

Annex E of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals in one phase without concept note
PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID

CALL FOR PROPOSAL: SKILLS DEVELOPMENT TRAININGS GRANT FOR RWENZORI-ALBERTINE REGION - UGA1402711-10045/ SSU BE/CFP/010

Grid completed by: _____ **Date:** ___/___/___

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

| | |
|--|--|
| Reference number: | |
| Title of action: | |
| Project no: | |
| Applicant (country): | UGANDA |
| Target region(s) or country/countries: | Kasese, Kabarole (Bunyangabu and Fort Portal city inclusive), Hoima, Masindi, Bulisa; and Kyegegwa, Kamwenge and Kikuube |
| Amount requested | EUR _____ |
| Duration: | ___ months |

II. VERIFICATION

| 1. Administrative verification | Yes | No |
|---|-----|----|
| 1. The correct proposal form was used | | |
| 2. The form is completed and signed | | |
| 3. Applicant's declaration is filled and signed | | |
| 4. The form is typewritten and in the required language | | |
| 5. Application is attached to the email | | |
| 6. The required annexes are attached | | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| 7. The submitted version in in PDF | | |
| 8. Each co-applicant (where relevant) has completed and signed the mandate, which is attached | | |
| 9. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in UGX and EUR | | |
| 10. The logical framework is completed and attached | | |
| 2. Verification of admissibility | | |
| 11. The applicant (and the co-applicants) fulfil(s) the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1. of the guidelines | | |
| 12. 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) | | |
| 13. The proposed action will be implemented in the eligible districts | | |
| 14. The proposed action and activities are admissible under point 2.1.3 of the guidelines | | |
| 15. The duration of the action is between <X months> and <X months> (authorised minimum and maximum duration) | | |
| 16. The requested contribution is between the minimum and the maximum authorized | | |
| 17. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs | | |
| <p>Conclusion: proposal <will/will not> be taken into account in the evaluation</p> <p>Comments:</p> | | |

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 | Max score | Score |
|--|-----------|-------|
| 18. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient experience in managing projects? | 5 | |
| 19. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient technical expertise? (particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed) | 5 | |
| 20. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have adequate management capacity? (particularly, regarding staff, facilities and the capacity to manage the action's budget) | 5 | |
| 21. Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing? | 5 | |
| Total score (1) | 20 | |
| Comments: | | |

If the application obtains a total score below “average” (12 points) for section (1) financial and operational capacity, it will be eliminated by the evaluation committee.

| 2. Relevance of the action | Max score | Score |
|---|-----------|-------|
| 22. How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and expected results of the call for proposals? | 5(x2)** | |
| 23. How relevant is the proposal to the particular needs and constraints of the target country (ies) or region (s)? (including synergy with other Belgian cooperation initiatives and the avoidance of duplication) | 5(x2)** | |
| 24. To what extent are the parties involved (final beneficiaries, target groups) clearly defined and strategically chosen? Have their needs been clearly defined and are they adequately addressed in the proposal? | 5 | |
| 25. Does the proposal contain specific elements providing added value, such as environmental aspects, the promotion of equal opportunities and gender equality, the needs of the disabled, the rights of minorities and indigenous populations or innovation and best practices [as well as other additional elements mentioned in section 1.2 of the guidelines for applicants]? | 5 | |
| Total score (2) | 30 | |
| <p>Comments:</p> | | |

| 3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action | Max score | Score |
|--|------------------|--------------|
| 26. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results? | 5 | |
| 27. Is the action plan clear and feasible? | 5 | |
| 28. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for? | 5 | |
| 29. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the partners satisfactory? | 5 | |
| Total score (3) | 20 | |
| <p>Comments:</p> | | |

| 5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action | Max score | |
|---|-----------|--|
| 33. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget? | 5 (x 2)** | |
| 34. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory? | 5 | |
| Total score (5) | 15 | |
| <p>Comments:</p> | | |

** score multiplied by 2 due to its importance.

| Overall score and recommendation | Max score | Score |
|---|-----------------------------|-------|
| 1. Financial and operational capacity | 20 | |
| 2. Relevance of the action | 30 | |
| 3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action | 20 | |
| 4. Sustainability of the action | 15 | |
| 5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action | 15 | |
| OVERALL SCORE | 100 | |
| Only proposals that have achieved a score of 6/10 for criterion 22 and 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.