**Annex F2a of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals**

PROPOSAL verification and evaluation grid

CALL FOR PROPOSAL: **Support to quality extracurricular activities**

**Grid completed by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_**

1. **IDENTIFICATION DATA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reference number:** |  |
| **Title of action:** |  |
| **Navision no.:** |  |
| **Applicant (country):** |  |
| **Target region/regions or country/countries:** |  |
| **Amount requested**  | **EUR** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Local currency** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **Duration:** | \_\_\_ months |

1. **VERIFICATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Administrative verification**
 | Yes | No |
| 1. The correct proposal form was used.
 |  |  |
| 1. The form is completed and signed.
 |  |  |
| 1. The form is typewritten and in the required language.
 |  |  |
| 1. One original is attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. The required annexes are attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. An electronic version of the form (USB stick) is attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. Each co-applicant (where relevant) has completed and signed the mandate, which is attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR.
 |  |  |
| 1. The logical framework is completed and attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. **Verification of admissibility**
 |  |  |
| 1. The duration of the action is between 18 months and 36 months (authorised minimum and maximum duration).
 |  |  |
| 1. The costs presented in the action’s budget are eligible costs
 |  |  |
| 1. The contribution requested has not been modified by more than 20% from the amount requested at the concept note stage and remains below the maximum limit.
 |  |  |
| **Conclusion: proposal <will/will not> be taken into account in the evaluation**Comments: |

1. **EVALUATION**

**Scoring guidelines**

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **sub-sections**. For each sub-section, a score between 1 and 5 is given, in accordance with the assessment scale below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Score | Assessment |
| 1 | Very poor  |
| 2 | poor |
| 3 | Average |
| 4 | Good |
| 5 | Very good |

These scores must be added up to obtain the total score for the section in question. Total scores of sections must be carried forward to point 6 and added up to obtain the overall score for the application in question.

For each section, a box is provided for writing comments – which must concern the points covered in the section in question. Comments should be made for each **section**. If an evaluator gives a score of 1 (very poor), 2 (poor) or 5 (very good) for a sub-section, they must justify this in the “comments” box. These boxes may be enlarged as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Financial and operational capacity | **Max****score** | **Score** |
| 1. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient experience in managing projects?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient technical expertise?(particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed)
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have adequate management capacity? (particularly, regarding staff, facilities and the capacity to manage the action’s budget)
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing?
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (1)** | **20** |  |
| **Comments:**  |

If the application obtains a total score below “average” (12 points) for section (1) financial and operational capacity, it will be eliminated by the evaluation committee.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance of the action | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. Carry over the total score obtained in the evaluation of the concept note
 | 30 |  |
| **Total score (2)** | **30** |  |
| **Comments:** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Effectiveness and feasibility of the action | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Is the action plan clear and feasible?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the partners satisfactory?
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (3)** | **20** |  |
| **Comments:**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sustainability of the action | **Max score** |  |
| 1. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects?(particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable?

- from a financial point of view (*how will the activities be funded at the end of the grant?*)- from an institutional point of view *(are there structures that will allow the activities to be continued at the end of the action ? Will there be local “ownership” of action results?)*- at the political level (where applicable) *(what will be the structural impact of the action – for example, will it lead to better laws, codes of conduct, methods, etc.?)**-* from an environmental point of view (where applicable) *(will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?)* | 5 |  |
| **Total score (4)** | **15** |  |
| **Comments:**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action | **Max score** |  |
| 1. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?
 | 5 (x 2)\*\* |  |
| 1. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (5)** | **15** |  |
| **Comments:**  |

\*\* score multiplied by 2 depending on its importance.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Overall score and recommendation | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. Financial and operational capacity
 | 20 |  |
| 1. Relevance of the action
 | 30 |  |
| 1. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action
 | 20 |  |
| 1. Sustainability of the action
 | 15 |  |
| 1. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action
 | 15 |  |
| **OVERALL SCORE** | **100** |  |
| Only proposals that have achieved an overall score of 60/100 will be pre-selected |
| Recommendation: | Not provisionally selected: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | YES/NO |
| Supporting documents relating to the grounds for exclusion provided |  |

Proposals for which the requested documents have not been provided are not included in the list of successful proposals.