**EVALUATION GRID**

**Call for proposals: <TITLE>**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grid completed by** |  |
| **Number of the proposal** |  |
| **Name of the applicant** |  |
| **Title of the action** |  |

**Scoring guidelines**

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **subsections**. Each subsection must be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following guidelines:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Score | Meaning |
| 1 | very poor |
| 2 | poor |
| 3 | adequate |
| 4 | good |
| 5 | very good |

These scores are added to give the total score for the section concerned. The totals for each section are then listed added together to give the total score for the concept note.

Insert the reference and/or passages of the relevant section in the concept note as well as any comment, remark and justification concerning the evaluation of the subsection. Note that upon request, any lead applicant may be given the comments and justifications provided.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Section in the application form** | **Comments & Justification** | **Maxi. score** | **Scores** |
| **1. Financial and operational capacity** |  |  | **20** |  |
| 1.1 Do the applicants have sufficient in-house experience of projectmanagement? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 1.2 Do the applicants have sufficient in-house technical expertise? (especially knowledge of the issues to be addressed) |  |  | 5 |  |
| 1.3 Do the applicants have sufficient in-house management capacity? (Including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 1.4 Does the proposal contain particular added-value elements (e.g. innovation, best practices)? [and the other additional elements indicated under 1.2. of the guidelines for applicants] |  |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | | |
| **2. Relevance** |  |  | **20** |  |
| 2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives of the call for proposals and the project? Are the expected results of the action aligned with the priorities defined in the guidelines for applicants? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2.2 How relevant is the proposal to the particular common needs and constraintsof the target country(ies), region(s) and/or relevant sectors (including synergy with other development initiatives and avoidance of duplication)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs and constraints been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2.4 Does the proposal have a real cross-border added value? Does it contain particular added-value elements (e.g. innovation, best practices)? |  |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | |  |
| **3. Design of the action** |  |  | **15** |  |
| 3.1 How coherent is the design of the action? Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the envisaged outputs and outcome(s)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 3.2 Are the outputs consistent with the needs of the target groups? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 3.3 Are the outputs likely to contribute to the expected results? |  |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | |  |
| **4. Implementation approach** |  |  | **15** |  |
| 4.1 Is the action plan for implementing the action clear and feasible? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 4.2 Is the timeline realistic? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 4.3 Is the co-applicant(s)'s level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory? |  |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | |  |
| **5. Sustainability of the action** |  |  | 15 |  |
| 5.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 5.2 Is the action likely to have multiplier effects, including scope for replication, extension, capitalisation on experience and knowledge sharing? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 5.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable?  - Financially *(e.g. financing of follow-up activities, sources of revenue for covering all future operating and maintenance costs)*  - Institutionally *(will structures allow the results of the action to be sustained at the end of the action? Will there be local ‘ownership’ of the results of the action?)*  - At policy level (where applicable) *(what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods)*  - Environmentally (if applicable) *(will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?)* |  |  | 5 |  |
|  | | | |  |
| **6. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action** |  |  | **15** |  |
| 6.1 Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 6.2 Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the results satisfactory? |  |  | 10 |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE** |  |  | **100** |  |

**General comments (major strong points and weaknesses).**

**[Please add any other relevant information, including other actions (whether financed by the EU or not) which are relevant to the proposed action.]**