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

# 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 business support organisations **to develop tools and/or trajectories to support and guide businesses in terms of sustainability and respect for human rights**

**Grid completed by: …**
**Date: ___/___/___**

## I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

| | |
|---|---|
| **Reference number:** | **BEL22010-10024** |
| **Title of the action for which the grant is requested:** | |
| **Name of the applicant:** | |
| **Amount requested:** | **EUR _____** |
| **Duration of the action:** | **____ months** |

## II. VERIFICATION

| **1. Administrative verification** | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| 1. The correct proposal form was used. | | |
| 2. The form is completed and signed. | | |
| 3. The applicant's declaration is completed and signed. | | |
| 4. The form is typewritten and in the required language. | | |
| 5. The required annexes are attached (see list on the last page of the Guidelines for Applicants). | | |
| 6. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR. | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 7. The logical framework is completed and attached. | | |
| **2. Verification of admissibility of the applicant** | | |
| 8. The applicant fulfils the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1. of the Guidelines for Applicants. | | |
| 9. 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) | | |
| • **The administrative check is <OK / not OK>**<br>• **The applicant <is admissible / is not admissible>**<br>**Conclusion:**<br>• **The concept note <is / is not> taken into account for the rest of the verification** | | |

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| **3. Verification of admissibility of the action** | | |
| 10. The action will be implemented in the eligible region(s). | | |
| 11. The proposed action and activities are admissible under point 2.1.3 of the guidelines. | | |
| 12. The subsidised action ends on 30 September 2027 at the latest. | | |
| 13. The contribution requested is between the authorised minimum and maximum. | | |
| 14. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs | | |
| **Conclusion: the proposal <will/will not> be taken into account for the evaluation** | | |

## 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 added up to obtain the overall score for the application in question.

BSO = Business Support Organisation

| 1 Financial and operational capacity of the applicant | Max score | Score |
|---|---|---|
| 15. Does the applicant have sufficient experience in managing projects? | 5 | |
| 16. Does the applicant have sufficient technical expertise? (particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed) | 5 | |
| 17. Does the applicant have adequate management capacity? (particularly, regarding staff, facilities, and the capacity to manage the action's budget) | 5 | |
| 18. Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing? | 5 | |
| **Total score (1)** | **20** | |
| **2 Applicant profile** | | |
| 19. The support techniques used by the BSO, and in particular the use of participatory methodologies. | 5 | |
| 20. Number of organisations supported per year. | 5 | |
| 21. The proportion of producers' organisations and/or cooperatives and/or social economy enterprises among the structures supported by the BSO. | 5 | |
| 22. The degree of the BSO's involvement in the cocoa, coffee and/or cashew nuts sectors. | 5 | |
| **Total score (2)** | **20** | |
| **3 Relevance of the action** | | |
| 23. To what extent is the proposal relevant to the expected objectives and results of the Call for Proposals? How does the action enable companies to be supported and guided in terms of sustainability and respect for human rights?* | 5 x 2* | |
| 24. To what extent do the activities aimed at acquiring know-how or developing tools, meet needs identified by users/beneficiary organisations? | 5 | |
| 25. To what extent does the proposal contribute to the achievement (in part or in full) of the BSO's business plan? | 5 | |
| 26. How innovative is the proposal? To what extent does the proposal enable the BSO to strengthen itself in an area that is new to the BSO? | 5 | |
| **Total score (3)** | **25** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **4 Feasibility of the action** | | |
| 27. Are the proposed activities appropriate, practical, and consistent with the expected objectives and results? | 5 x 2* | |
| 28. Is the action plan clear and feasible? | 5 | |
| **Total score (4)** | **15** | |
| **5 Sustainability of the action** | | |
| 29. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable?<br>- from a financial point of view (*how will the activities be funded at the end of the grant?*)<br>- 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?)*<br>- from a social point of view (if applicable) (*will the action have a positive/negative impact on social aspects?*)<br>- from an environmental point of view (where applicable) *(will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?)*<br>- 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.?)* | 5 | |
| **Total score (5)** | **5** | |
| **6 Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action** | | |
| 30. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory? | 5 | |
| 31. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget? | 5 | |
| **Total score (6)** | **10** | |

* scores multiplied by 2 due to their importance

| Overall score and recommendation | Max score | Score |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Financial and operational capacity | **20** | |
| 2. Applicant profile | **20** | |
| 3. Relevance of the action | **25** | |
| 4. Feasibility of the action | **15** | |
| 5. Sustainability of the action | **5** | |
| 6. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action | **10** | |
| **OVERALL SCORE** | **95** | |

Only proposals that have achieved a score of 6/10 for criterion 23 ("*To what extent is the proposal relevant to the expected objectives and results of the Call for Proposals?*") and an overall score of 57/95 (i.e. 60%) will be shortlisted.

| 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 (main strengths and weaknesses)** |
|---|
| |