

Annex F1aE - Evaluation Grid for a Concept Note - Two-Phase Call for Proposals

Call for Proposals: <TITLE>- <NUMBER>

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

Declaration of Impartiality and Confidentiality

I, the undersigned, agree to participate in the evaluation of the proposal submitted by the organization concerned within the framework of the direct award procedure referenced below.

I declare, to the best of my knowledge, that I am not in a situation of actual, potential, or apparent conflict of interest with the organization concerned, its representatives, or its potential associates.

Should such a situation arise during the evaluation, I undertake to immediately inform the person responsible for the evaluation process and to cease participating in the evaluation if the conflict is confirmed.

I undertake to examine the proposal impartially, objectively, and neutrally, based on the applicable criteria and requirements.

I also undertake to respect the confidentiality of the information received or consulted in the context of this evaluation, not to disclose it to unauthorized persons, and to use it only for the purposes of evaluating the file.

These obligations remain applicable after the end of my participation in the evaluation.

Signature:

I. Identification Data

Call for Proposals Reference Number	
Concept note reference number	
Action Title	
Enabel Parent Project Number	
Applicant Name	
Co-applicant(s), if applicable	
Relevant Lot, if applicable	
Proposed Intervention Area	
Amount Requested from Enabel	
Proposed Duration	

II. Evaluation

Scoring Guidelines

Each sub-criterion is scored from 1 to 5: 1 = very inadequate; 2 = inadequate; 3 = average; 4 = good; 5 = very good. This rating out of 5 is then converted into a weighted score to reflect the actual weight of the sub-criterion in the evaluation grid. The final score for the sub-criterion is calculated proportionally to the maximum number of points allocated to it in the grid, whether it be a maximum of 2, 3, 10, 15 points, or any other prescribed ceiling.

Thus, when a sub-criterion is scored out of 10 points, the score out of 5 is multiplied by 2.

The comments must explain the main findings justifying the assigned score. A score of 1, 2, or 5 should be justified in a particularly explicit manner.

1. Relevance of the action - 30 points

Sub-criterion	Elements to be assessed	Score	Comments
1.1 Relevance in relation to the objectives, expected results, orientations, and parameters defined in the guidelines	Assess, in particular, the understanding of the objectives set by Enabel, the contribution to the expected results, the respect for the areas, sectors, themes, or specific needs indicated, and the consistency with the framework of the call for proposals.	___/10	
1.2 Relevance to the context, needs, and constraints of the targeted country, region, or sector	Assess, in particular, the quality of the needs analysis, the consideration of local, sectoral, or institutional constraints, the consistency with existing policies or interventions, the synergies	___/10	

	with other initiatives, and the absence of obvious duplication.		
1.3 Strategic identification of end beneficiaries, stakeholders, and actors involved	Assess, in particular, the consistency with the categories defined in the guidelines, the geographic and thematic targeting, the beneficiary estimation, the consideration of their needs, and the mechanisms for participation or ownership.	___/5	
1.4 Added Value of the Concept Note	In particular, assess the integration of the required cross-cutting themes, innovative approaches or best practices, strategic complementarities, sustainability, ownership, replicability, or other distinctive elements mentioned in the guidelines.	___/5	

Overall score for the relevance of the action: ____ / 30

2. Action Design -20 points

Sub-criterion	Elements to be assessed	Score	Comments
2.1 Internal coherence of the proposed action logic	Assess whether the concept note presents a sufficiently clear and coherent action logic at this stage: link between the expected results, the main types of activities proposed, and the desired effects for the end beneficiaries. The assessment focuses on the internal coherence of the action, without reassessing its relevance to the objectives of the call, the context, or the needs.	___/10	
2.2 Indicative Feasibility and Preliminary Operational Structuring	Assess whether the concept note provides, at this stage, sufficient information on the main implementation methods: general structure of activities, role or positioning of the main stakeholders, indicative timeline, and main factors or constraints taken into account. The assessment focuses on the sufficiently structured and plausible nature of the action at the concept note stage, without requiring the level of detail expected in the full proposal.	___/10	

Total score for action design: ____ / 20

III. Overall Score and Recommendation

Section	Maximum Score	Score Achieved
Relevance of the Action	30	
Design of the Action	20	
OVERALL SCORE	50	

Only concept notes obtaining a minimum overall score of 30 out of 50 will be shortlisted.

In addition, only concept notes obtaining a minimum score of 6 out of 10 for criterion 1.1 will be shortlisted.

Recommendation / Conclusion:

☐ Shortlisted / Provisionally Selected

☐ Not Shortlisted / Provisionally Not Selected

V. General Comments

Main Strengths:

Main Weaknesses or Areas of Attention:

