

Annex F2aE - Evaluation Grid for a Proposal:

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

Call for Proposals: Scaling pathways for green competences in teacher training and professional development in sub-Saharan Africa – BEL23004-10148

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 call for proposals 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	
Solution to be scaled	
Green competence gap addressed	
Enabel Parent Project Number	BEL23004
Applicant Name	
Co-applicant(s), if applicable	
Intervention Area	
Proposed Duration	
Total Action Amount	
Amount Requested from Enabel	
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, where applicable, co-applicants, in project management	Assess experience in similar actions, in the same sector, on a comparable scale, with similar beneficiaries or implementation methods. Assess, including but not limited to, the following aspects: Whether the applicant or a co-applicant has previously taken a solution beyond its original setting: expanded it to new geographies, institutions or user groups, handed it over to another organisation, or secured its adoption by a public system.	___/5	
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. Assess, including but not limited to, the following aspects: - Green competences expertise - Track record of engaging Ministries and national teacher training and professional development providers.	___/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. Assess, including but not limited to, the following aspects: - Reliance on grant funding for the solution being scaled, and whether the sustainability pathway addresses it. - Whether the core delivery of the solution is financed for the full duration of the action from identified and, where possible, secured sources, and whether the consequences of any shortfall are addressed.	___/5	

Elimination threshold: if the proposal receives less than 12/20 for this section, it is rejected. A score of 1/5 for any of sub-criteria 1.1 to 1.4 also results in the rejection of the proposal.

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. Verify in particular that the solution being scaled is the same solution presented in the concept note, that green competences remain the primary focus, and that the action has not become the core delivery of the solution.	Not graded	

Total relevance 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. Assess in particular: - Activities are confined to the scaling, learning and sustainability process. Core delivery of the solution, and the routine production of content, curricula or materials, are not eligible. Where present, identify them here and reflect the consequence under 6.4.	___/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. Assess in particular: - Where the solution pursues adoption by national institutions, how that adoption is to be secured, including the decision points and approvals involved and who owns them. - How the approach adjusts if adoption proves slower or takes a different form than assumed. - Alignment of the solution with the relevant national teacher competency framework, curriculum or professional standards, and whether facilitator or trainer qualification requirements are defined and met.	___/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 Mechanisms	Assess the clarity of operational roles, the adequacy of human, material, and technical resources.	___/5	

Total score for activities and implementation methods: ____ / 20

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

Sub-criterion	Elements to 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. Assess in particular: - Where national institutions are involved, they have a defined role in the governance of the action, not only a mention as stakeholders. Documented engagement is taken into account. - A person or function is identified as responsible for communication and visibility, with the time allocated stated.	___/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 data sources, data collection responsibilities, use of data to guide action, and reporting procedures to Enabel. Assess in particular: - Learning: whether the learning questions are specific to scaling this solution rather than generic, how learning is captured, and who has authority to act on findings during implementation. - Sharing: knowledge products with named audiences, sharing with other RTIA-supported initiatives and within the region, and the scaling case study required before the end of the action. - Resourcing: responsibility assigned, time allocated, and corresponding budget lines in Annex B. - Data can be disaggregated at minimum by gender, country and category of stakeholder reached. The quality and feasibility of the proposed measurement approach is scored here, including whether the applicant can realistically collect the data its indicators require. The exact indicator formulations, baselines and targets are agreed during technical optimisation and are not scored.	___/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	Elements to 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. Assess in particular: - Risks specific to scaling: political and institutional change in partner institutions, adoption not materialising within the grant period, the core delivery of the solution losing its funding during the action, and the solution not performing as expected at greater scale or in a new setting.	___/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. Assess in particular: - The credibility of the sustainability pathway required as expected output 2, and the extent to which it was developed in engagement with national institutions, such as the relevant Ministry department and national teacher training and professional development provider. - What is realistically expected to be in place by the end of the action, as distinct from what remains aspirational. - Beyond-local reach: how the impact of the solution extends past its immediate national setting. Learning and knowledge products are assessed under 4.3 and are not scored again here.	___/5	
5.3 Operational Integration of Cross-Cutting Themes - 5 points	Assess how the cross-cutting theme of gender equality is 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. Assess in particular: - How the action promotes gender equality in access to and participation in teacher training, avoids reinforcing existing gender gaps, and takes account of the differentiated ways environmental challenges affect girls and boys, women and men.	___/5	

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

6 Budget and cost-effectiveness ratio - 10 points

Sub-criterion	Elements to 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. Assess in particular: - Costs are linked to the scaling, learning and sustainability activities defined in guidelines 2.1.2. Core delivery, routine production of content, curricula or materials, and infrastructure or equipment for large-scale roll-out are not eligible. - Structural costs do not exceed 7% of the operational costs financed by Enabel. - The communication and visibility budget is not less than the minimum share of total eligible costs set in	___/5	

Sub-criterion	Elements to be assessed	Score	Comments
	guidelines 2.1.2.		

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:

- _____