

Annex F2a of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals

PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID

**CALL FOR PROPOSAL: Enhancing Waste Collection Services
through Women-Led Business Development in the
Municipalities of Nacala and Nampula**

AND < **MOZ22005- 10074** >

Grid completed by: _____ Date: ____/____/____

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Reference number:	
Title of action:	
UBW 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. The required annexes are attached.		

5. The application was correctly submitted through Submit platform.		
6. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR and within the budget limitations. - Minimum amount: EUR 200,000 (two hundred thousand euros) for both municipalities. - Maximum amount: EUR 220,000 (two hundred and twenty thousand euros) for both municipalities.		
7. The logical framework (if requested) is completed and attached.		
2. Verification of admissibility		
8. The duration of the action is between 12 months and 15 months (authorised minimum and maximum duration).		
9. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs		
10. 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.

1. Financial and operational capacity			
Assessment criterion	Assessment Focus	Max score	Score
11. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient experience in managing projects?	Based on section 2.3 of the application part B (full proposal) - expertise of applicant this assessment is made. Also consider the Core Team CV for the team lead: how strong is the presented profile?	5	
12. Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing?	Based on section 2.3 of the application part B (full proposal) - expertise of applicant this assessment is made. Does the applicant have sufficient various projects and a variety of different donors. The applicant regularly implement funded projects. Do they also have other sources of funding than grants?	5	
Total score (1)¹ (minimum to obtain is <u>6</u> - see footnote)		<u>10</u>	
Comments:			

2. Relevance of the action			
Assessment criterion	Assessment Focus		Score

1 If the application obtains a total score below “average” (6 points) for the section “financial and operational capacity”, it will be eliminated by the evaluation committee.

		Max score	
13. Carry over the total score obtained in the evaluation of the concept note: <i>which focuses on the relevance of the action (alignment with objectives, alignment with local priorities and the general call for proposal)</i>	The Concept Note score will be scored 'out of 90', the transposed score for relevance assessed at the Concept Note-phase will thus be divided by three, to count for 'out of 30' points at full proposal phase.	30	
14. Are the components of intersectionality approach, Sexual Exploitation, Abuse and Harassment (SEAH), Occupational Health and Safety (OHS), Environmental, Health and Safety (EHS) sufficiently incorporated?	Quality of: • Intersectionality analysis • GBV/SEAH; OHS and EHS risk mitigation	5	
Total score (2)		35	
Comments:			

3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action			
Assessment criterion	Assessment Focus	Max score	Score
15. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results?	Clarity and coherence of the intervention logic: • Overall objective, specific objectives and expected results clearly defined • Proposed results logically follow from problem analysis and are consistent with the three focus areas. • How consistent are the different components (women's economic empowerment, improving municipal waste services, partnership framework) and link each other?	(5x2*)	
16. Is the action based on evidence?	Problem analysis and evidence base, clarity and evidence in describing: • Local market-related constraints	5	

	affecting women's, • Analysis of opportunities within local waste collection services • Transparent selection criteria for women beneficiaries • Capacity-building needs		
17. Is the action plan clear and feasible?	Feasibility within 12-15 months months: • Realism of scope, outputs and implementation calendar • Feasibility of business models • Feasibility of partnership framework	5	
18. Does the application contain objective indicators to evaluate the results of the action?	To which extent did the intervention logic translate well to realistically measurable indicators <u>(logical framework)</u> ? To which extent will the proposed indicators measure the real change that will occur? Is an evaluation planned?	5	
19. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the partners and stakeholders satisfactory?	Quality and added value of partnerships: • Relevance and complementarity of PGIRSU and key partners • Demonstrated or planned operational presence in Nacala and Nampula municipalities • Clarity of roles and coordination arrangements • To which extent does the action aims for women-led businesses integration into municipalities waste value chain?	5	
Total score (3)		30	
Comments: 			

4. Sustainability of the action			
Assessment criterion	Assessment Focus	Max score	Score

20. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?	To which extent is it probable that the proposed technical approach will make a real impact on increasing women's income? To which extent will improve waste collection within the target municipalities? Does it present an integrated approach?	5	
21. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects? (particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)	Potential for learning and replication: • Potential for learning, documentation and replication of models in other municipalities? • Likelihood of remaining operational post-grant • How will the action continue to have effects even after the action ends?	5	
22. 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 - from an environmental point of view	1. Sustainability: 2. Financial sustainability 3. Institutional sustainability 4. Integration with the municipalities waste collection service chain 5. Local sustainability 6. Environmental sustainability	5	
Total score (4)		15	
Comments:			

5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action			
Assessment criterion	Assessment Focus	Max score	Score
23. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	Proportionality and realism of the budget: • Coherence between the detailed budget, scale of activities and 12-15month duration. • Plausibility of resource allocation to achieve stated results.	5	
24. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?	Cost-effectiveness and efficient use of resources: • Balance between spending in all CfP component • Acceptable rate of presented management cost • Value for money	5	
Total score (5)		10	
Comments:			

* score multiplied by 2 or 3 depending on its importance.

Overall score and recommendations	Max score	Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	10	
2. Relevance of the action	35	
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	30	
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.