

**Annex F2 of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals**
**PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID**

*This grid is provided for the information of applicants, so that they can be fully aware of the criteria on which their proposal will be assessed. The grid will be completed by Enabel for each application received.*

**Trade for Development Centre – Call for Proposals for the implementation of a strategy and/or an action plan to be more sustainable and more respectful of decent income and decent work**

Call for Proposals number: BEL22010-10023

**Grid completed by:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Date:** \_\_/\_\_/\_\_

**I. IDENTIFICATION DATA**

Reference number:	
Title of action:	
Applicant (country):	
Target region/regions or country/countries:	
Amount requested	EUR _____
Duration:	____ months

**II. VERIFICATION**

<b>1. Administrative verification</b>	Yes	No
1. The correct proposal form was used.		
2. The form is completed and signed.		
3. The form is typewritten and in the required language.		

4. The required annexes are attached.		
5. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR.		
6. The logical framework is completed and attached.		
<b>2. Verification of admissibility</b>		
7. The subsidised action shall end on 30 September 2027 at the latest.		
8. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs.		
9. 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.		
<b>Conclusion: proposal &lt;will/will not&gt; be taken into account in the evaluation</b> Comments:		

### III. 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 inadequate
2	Inadequate
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 7 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 inadequate), 2 (inadequate) or 5 (very good) for a sub-section, they must

justify this in the “comments” box. These boxes may be enlarged as needed.

<b>1 Financial and operational capacity</b>	<b>Max score</b>	<b>Score</b>
10. Carry over the total score obtained in the evaluation of the concept note	20	

<b>2 Sustainability of the organisation</b>	<b>Max score</b>	<b>Score</b>
11. Carry over the total score obtained in the evaluation of the concept note	30	

<b>3 Relevance of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	<b>Score</b>
12. Carry over the total score obtained in the evaluation of the concept note	35	

<b>4 Effectiveness and feasibility of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	<b>Score</b>
13. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the expected objectives and results?	5	
14. Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	
15. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for?	5	
16. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the partners satisfactory?	5	
<b>Total score</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		

<b>5 Sustainability of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	
17. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?	5	
18. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects? (particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)	5	
19. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable? - from a financial point of view ( <i>how will the activities be funded at the end of the grant?</i> ) - from an institutional point of view ( <i>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?</i> ) - from a social point of view (if applicable) ( <i>will the action have a positive/negative impact on social aspects?</i> ) - from an environmental point of view (where applicable) ( <i>will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?</i> ) - at the political level (where applicable) ( <i>what will be the structural impact of the action – for example, will it lead to better laws, codes of conduct, methods, etc.?</i> )	5	
20. The proposed action actively supports the effective participation of women in decision-making and in production, processing, and commercial activities.	5	
21. The proposed action demonstrates a significant leverage effect through a partnership with a commercial enterprise, university, research centre or other cooperation agency.	5	
<b>Total score</b>	<b>25</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		

<b>6 Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	
22. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	5 (x 2)**	
23. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?	5	
<b>Total score</b>	<b>15</b>	

**Comments:**

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

7 Overall score and recommendation	Max score	Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	20	
2. Sustainability of the organisation	30	
3. Relevance of the action	35	
4. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	20	
5. Sustainability of the action	25	
6. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action	15	
<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	<b>145</b>	

Only proposals that have achieved an overall score of 87/145 (60%) 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.