

## Annex F1a of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals

## CONCEPT NOTE VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID

## CALL FOR PROPOSALS: &lt; TITLE &gt;

## I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

|                            |  |
|----------------------------|--|
| Grid completed by:         |  |
| Call for Proposals number: |  |
| Title of action:           |  |
| Navision no.               |  |
| Name of applicant:         |  |

## II. VERIFICATION

|  | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| <b>1. Administrative verification</b>  |     |    |
| 1. Instructions on the concept note have been followed.  |     |    |
| 2. Applicant's declaration has been completed and signed.  |     |    |
| 3. Annex Aa (Grant Application File) is completed and signed   |     |    |
| 4. The proposal is typewritten and in the required language.   |     |    |
| 5. The online form of <a href="http://www.submit.be">www.submit.be</a> is completed.   |     |    |
| 6. The required annexes are attached.  |     |    |
| <b>2. Verification of admissibility</b>  |     |    |
| 7. The applicant (and co-applicants) fulfil the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1.   |     |    |
| 8. 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) |     |    |
| 9. The legal status of the applicant and co-applicants meets the guidelines' requirements.   |     |    |
| 10. The action will be implemented in the eligible region(s).  |     |    |
| 11. The action and activities proposed are admissible under  |     |    |

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| point 2.1.3 of the guidelines.  |  |  |
| 12. The duration of the action is between 30 months and 36 months (authorised minimum and maximum duration).                                  |  |  |
| 13. The contribution requested is between the authorised minimum and maximum and the co-financing complies with the established requirements. |  |  |
| <b>Conclusion: The concept note will/will not be taken into account for the evaluation</b><br>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 added up to obtain the overall score for the concept note in question.

| Relevance of the action   | Max score | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| 14. To what extent is the proposal relevant to the expected objectives and results of | 5(x2)**   |       |

|   |                  |              |
|---|------------------|--------------|
| the Call for Proposals?*  |                  |              |
| 15. To what extent is the proposal relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region/regions? (including synergy with other initiatives of Belgian cooperation and avoidance of duplication)   | 5(x2)**          |              |
| 16. To what extent have the parties involved (final beneficiaries, target groups) been clearly defined and strategically selected? Have their needs been clearly defined and properly addressed in the proposal?  | 5                |              |
| 17. Does the proposal contain specific elements that add value, such as environmental aspects, the promotion of equal opportunity and gender equality, the needs of the disabled, minority rights and rights of indigenous populations or innovation and best practices [as well as any other additional elements mentioned in section 1.2 of the guidelines for applicants]? | 5                |              |
| 18. The applicant has Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) plan (5 points will be awarded for a comprehensive and relevant ESG plan, 0 points if no ESG plan is submitted)  | 5                |              |
| <b>Total score (1)</b>  | 35               |              |
| <b>Concept of the action</b>  | <b>Max score</b> | <b>Score</b> |
| 19. To what extent is the overall concept of the action coherent? In particular, does it reflect a problem analysis; does it take into account external factors as well as the stakeholders concerned?  | 5                |              |
| 20. Is the action feasible (accessibility and safety of the intervention areas) and logical in relation to the objectives and expected results?   | 5                |              |
| 21. To what extent does the solution have the potential to be scaled up in a technically feasible and financially viable manner? What is its sustainable scaling-up strategy?   | 5(x2)**          |              |
| 22. Is the proposed system aligned with existing public strategies and policies? Is the innovation/project supported locally and is there local buy-in, in partnership with institutions, that would enable the project to be sustained after funding?  | 5                |              |
| 23. Is the innovation/project aligned with the thematic priorities of the Call and its relevance to Enabel's country portfolio objectives?  | 5                |              |
| 24. To what extent does the project include an assessment of the socio-economic impact of the proposed innovation?  | 5                |              |
| <b>Total score (2)</b>  | 35               |              |
| <b>OVERALL SCORE</b>  | <b>70</b>        |              |

\*\* Scores will be multiplied by 2 depending on their importance.

Only concept notes which have obtained a minimum score of 40 points out of 70 will be shortlisted.

And only concept notes which have obtained a minimum score of 6 out of 10 points for criterion no. 14 and of 3 out of 5 points for criterion no. 16 will be shortlisted.

|  |
|--|
| <b><u>General comments (main strengths and weaknesses)</u></b> |
|--|