes guidance or capacity-building for municipal staff and local stakeholders.
	Fully Replicable & Scalable	10	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project functions as a scalable public lighting model, easily expandable across streets or public spaces; full technical, financial, and operational toolkit provided. Narrative: Clear pathway for replication by other municipalities or community-led initiatives; positioned as benchmark/pilot for wider rollout.
9	Quality of the proposal		
	Very Poor Quality	1	- Proposal is incomplete and poorly structured - Missing key components such as objectives, budget, or methodology - No clear feasibility shown
	Extremely Weak	2	- Proposal submitted but lacks clarity - Several key parts missing (e.g., timeline, team roles, risk identification)
	Weak	3	- Basic proposal exists, but many sections lack detail or structure - Difficult to assess viability
	Below Average	4	- Proposal includes most required parts but lacks technical detail or clarity - Some elements are placeholders only



	Moderate Quality	5	- Proposal is understandable and generally well-organized - All main components are present, but some require improvement (e.g., risk matrix, staffing plan, technical specs)
	Moderate to Good	6	- Most elements are well-prepared - Some technical areas or financial details need clarification - Proposal shows medium feasibility
	Good	7	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget) – Most key components are included, but some areas (e.g., risk assessment, technical details, budget clarity) may need improvement.
	Very Good	8	- Nearly all sections complete and logically presented - Timeline, budget, and risk planning are consistent with goals - Well-supported implementation plan
	Excellent	9	- Strong, detailed proposal with professional formatting - Gantt chart, budget breakdown, and risk matrix included - High feasibility and well-documented methodology
	Outstanding Proposal	10	- Fully professional and comprehensive submission - Clear objectives and methodology - Detailed implementation plan (Gantt chart), team structure, risk analysis, and budget - Feasibility and sustainability well demonstrated
10	Economic Impact		
Maximum number of points for economic impact is 10. The final Economic Impact score (1–10) is calculated as follows:			
1. Assign points (1–10) for each of the four criteria: stated below: payback period, coverage of consumption/ energy savings, job creation, reinvetment plan.			
2. Sum the points from all applicable criteria.			
3. Divide the sum by the number of criteria used.			
4. Round to the nearest whole number and this is the final economic impact score.			
Example:			
Payback period: 5 years = 10 points			
Coverage of consumption: 75% = 9 points			
Job creation: 15 jobs = 10 points			
Reinvestment plan: 50% reinvestment, well described = 10 points			
Total: 10 + 9 + 10 + 10 = 39			
Average: 39 / 4 = 9,75 → Total score: 10			
(1) Payback period (investment return time)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period > 13 years	
	2	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 12–13 years	
	3	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 11–11,99 years	
	4	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 10–10,99 years	
	5	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 9–9,99 years	
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 8–8,99 years	
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 7–7,99 years	



		8	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 6–6,99 years
		9	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 5–5,99 years
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period ≤5 years
	(2) Coverage of consumption (% of the annual energy consumption covered or saved by the project)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved <5%
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 5-9%
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 10-19%
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 20-29%
		5	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 30-39%
		6	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 40-49%
		7	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 50-59%
		8	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 60-69%
		9	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved 70-79%
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Coverage of consumption/ energy saved ≥80%
	(3) Job creation (number of new jobs – permanent or temporary)	1	Feasibility study, Project application 0 jobs created
		2	Feasibility study, Project application 1 job created
		3	Feasibility study, Project application 2 jobs created
		4	Feasibility study, Project application 3 jobs created
		5	Feasibility study, Project application 4 jobs created
		6	Feasibility study, Project application 5-6 jobs created
		7	Feasibility study, Project application 7-8 jobs created
		8	Feasibility study, Project application 9-11 jobs created
		9	Feasibility study, Project application 12-14 jobs created
		10	Feasibility study, Project application ≥ 15 jobs created
	(4) Reinvestment plan (quality and concreteness of the plan for reinvesting savings/profits)	1	Feasibility study, Project application No reinvestment plan
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Minimal plan: no specific figures
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Very weak plan: only stated intention to reinvest
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Weak plan: <10% reinvestment or unclear



	5	Feasibility study, Project application Basic plan: 10–14% reinvestment, minimally described
	6	Feasibility study, Project application Acceptable plan: 15-19% reinvestment, partially described
	7	Feasibility study, Project application Solid plan: 20-24% reinvestment, basic description
	8	Feasibility study, Project application Good plan: 25–29% reinvestment, clearly described
	9	Feasibility study, Project application Very good plan: 30–39% reinvestment, specific projects listed
	10	Feasibility study, Project application Excellent detailed plan: ≥40% of savings reinvested in further local projects, with clear timeline and ROI

C. Social Evaluation Criteria (Bonus Points)

Social criteria are assessed as bonus points and aim to recognise additional social value, gender inclusion and community engagement beyond the core technical and quality requirements.

DATA Social criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
11	Social impact		
	No identifiable social benefit	0	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Project improves lighting only for internal or restricted areas (e.g., municipal offices, fenced-off areas) without broader community access. – No measurable benefit for local residents, users, or vulnerable groups. – No reinvestment of operational savings or revenues into community programs or public services. – No public engagement, awareness, or educational activities related to energy efficiency, safety, or environmental benefits
	Project generates clear social benefit for the local or target community.	5	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Lighting improvements provide direct and measurable benefits to the public (e.g., safer streets, pedestrian areas, parks, or public spaces). – Project demonstrates mechanisms for community benefit (e.g., prioritization of lighting in high-risk areas, improved accessibility for vulnerable groups). – Includes public awareness, outreach, or educational activities related to energy efficiency, safety, or environmental sustainability. – Generates co-benefits relevant to the community (e.g., reduced crime risk, enhanced public health and safety, improved night-time visibility for pedestrians and cyclists). – Provides visible and demonstrable benefits for the local community (e.g., lighting in public spaces, clear communication of benefits to residents)
12	Gender inclusion		
	No consideration of gender or no women involved.	0	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No evidence of gender considerations in project design, implementation, or governance. - Project team or governing/implementing body is clearly gender-imbalanced and does not meet the 40/60 representation principle. - No women involved in decision-making, planning, procurement, operation, or implementation roles related to the Public Lighting project. - Project documentation does not reference gender equality, inclusive mobility, or gender-sensitive approaches.



	At least one woman meaningfully involved or project includes gender-sensitive elements.	5	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Women and men are represented in line with the 40/60 principle within the project team, steering group, or governance structure responsible for the community-led public lighting project. – Meaningful participation of women in at least one key role (planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, or operation). – Project includes gender-sensitive objectives and outcomes, such as ensuring safe, well-lit public spaces for all users, targeted outreach to underrepresented groups, or inclusive community consultations. – Gender considerations are clearly described and reflected in project documents and implementation arrangements.
13	Community involvement		
	No Community Involvement	0	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – No evidence of consultation with local residents, user groups, or local stakeholders at any stage of the public lighting project. – Project designed and implemented solely by the municipality, public institution, or project owner without community input. – No partnerships, outreach activities, or communication with local actors related to the public lighting project. – Community has no role in decision-making, governance, location choice, or allocation of benefits.
	Active Community Involvement	5	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Community members and/or local user groups are actively and meaningfully involved in one or more project phases: conceptualization, site selection, planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, operation, or monitoring. – Project includes structured engagement activities (public meetings, workshops, consultations, co-design processes) related to the public lighting project. – Evidence of partnerships with local stakeholders, such as schools, NGOs, civil society organizations, neighborhood groups, or local businesses. – Community involvement influences project design, governance, access, or allocation of benefits, beyond mere information sharing.



Annex V – Technical, Quality and Social Scoring Matrix for EV Charger Projects

Indicative scoring guidance and sources of verification

This section is intended to help applicants understand how evaluation criteria are assessed and which documents are typically used to verify the information provided.

Technical Criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
1. kW Installed	Higher installed MW gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
2. CO ₂ Reduction in tCO ₂ /year	Higher CO ₂ reduction gets higher scores	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design
3. Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)	Lower gets higher scores	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
4. Equipment efficiency	Higher equipment efficiency and quality gets higher score	Feasibility study, Idea design, BOQ, main project design
5. Finance Provided	Higher finance provided higher score	Statement, project proposal
6. Community Led	Community Led involvement in project	Statement, project proposal
Quality criteria	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
7. Relevance of project	Evaluate the alignment of the project with municipal needs, strategic priorities, and the objectives of the Call. Projects with clearly justified needs and strong consistency between problems, solutions, and expected economic benefits receive higher scores.	Feasibility study, project proposal
8. Replication potential	Evaluate whether the project design, tools, or approaches are easily adaptable and supported with documentation for reuse in other municipalities.	Feasibility study, Project documentation, case studies
9. Quality of the proposal	Review the completeness, coherence, and structure of the proposal, focusing on presence and quality of key components.	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget)
10. Economic Impact	Higher economic benefits receive better scores, encouraging municipalities to prioritize impactful investments	Feasibility study, Project Application
Social criteria - BONUS	How to Determine Score?	Source of verification?
11. Social Impact	Determine if the project improves community well-being, access to services, inclusivity, or supports vulnerable groups.	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan
12. Gender Inclusion	Check for meaningful participation of women in planning, leadership, or project execution, and inclusion of gender considerations in design.	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis
13. Community involved	Evaluate if the project includes input from community stakeholders or partners and provides benefits or shared responsibilities.	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports



EU4CAET is co-funded by the European Union and the Federal Republic of Germany. GIZ has been commissioned to implement it as part of the CAET programme by the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development. The project supports Bosnia and Herzegovina's energy transition by providing expertise and grant funds for community-led sustainable energy projects.

A. Technical Evaluation Criteria

This subsection defines the technical criteria used to assess the performance, cost-efficiency, technical readiness and financing structure of the proposed investment.

DATA Technical criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
1	KW Installed		
	0,1 - 2,9 kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	3 – 4,9 kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	5 – 6,9 kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	7 – 10,9 kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	11 – 14,9 kW	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	15 – 22,9 kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	23 – 30,9 kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	31 – 37,9 kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	38 – 43,9 kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	≥ 44 kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
2	CO₂ Reduction in tCO₂/year		
	0,1 - 1,5 tCO ₂ /year	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	1,6 - 3,5 tCO ₂ /year	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	3,6 - 6,5 tCO ₂ /year	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	6,6 - 10,5 tCO ₂ /year	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	10,6 - 16 tCO ₂ /year	5	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	16,1 - 21 tCO ₂ /year	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	21,1 - 25 tCO ₂ /year	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	25,1 - 28 tCO ₂ /year	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	28,1 - 31,9 tCO ₂ /year	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	≥32 tCO ₂ /year	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
3	Cost Efficiency (BAM/kW)		
	430 – 449,9 BAM/kW	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	410 – 429,9 BAM/kW	2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	390 – 409,9 BAM/kW	3	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	370 – 389,9 BAM/kW	4	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application



	350 – 369,9 BAM/kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	330 – 349,9 BAM/kW	6	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	310 – 329,9 BAM/kW	7	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	301 – 309,9 BAM/kW	8	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	300 – 290 BAM/kW	9	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
	< 289,9 BAM/kW	10	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application
4	Operational Quality and Interoperability		
	Scoring for the following segment is applied on a per-category hierarchical basis, whereby only the highest applicable score within each category is awarded. Support for higher-level solutions supersedes lower-level solutions.		
	The maximum total score for this segment is 10 points, allocated across five (5) categories, with each category carrying a maximum of 2 points. Scores within the same category are not cumulative.		
	<u>If a charger does not meet the requirements for score level 1 or 2 within a category, that category shall receive 0 points.</u>		
	Authentication methods	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Support for one authentication method, such as: - RFID card/tag or - PIN code or - local user profile / app-based access.
		2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Support for multiple authentication methods, such as: - RFID + PIN - RFID + mobile app - user profiles managed locally or via backend.
	IP protection	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application IP protection class IP54 – IP64 (inclusive) Includes the following IP protection classes: - IP54, IP55, IP56, IP60, IP64
		2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application IP protection class IP65 or higher Includes the following IP protection classes: - IP65, IP66, IP67, IP68



Integrated protection functions	1	<p>Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application</p> <p><u>Only one</u> integrated protection function stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PEN fault detection OR - Integrated RCD (Type A or Type B) OR - DC leakage current detection (6 mA) OR - Surge protection (SPD) OR - Overcurrent / overvoltage protection OR - Ground fault detection <p><i>Only integrated (built-in) protection functions shall be considered. External upstream protections shall not be scored.</i></p>
	2	<p>Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application</p> <p><u>Two or more</u> integrated protection functions stated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PEN fault detection - Integrated RCD (Type A or Type B) - DC leakage current detection (6 mA) - Surge protection (SPD) - Overcurrent / overvoltage protection - Ground fault detection <p><i>Only integrated (built-in) protection functions shall be considered. External upstream protections shall not be scored.</i></p>
Communication & interoperability	1	<p>Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application</p> <p>Remote backend or cloud system available, using proprietary communication.</p> <p>What must be stated: "Cloud platform" "Remote backend" "Remote monitoring system".</p>
	2	<p>Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application</p> <p>Support for standardized and/ or advanced communication protocol:</p> <p><u>OCPP 1.6J</u> <u>OCPP 2.0.1.</u></p>



	Energy metering	1	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Internal energy metering providing basic measurement of energy consumption per charging session (kWh) for informational and monitoring purposes only. Acceptable solutions include: - energy consumption per session (kWh) visible on the charger, or - energy consumption per session (kWh) accessible via app or proprietary backend. What must be stated in datasheet: "Energy consumption per charging session (kWh)" or "Session-based energy metering" or "Charging statistics (kWh)" <i>Only integrated (built-in) energy metering shall be considered. External upstream meters shall not be scored.</i>
		2	Feasibility study, project proposal, idea design, project application Integrated energy metering enabling structured and reliable measurement of electricity consumption suitable for monitoring, reporting and cost allocation , with user- or session-level differentiation. The charger shall meet at least one of the following criteria: - MID-certified energy meter integrated in the charger, or - internal energy metering with explicitly stated measurement accuracy and user-based allocation (user / RFID / profile). What must be stated in datasheet: "MID-certified energy meter" or "Billing-grade energy metering" or "Energy metering accuracy $\pm X \%$ " explicit reference to per user / per RFID / per profile energy measurement <i>Only integrated (built-in) energy metering shall be considered. External upstream meters shall not be scored.</i>
5	Own Contribution		
	20-23%	1	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	23,1-26%	2	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	26,1-29%	3	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	29,1-32%	4	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	32,1-35%	5	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	35,1-38%	6	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	38,1-41%	7	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	41,1-44%	8	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)



	44,1-47%	9	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
	47,1-50%	10	Statement, Project application - Provided funds by the project owner)
6	Community-LED		
	Concept only	1	Project application Project idea described at a conceptual level – Technology mentioned, but no site, scope, or approvals considered
	Initial preparation	2	Project application Identified building/location and technology – Preliminary technical considerations – No permits or formal approvals initiated
	Formal preparation initiated	3	Project application Municipal decision or internal approval to implement project – Initial technical documents started (concept design, cost estimate)
	Technical preparation in progress	4	Project application Draft technical solution available – Permits or approvals identified and partially initiated (if required) – Feasibility study or equivalent technical analysis prepared
	Technically ready project	5	Project application All required technical documentation completed – Required permits/approvals obtained or clearly not required – Project can proceed to procurement/implementation
	Basic community reference	1	Project application Community mentioned as beneficiary – General description of expected benefits – Limited evidence of engagement or consultation
	Defined target groups	2	Project application Clear identification of target groups (citizens, students, users, households) – Explanation of how the project benefits them – Some outreach or consultation activities described
	Structured community involvement	3	Project application Documented engagement activities (meetings, consultations, surveys) – Community needs reflected in project design – Benefits clearly differentiated (social, economic, environmental)
	Strong community integration	4	Project application Project clearly shaped by community input – Benefits extend beyond direct users to the wider local population – Clear plan for communication, visibility, and continued engagement
	Exemplary community-led municipal project	5	Project application Community engagement is central to the project concept – Municipality acts as facilitator, not only implementer – Clear, well-articulated benefits for multiple community groups – High-quality narrative demonstrating significant effort and ownership



B. Quality Evaluation Criteria

This subsection assesses the strategic relevance, economic rationale, replicability and overall quality of the project proposal.

DATA Quality criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
7	Relevance of project		
	Very weak relevance	1	Feasibility study, Project application Community mentioned only formally – Municipality listed as lead without explanation of community value – No defined users or target groups
	Weak relevance	2	Feasibility study, Project application Basic project idea described – Benefits limited mainly to municipal operations or employees – Community benefit marginal or symbolic
	Low relevance	3	Feasibility study, Project application Project linked to public service improvement in general terms – Technology and location identified (e.g. lighting zone, EV charger location, boiler house) – Target groups mentioned but not quantified
	Partial relevance	4	Feasibility study, Project application Project purpose aligned with community needs – Municipality clearly acts as lead – Target groups identified (citizens, users, drivers, households) – Limited analysis of how many people benefit
	Moderate relevance	5	Feasibility study, Project application Clear project objective linked to local policy or community need – Users and beneficiaries identified and quantified (e.g. residents, pupils, drivers, households) – Benefits consistent with feasibility study
	Good relevance	6	Feasibility study, Project application Project clearly improves services used by local people – Benefits extend beyond municipal administration – Clear social, environmental, or economic benefits (safety, mobility, comfort, cost reduction)
	High relevance	7	Feasibility study, Project application Strong alignment between project design and local community priorities – Community users actively considered in design (location, access, service quality) – Clear contribution to local energy or climate goals
	Very high relevance	8	Feasibility study, Project application Project responds to clearly identified community needs – High number of direct or indirect beneficiaries – Strong combined benefits (social, environmental, economic) – Community value clearly articulated, not only technical gains
	Excellent relevance	9	Feasibility study, Project application Project is central to improving quality of life or public services in the municipality – Mission, vision, and project design fully aligned – Feasibility study quantifies benefits for different user groups



	Outstanding relevance	10	Feasibility study, Project application Project is a flagship community-led municipal initiative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Strong, people-centered narrative – Broad and lasting impact on local community – High visibility, replicable logic, and exemplary justification supported by data
8	Replication potential		
	Very weak replicability	1	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Charging solution depends heavily on local constraints (non-standard connection, atypical layout); no generalized design or cost assumptions. Narrative: Project presented as a one-off investment with no learning value for other locations.
	Weak replicability	2	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Some components reusable (charger model, software), but overall system logic (grid, parking, access) not transferable; no standardized BoQ or specs. Narrative: Replication not discussed; project does not aim to inform other municipal or community sites.
	Low replicability	3	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Design and procurement documented, but highly site-specific (grid upgrade, parking layout); no assessment of applicability elsewhere. Narrative: Economic and institutional lessons not extracted or explained.
	Partial replicability	4	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Basic EV charger setup could be reused in similar municipal parking areas; limited documentation on grid capacity, installation steps, or load management. Narrative: No explicit replication narrative, but project could inspire similar initiatives with effort.
	Moderately Replicable	5	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project includes adaptable design principles (standard AC/DC chargers, modular foundations); feasibility study explains sizing, connection, and basic costs. Narrative: Project implicitly positioned as a reference for similar municipal or public locations.
	Good replicability	6	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Technical and economic model reusable for small to mid-size municipalities; clear cost structure, basic revenue logic, and O&M approach; lessons learned documented. Narrative: Project clearly presented as a model that other municipal departments or communities could follow.
	Strong Replicability	7	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Modular charger design, standardized specs, clear grid-capacity assumptions, and documented procurement approach. Narrative: Clear guidance on site selection (visibility, accessibility, demand) and community benefit logic.
	Very high replicability	8	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Complete replication-ready package (charger specs, BoQ, grid connection steps, O&M plan, pricing logic). Narrative: Economic and social benefits for communities clearly explained and adaptable to other municipalities.
	Near-scalable replication model	9	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Templates and tools provided (ToR for installers, procurement docs, OCPP configuration, safety checklists). Narrative: Includes guidance or capacity-building elements for municipal staff and local stakeholders.



	Fully Replicable & Scalable	10	Feasibility study, Project application Technical: Project functions as a scalable municipal EV charging model, easily expandable across parking sites or regions; full technical, financial, and operational toolkit provided. Narrative: Clear pathway for replication by other municipalities or community-led initiatives; project positioned as a benchmark or pilot for wider rollout.
9	Quality of the proposal		
	Very Poor Quality	1	- Proposal is incomplete and poorly structured - Missing key components such as objectives, budget, or methodology - No clear feasibility shown
	Extremely Weak	2	- Proposal submitted but lacks clarity - Several key parts missing (e.g., timeline, team roles, risk identification)
	Weak	3	- Basic proposal exists, but many sections lack detail or structure - Difficult to assess viability
	Below Average	4	- Proposal includes most required parts but lacks technical detail or clarity - Some elements are placeholders only
	Moderate Quality	5	- Proposal is understandable and generally well-organized - All main components are present, but some require improvement (e.g., risk matrix, staffing plan, technical specs)
	Moderate to Good	6	- Most elements are well-prepared - Some technical areas or financial details need clarification - Proposal shows medium feasibility
	Good	7	Full proposal, implementation plan, budget, timeline (Well-prepared application with all supporting documents: full methodology, Gantt chart or timeline, team roles, risk matrix, and detailed budget) – Most key components are included, but some areas (e.g., risk assessment, technical details, budget clarity) may need improvement.
	Very Good	8	- Nearly all sections complete and logically presented - Timeline, budget, and risk planning are consistent with goals - Well-supported implementation plan
	Excellent	9	- Strong, detailed proposal with professional formatting - Gantt chart, budget breakdown, and risk matrix included - High feasibility and well-documented methodology
	Outstanding Proposal	10	- Fully professional and comprehensive submission - Clear objectives and methodology - Detailed implementation plan (Gantt chart), team structure, risk analysis, and budget - Feasibility and sustainability well demonstrated
10	Economic Impact		
	Maximum number of points for economic impact is 10. The final Economic Impact score (1–10) is calculated as follows: 1. Assign points (1–10) for each of the three criteria: stated below: payback period, job creation, reinvestment plan. 2. Sum the points from all applicable criteria. 3. Divide the sum by the number of criteria used. 4. Round to the nearest whole number and this is the final economic impact score. Example: Payback period: 6 years = 9 points Job creation: 15 jobs = 10 points Reinvestment plan: 50% reinvestment, well described = 10 points Total: 9 + 10 + 10 = 29 Average: 29 / 3 = 9,66 → Total score: 10		



	(1) Payback period (investment return time)	1	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period > 13 years
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 12–13 years
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 11–11,99 years
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 10–10,99 years
		5	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 9–9,99 years
		6	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 8–8,99 years
		7	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 7–7,99 years
		8	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 6–6,99 years
		9	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period 5–5,99 years
		10	Feasibility study, Project application Payback period ≤ 5 years
	(2) Job creation (number of new jobs – permanent or temporary)	1	Feasibility study, Project application 0 jobs created
		2	Feasibility study, Project application 1 job created
		3	Feasibility study, Project application 2 jobs created
		4	Feasibility study, Project application 3 jobs created
		5	Feasibility study, Project application 4 jobs created
		6	Feasibility study, Project application 5-6 jobs created
		7	Feasibility study, Project application 7-8 jobs created
		8	Feasibility study, Project application 9-11 jobs created
		9	Feasibility study, Project application 12-14 jobs created
		10	Feasibility study, Project application ≥ 15 jobs created
	(3) Reinvestment plan (quality and concreteness of the plan for reinvesting savings/profits)	1	Feasibility study, Project application No reinvestment plan
		2	Feasibility study, Project application Minimal plan: no specific figures
		3	Feasibility study, Project application Very weak plan: only stated intention to reinvest
		4	Feasibility study, Project application Weak plan: <10% reinvestment or unclear
		5	Feasibility study, Project application Basic plan: 10–14% reinvestment, minimally described
		6	Feasibility study, Project application Acceptable plan: 15-19% reinvestment, partially described
		7	Feasibility study, Project application Solid plan: 20-24% reinvestment, basic description



	8	Feasibility study, Project application Good plan: 25–29% reinvestment, clearly described
	9	Feasibility study, Project application Very good plan: 30–39% reinvestment, specific projects listed
	10	Feasibility study, Project application Excellent detailed plan: ≥40% of savings reinvested in further local projects, with clear timeline and ROI

C. Social Evaluation Criteria (Bonus Points)

Social criteria are assessed as bonus points and aim to recognise additional social value, gender inclusion and community engagement beyond the core technical and quality requirements.

DATA Social criteria			
No	Name	Points	Clarification for scoring
11	Social impact		
	No identifiable social benefit	0	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – EV charger serves only the building owner or internal fleet (e.g. municipal office, administrative facility), without public or community access. – No direct or indirect benefit for local residents, users, or vulnerable groups. – No reinvestment of operational savings or revenues into social programs, public services, or community development. – No public engagement, education, awareness, or visibility activities related to e-mobility, renewable energy, or energy transition.
	Project generates clear social benefit for the local or target community.	5	Feasibility study, Project proposal, stakeholder engagement plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Demonstrates clear and measurable direct or indirect benefits to the local community or vulnerable groups (e.g. publicly accessible EV charging, documented reduction of municipal transport costs with reinvestment into social services or community infrastructure). – Includes community benefit mechanisms (e.g. affordable or priority charging for residents, shared use with local institutions, reinvestment of revenues into local mobility or environmental projects). – Contains public awareness, outreach, or educational activities related to e-mobility, renewable energy, or the energy transition. – Generates environmental and health co-benefits with social relevance (e.g. reduced local air pollution, noise reduction, promotion of low-emission transport). – Provides visible and demonstrable benefits for the local community (e.g. EV chargers located in public or symbolic community spaces, clear communication of benefits to citizens).
12	Gender inclusion		
	No consideration of gender or no women involved.	0	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No evidence of gender considerations in project design, implementation, or governance. - Project team or governing/implementing body is clearly gender-imbalanced and does not meet the 40/60 representation principle. - No women involved in decision-making, planning, procurement, operation, or implementation roles related to the EV charger project.



			- Project documentation does not reference gender equality, inclusive mobility, or gender-sensitive approaches
	At least one woman meaningfully involved or project includes gender-sensitive elements.	5	Team composition, proposal content, gender analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proof that women and men are represented in line with the 40/60 principle within the project team, steering group, or governance structure responsible for the community-led EV charger project. - Meaningful participation of women in at least one key role (conceptualization, planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, or operation). - Project includes gender-sensitive objectives and outcomes, such as promoting equal access to EV charging infrastructure, targeted outreach to underrepresented users, or capacity-building activities related to e-mobility. - Gender considerations are clearly described and reflected in project documents and implementation arrangements.
13	Community involvement		
	No Community Involvement	0	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No evidence of consultation with local residents, user groups, or local stakeholders at any project stage. - Project designed and implemented solely by the municipality, public institution, or project owner without community input. - No partnerships, outreach activities, or communication with local actors related to the EV charger project. - Community has no role in decision-making, governance, location choice, pricing/access rules, or benefit-sharing.
	Active Community Involvement	5	Meeting records, partnership letters, project reports <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community members and/or local user groups are actively and meaningfully involved in one or more project phases: conceptualization, site selection, planning, decision-making, procurement, implementation, operation, or monitoring. - Project includes structured engagement activities (public meetings, workshops, consultations, co-design processes) related to the EV charging infrastructure. - Evidence of partnerships with local stakeholders, such as schools, NGOs, civil society organizations, neighborhood groups, mobility associations, or local businesses. - Community involvement influences project design, governance, access conditions, pricing, or allocation of benefits, not merely information sharing.





Co-funded by
the European Union



Implemented by

giz Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

Together for energy transition



EU4CAET