Slate Funding

N.B. Although the questions are in English, **please answer in the language of the application** – if possible – otherwise in German, French or English. Feel free to send us your comments on the single projects of a slate. This will simplify the consolidation process in case of divergent expert evaluations. It will also help us to explain a refusal to candidates and is always very much appreciated since it can help the projects even if they are refused.

| AWARD CRITERIA | General interpretation of award criteria relevant for all projectsPlease write your text into this column. | Weighting of the criterion | Elements of analysis of the award criteria |
|---|---|----------------------------------|--|
| Relevance and European added- value | 1. Approach of the Company to develop and produce at a European and international level a slate (package) of 3 to 5 projects and the capacity of the company to be innovative in its activities | (Total 30) | |
| | 1a) Approach of the Company to develop and produce at a European and international level a slate (package) of 3 to 5 projects | /20 | Relevance and added value of the proposed slate to improve the company's position on the European and international market in relation to its: co-production approach partnership with players from different countries, including from countries with different production capacity visibility at major film festivals and physical and online markets capacity to increase the company's turnover ability to develop several projects in parallel |
| | 1b) Capacity of the company to be innovative in its activities | /10 | Ability of the company to adapt to a |

| | | competitive and changing audiovisual landscape and to improve its market position by being innovative in its activities in terms of: |
|--|---|---|
| Quality of the content and activities | 2. Quality of the slate of projects and quality of the development strategy | /15 Quality and creative potential of each project strength and distinctiveness of idea/subject matter/project focus premise dramatic potential narrative choices quality of the writing character development world of story visual approach art work Adequacy of the development plan to the needs of each project Sufficiency of detail Adequacy of development schedules planned |

| Dissemination of projects' results | 3. The potential to reach audiences at European and international level, and the European and international distribution and marketing strategy | (Total 35) | |
|------------------------------------|---|------------|--|
| | 3a) Potential to reach audiences at European and international level | /15 | Transnational appeal of the concept/subject of the projects Potential of the projects to cross borders taking into account The creative team the cast the proposed execution and the strategies and collaboration methodology presented, especially with non-national co-production partners |
| | 3b) The European and international distribution strategy | /10 | Relevance of the distribution strategy regarding distribution methods foreseen, partners in place or envisaged, awareness of the markets, European/international vision, relevance of choice of territories (neighbouring countries and regions, Europe, other continents) |
| | 3c) The European and international marketing strategy | /10 | Relevance of the marketing strategy in terms of the identified target audience(s), unique selling points, |

Applicant Company: Expert Name:

| | | | innovative marketing and audience engagement tools, promotional activities |
|---------------------------|---|------------|---|
| Impact and sustainability | 4. Quality of the financing strategy and its European dimension, and feasibility potential of the slate of projects | (Total 20) | |
| | 4a) Quality of the financing strategy and its European dimension | /10 | Awareness of the suitable potential partners and territories targeted Sufficiency and realism of the financing plan Diversity of sources of funding foreseen Level of commitment and share of non-national financing |

| 4b) Feasibility potential of the slate of projects | /10 | Adequacy of the production costs |
|--|-----|---|
| | | • Adequacy of the financing strategy compared to the estimated production costs |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

Applicant Company:

Assessment Sheet Slate Funding v. 01.02.2023

Expert Name:

Swiss MEDIA Compensating Measures

TOTAL

Please fill in the total of points given for each criteria:

| Criteria | Definition | Max. Points | Expert | Threshold to be eligible for funding |
|--|---|----------------|--------|--|
| 1.Relevance and European added- value | Approach of the Company to develop and produce at a European and international level a slate (package) of 3 to 5 projects and the capacity of the company to be innovative in its activities | 30 | | (Depending on availability of budget) |
| 2. Quality of the content and activities | Quality of the slate of projects and quality of the development strategy | 15 | ••• | |
| 3. Dissemination of project results | The potential to reach audiences at European and international level, and the European and international distribution and marketing strategy | 35 | | |
| 4. Impact and sustainability | Quality of the financing strategy and its European dimension, and feasibility potential of the slate of projects | 20 | | |
| Total | | 100 Points | | 70 Points |

As an indication, would you recommend the rejection or the selection of the slate of projects? How would you assess the projects on an individual basis? (Please mark with an "X" as appropriate)

| | Slate | Project 1 Title | Project 2 Title | Project 3 Title | Project 4 Title | Project 5 Title |
|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| Recommendation for selection | | | | | | |
| Recommendation for rejection | | | | | | |

If you recommend the selection:

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

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

...

Applicant Company:

Assessment Sheet Slate Funding v. 01.02.2023

Expert Name:

Swiss MEDIA Compensating Measures

Points

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

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

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

N.B.2. Some criteria are to be rated on a scale of 15 points. In those cases, you may find useful to use the standard scale and then multiply the score by the corresponding factor, further refine to the next whole number (if applicable). For example: 8/10 points in the standard scale corresponds to 12/15 (factor: x1.5).

N.B.3 As a horizontal criterion, please evaluate – if applicable – the strategies to ensure a more **sustainable and environmentally-respectful industry, gender balance, inclusion, diversity and representativeness**, either in the project/content or in the way of managing the activities.