**Annex F3c of the Guidelines for simplified Calls for Proposals in one phase without concept note**

PROPOSAL verification and evaluation grid

 Call for proposals: Support for national ethical, sustainable, fair trade or organic farming days or weeks organised in Africa.

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

1. **IDENTIFICATION DATA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference number: |  |
| Title of action: |  |
| Project no.: |  |
| Applicant (country): |  |
| Amount requested  |  **EUR** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| 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 applicant’s declaration is filled and signed
 |  |  |
| 1. The form is typewritten and in the required language.
 |  |  |
| 1. The required annexes are attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in Euro.
 |  |  |
| 1. The logical framework is completed and attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. **Verification of admissibility**
 |  |  |
| 1. The applicant fulfills the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1. of the guidelines
 |  |  |
| 1. The applicant is not on an Enabel exclusion list (exclusion ground no. 6) or on a financial sanctions list, BE, EU or UN (exclusion ground no. 7)
 |  |  |
| 1. The action will be implemented in the eligible region(s)
 |  |  |
| 1. The proposed action and activities are admissible under point 2.1.3 of the guidelines
 |  |  |
| 1. The action takes place in 2024 and/or 2025
 |  |  |
| 1. The contribution requested is between the authorized minimum and maximum.
 |  |  |
| 1. The costs presented in the action’s budget are eligible costs
 |  |  |
| **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 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 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 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.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Financial and operational capacity | **Max****score** | **Score** |
| 1. Does the applicant have sufficient experience in managing projects?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Does the applicant have sufficient technical expertise?(particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed)
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Does the applicant 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:**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance of the action | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and expected results of the call for proposals?
 | 5(x2)\*\* |  |
| **Total score (2)** | **10** |  |
| **Comments:** |
| Feasibility of the action | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results?
 | 5x2\* |  |
| 1. Is the action plan clear and feasible?
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (3)** | **15** |  |
| **Comments:**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sustainability of the action | **Max score** |  |
| 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)** | **5** |  |
| **Comments:**  |
| Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action | **Max score** |  |
| 1. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (5)** | **10** |  |
| **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
 | **10** |  |
| 1. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action
 | **15** |  |
| 1. Sustainability of the action
 | **5** |  |
| 1. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action
 | **10** |  |
| **OVERALL SCORE** | **60** |  |
| Only proposals achieving the score of de 6/10 for criteria 21 and global score of 36/60 shall 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.

Applicants whose proposals are pre-selected shall then be subject of an organisational analysis.

**General comments (Strength and weaknesses)**