

Annex F2a of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals

PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID

CALL FOR PROPOSAL: <TITLE> AND <Nr>

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:	_____ months

II. VERIFICATION

1. Administrative verification	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. One original and <X copy/copies> are attached.		
5. The required annexes are attached.		
6. An electronic version of the form (CD-ROM) is attached.		
7. Each co-applicant (where relevant) has completed and signed the mandate, which is attached.		
8. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the		

required format and denominated <in EUR/national currency>.		
9. The logical framework (if requested) is completed and attached.		
2. Verification of admissibility		
10. The duration of the action is between <X months> and <X months> (authorised minimum and maximum duration).		
11. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs		
12. 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:		

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
13. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient experience in managing projects?	5	
14. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient technical expertise? (particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed)	5	
15. 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	
16. 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
17. 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
18. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results?	5	
19. Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	
20. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for?	5	
21. 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	
22. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?	5	
23. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects? (particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)	5	
24. 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>) - 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>) - from an environmental point of view (where applicable) (<i>will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?</i>)	5	
Total score (4)	15	
Comments:		

Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action	Max score	
25. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	5 (x 2)**	
26. 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	
2. Relevance of the action	30	
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	20	
4. Sustainability of the action	15	
5. 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.