Annex F2aE - Evaluation Grid for a Proposal:

Two-Phase Call for Proposals - Transfer of the Relevance Score from the Concept Note

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:

Purpose of the Grid
This grid is intended for the evaluation of a complete proposal submitted as part of a two-stage Call for Proposals. The relevance of the action is taken into account by transferring the weighted relevance score obtained at the concept note stage. The evaluation of the complete proposal therefore focuses primarily on capacity, operational quality, governance, sustainability, budget, and the consistency of the complete proposal with the shortlisted concept note.

I. Identification Data

Proposal Reference Number	
Action Title	
Enabel Parent Project Number	
Applicant Name	
Co-applicant(s), if applicable	
Lot, if applicable	
Intervention Area	
Proposed Duration	
Total Action Amount	
Amount Requested fromEnabel	
Co-financing / Other Funding Sources, if applicable	

II. Evaluation

Scoring Guidelines
Except for relevance, which is transferred from the concept note score according to the formula below, each sub-criterion is scored from 1 to 5: 1 = very inadequate; 2 = inadequate; 3 = average; 4 = good; 5 = very good. A comment must be provided for each sub-criterion to justify the assigned score.
The final score for the sub-criterion is calculated proportionally to the maximum number of points allocated to it in the rubric, whether it be a maximum of 2, 3, 10, 15 points, or any other specified ceiling.

1 Operational and Financial Capacity -20 points

Sub-criterion	Elementsto be assessed	Score	Comments
1.1 Relevant experience of the applicant and, whereapplicable, co-applicants, in project	Assess experience in similar actions, in the same sector, on a comparable scale, with similar beneficiaries or implementation methods.	__/5	

Sub-criterion	Elementsto be assessed	Score	Comments
management			
1.2 Available technical expertise	Assess knowledge of the sector, the issues to be addressed, the proposed methods, and the complementarity between the applicant and co-applicants,where applicable.	__/5	
1.3 Operational and Financial Management Capacity	Does the applicant and, where applicable, the co-applicants, possess sufficient operational and financial management capacity to ensure the successful implementation of the action? This assessment takes into account, in particular, available human resources, experience in managing comparable actions or funding, available organisational and material resources, the amount of funding already managed, the financial data provided, the capacity to ensure coordination, monitoring, financial management and reporting, as well as the consistency between the proposed role in the action and the capacities of the applicant and the co-applicants.	__/5	
1.4 Stability and Sufficiency of Funding Sources	Assess the applicant's financial stability, the strength of its resources, and its capacity to support the implementation of the action.	__/5	
1.5 Organisational ESG Plan - to be used only when applicable: if private for-profit entities are involved for whom profit maximization is not a priority.	When this sub-criterion is applicable, assess whether the applicant has a clear, credible, and appropriate organisational ESG plan tailored to its profile, activities, and governance. The assessment focuses in particular on the identification of the main environmental, social, and governance risks, the measures planned to prevent or manage them, internal responsibilities, the planned monitoring, and the plan's realism. In the absence of an organisational ESG plan, the score assigned to this sub-criterion is 0/5.	__/5	

If sub-criterion 2.5 applies: score for section 2 = (score obtained out of 25 / 25) × 20. If sub-criterion 2.5 does not apply: score for section 2 = sum of sub-criteria 2.1 to 2.4, i.e., a score out of 20.

Elimination threshold: if the proposal receives less than 12/20 for this section, it is rejected.*Whensub-criterion 2.5 applies, this threshold is assessed after conversion to a scale of 20.* ***A score of 1/5 for any of sub-criteria 2.1 to 2.4 also results in the rejection of the proposal; this elimination threshold does not apply to sub-criterion 2.5.***

Total Financial and Operational Capacity Score: ____ / 20

2 Action Relevance - 20 points

Weighted Transfer of the Concept Note Score
The relevance score obtained during the evaluation of the concept note is carried over and converted to a score of 20 points using the following formula: (concept note relevance score / 30 × 20). This carryover applies provided that the full proposal remains consistent with the shortlisted concept note. Since the purpose of the full proposal is to develop, clarify, and operationalize the concept note, non-substantive changes do not result in a new relevance score. Their potential effects are taken into account in the evaluation criteria of the full proposal to which they relate. In the event of a substantial change to the nature, rationale, objectives, expected results, end beneficiaries, intervention area, or overall scope of the action, the committee documents the discrepancy and assesses whether the proposal should be rejected for non-compliance with the shortlisted concept note.

Element	Formula/ element to be assessed	Score	Comments
2.1 Transfer of the relevance score from the concept note	Transfer the relevance score obtained at the concept note stage and convert it to a 20-point scale: (score / 30) × 20.	__/20	
Ungraded consistency check	Verify that the complete proposal remains consistent with the shortlisted concept note, particularly regarding the nature of the action, objectives and results, intervention area, end beneficiaries, etc.	Not graded	

Totalrelevance score transferred : ____ / 20

3 Quality of Activities and Implementation Methods - 20 points

Sub-criterion	Elements to Assess	Score	Comments
3.1 Relevance and Coherence of Activities with Expected Results	Assess the clarity of the activities, their link to the expected results, their suitability for the beneficiaries, and their reasonable capacity to contribute to achieving the results.	__/5	
3.2 Quality of Methodology and Operational Feasibility	Assess the methodology described for each activity, the approaches, tools, implementation steps, practical arrangements, and feasibility in light of the context.	__/5	
3.3 Planning, Sequencing, and Coordination of Activities	Assess the realism of the schedule, the logical order of activities, the dependencies between activities, the preparation, implementation, and monitoring phases, and the coherence of the plan.	__/5	
3.4 Specific Roles, Resources, and Implementation	Assess the clarity of operational roles, the adequacy of human, material, and technical resources, and, where applicable, the	__/5	

Sub-criterion	Elements to Assess	Score	Comments
Mechanisms	operational quality of sub-grant or financial support mechanisms for end beneficiaries.		

Total score for activities and implementation methods: ____ / 20

4 Organisation, governance, and monitoring and evaluation - 15 points

Sub-criterion	Elementsto be assessed	Score	Comments
4.1 Organisational structure, responsibilities, and governance	Assess the suitability of the proposed organisational structure, the planned functions, responsibilities, reporting lines, and governance methods in light of the nature and complexity of the action.	__/5	
4.2 Coordination, communication, decision-making, and problem-solving	Assess the coordination mechanisms, information flows, decision-making processes, and management of difficulties, delays, conflicts, or irregularities, particularly when multiple stakeholders are involved.	__/5	
4.3 Monitoring, Evaluation, Indicators, Learning, and Reporting	Assess the quality of the monitoring and evaluation system, including indicators, targets, data sources, data collection responsibilities, use of data to guide action, and reporting procedures to Enabel.	__/5	

Total score for organisation, governance, and monitoring and evaluation: ____ / 15

5 Risk management, sustainability, and operational integration of cross-cutting themes - 15 points

Sub-criterion	Elementsto be assessed	Score	Comments
5.1 Risk identification and mitigation - 5 points	Assess the realistic identification of assumptions, risks, and constraints likely to affect the implementation or achievement of results, as well as the relevance, feasibility, and proportionality of the proposed mitigation measures.	__/5	
5.2 Sustainability and Impacts Beyond Enabel Funding - 5 points	Assess the mechanisms for ownership, continuity, and sustainable use of results, financial, institutional, and environmental sustainability, as well as the potential for lasting impacts for end beneficiaries and stakeholders.	__/5	
5.3 Operational Integration of Cross-Cutting Themes - 5 points	Assess how relevant or requested cross-cutting themes are concretely integrated into the design, activities, implementation methods, and, where applicable, monitoring of the action. This assessment focuses on the operational translation of the cross-cutting themes, and not solely on their general relevance, which has already been assessed at the concept note stage.	__/5	

Overall score for viability, risks, sustainability, and cross-cutting themes: ____ / 15

6 Budget and cost-effectiveness ratio - 10 points

Sub-criterion	Elementsto be assessed	Score	Comments
6.1 Structure, completeness, and consistency of the budget	Assess the consistency of the budget with the activities, expected results, implementation methods, and timeline. Verify that all necessary resources are budgeted, correctly allocated, and sufficiently detailed, and that no major inconsistencies, omissions, or duplications are identified.	__/5	
6.2 Cost-Effectiveness, Financial Risks, and Implementation Feasibility	Assess whether the proposed costs are proportionate to the expected results and demonstrate efficient use of resources. Evaluate whether the financial planning and expenditure forecasts are realistic in light of the implementation period and operational capacity, and identify significant risks of under-budgeting, over-budgeting, or unrealistic expenditure forecasts.	__/5	
6.3 Quality and Justification of Budgetary Calculations	Assess the realism and justification of the budgetary calculations and unit costs. Verify that quantities, unit rates, allocations, man-days, travel expenses, workshop costs, procurement costs, and staffing levels are sufficiently detailed, proportionate, and based on realistic assumptions.	__/5	
6.4 Financial Compliance and Cost Eligibility	Assess the apparent eligibility of costs and compliance with applicable rules and the budget template, including ceilings, funding rates, co-financing requirements, and limits applicable to overhead costs. Identify risks related to ineligible costs, double funding, or incorrect cost categorization, as well as, where applicable, the financial terms of third-party financing mechanisms.	__/5	

Raw budget score and cost-effectiveness ratio of the action: ____ / 20

*The relevance score is then carried over and converted out of 10 points according to the following formula: (raw budget*score and cost-effectiveness ratio*/ 20) × 10*

Total budget score and cost-effectiveness ratio: ____ / 10

III. Overall Score and Recommendation

Area	Maximum Score	Awarded Score
Financial and Operational Capacity	20	
Relevance of the Action - Weighted Transfer of the Concept Note Score	20	
Quality of Activities and Implementation Methods	20	
Organisation, Governance, and Monitoring and Evaluation	15	
Risk Management, Sustainability, and Operational Integration of Cross-Cutting Themes	15	
Budget and Cost-Effectiveness	10	
OVERALL SCORE	**100**	

Selection threshold: Only proposals obtaining a minimum overall score of 60/100 may be selected, subject to other applicable conditions.

Recommendation:

☐ **Proposal not selected**

☐ **Proposal recommended for selection**

☐ **Proposal recommended for selection with elements to be addressed during the optimisation step**

IV. Potential elements to be addressed during proposal optimisation

For proposals recommended for selection, evaluators may identify elements to be clarified, strengthened, or adjusted during the proposal optimisation step, in accordance with the internal guidelines for this stage.

These elements may include alignment with Enabel's guidelines, refinement of targeting, sequencing or adjustment of certain activities, strengthening of risk management, monitoring and evaluation, governance, budget allocation, third-party financing mechanisms, or specific clauses to be included in the Grant Agreement.

Identified elements:

- _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

The identified adjustments must remain within the limits set out in the optimisation note and cannot alter the essential elements that led to the selection of the proposal.

V. General Comments

Main Strengths:

- _____

Main Weaknesses or Key Risks:

- _____