

Annex F2a of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals

**GRANT PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID
(2ND ROUND, PART B)**
Call for Proposals

How Does Research on Inclusive Participation Contribute to the Development of a More United Society?

BEL22001-10057

Grid completed by: _____ Date: __/__/__

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

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

II. VERIFICATION

1. Administrative verification	Yes	No
1. The correct proposal form was used.		
2. The proposal form is completed and signed.		
3. The proposal form is in the required language (EN or FR) and in electronic format.		

4. The required annexes are attached and in electronic format.		
5. The applicant has completed and signed the declaration form.		
6. If relevant, the co-applicant has completed and signed the mandate form.		
7. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR.		
8. The logical framework is completed and attached.		
2. Verification of eligibility		
9. All (co-)applicants fulfils the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1. of the guidelines.		
10. The project will be implemented in focal countries		
11. The duration of the action is between 6 months and 12 months		
12. The contribution requested is between the authorised minimum and maximum.		
13. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs		
14. The contribution requested has not been modified by more than 15% from the amount requested at the concept note stage and remains below the maximum limit.		
15. Recent financial statement (<2 year) of the lead applicant (and if relevant co-applicant), certified by an independent body, are attached.		
16. Proof of being locally established is attached (lead applicant).		
17. Proof of 2 research programs in the past (lead applicant and co-applicant if there is one)		
Conclusion: proposal will be taken into account in the evaluation 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 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
18. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its co-applicant/partners, have sufficient experience in managing research projects?	5	
19. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its co-applicant/partners, have sufficient technical expertise on inclusive participation? (particularly through past research experiences in the country concerned by the research)	5	
20. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its co-applicant/partners, have adequate management capacity? (particularly, regarding staff, facilities and the capacity to manage the action's budget)	5	
21. 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
22. 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
23. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives (general and specific) and results?	5 (x 2)**	
24. Is the action (work) plan clear and feasible (the time, means allocated)	5	
25. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for?	5	
26. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the different actors concerned satisfactory?	5	
Total score (3)	25	
Comments:		

** score multiplied by 2 depending on its importance.

Sustainability of the action	Max score	
27. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact (e.g. on target groups, on bringing visibility to research on inclusive participation in Africa, possible utilisation by national, European and international stakeholders, enhanced quality of research)?	5	
28. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects? (particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)	5	
29. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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/donors that will allow the activities to be continued at the end of the action? Will there be local "ownership" of action results?</i>) - at the political level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action – for example, will it lead to better programmings, awareness raising among the population, national, European and international stakeholders, laws, codes of conduct, methods, etc.?</i>) - from a transversal aspects point of view (where applicable) (<i>will the action have a positive/negative impact on gender equality, social inclusion, human rights etc.</i>)? 	5	
Total score (4)	15	
Comments:		
Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action	Max score	
30. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	5	
31. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?	5	
Total score (5)	10	
Comments:		

Overall score and recommendation	Max score	Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	20	
2. Relevance of the action	30	
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	25	
4. Sustainability of the action	15	
5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action	10	
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.