**FULL APPLICATION Evaluation Grid**

**Grid completed by \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_/\_\_/2\_\_\_**

**I. IDENTIFICATION DATA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference number: |  |
| Budget line/EDF: |  |
| Applicant (country): |  |
| Title of action: |  |
| Region(s) or country/ies targeted: |  |
| Amount requested (and % of total eligible costs): | **EUR \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ ( \_\_\_% )  [\_\_\_\_\_% ]** |
| Duration: | \_\_\_ months |

**Scoring guidelines**

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **subsections**.

The evaluation grid is divided into sections and subsections. Each subsection must be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following guidelines:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Score | Meaning |
| 1 | very poor |
| 2 | poor |
| 3 | adequate |
| 4 | good |
| 5 | very good |

These scores are added to give the total score for the section concerned. The totals for each section are then listed in section 6 and added together to give the total score for the full application.

Each section contains a box for comments. These comments should address the issues covered by that section. Comments must be made on each **section**. Extra space may be used for comments if required.

Insert the reference and/or passages of the relevant section in the full application as well as any comment, remark and justification concerning the evaluation of the subsection. Note that upon request, lead applicants may be given the comments and justifications provided.

**II. EVALUATION GRID**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Financial and operational capacity** | **Score** |
| 1.1 Do the applicants and affiliated entity(ies), if applicable, have sufficient in-house **experience of project management**? | / 5 |
| 1.2 Do the applicants and affiliated entity(ies), if applicable, have sufficient in-house **technical expertise**? (specially knowledge of the issues to be addressed.) | / 5 |
| 1.3 Do the applicants and affiliated entity(ies), if applicable, have sufficient in-house **management capacity**? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)? | / 5 |
| 1.4 Does the lead applicant have stable and sufficient sources of **finance**? | / 5 |
| **Total score:** | **/20** |
| **Comments & justification:** | |

If the total score for this section is less than 12 points, the application will be rejected. If the score for at least one of the subsections is 1, the application will also be rejected. In case of doubts on compliance, the evaluation committee may decide to issue a request for further proofs to the lead applicant. Where the guidelines for applicants allow for financial support to third parties and the applicants propose such financial contribution to third parties, it has to be verified that the lead applicant offers adequate guarantees as regards the recovery of amounts due.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2. Relevance of the action** | **Score** |
| ***Score transferred from the concept note evaluation*** | /20 |
| **Total score:** | **/20** |
| **Comments:** | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3. Design of the action** | **Score** |
| 3.1 How coherent is the design of the action? Does the proposal indicate the expected results to be achieved by the action? Does the intervention logic explain the rationale to achieve the expected results? Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the envisaged outputs and outcome(s)? | / 5 |
| 3.2 Does the proposal/Logical Framework include credible baseline, targets and sources of verification? If not, is a baseline study foreseen (and is the study budgeted appropriately in the proposal)? | / 5 |
| 3.3 Does the design reflect a robust analysis of the problems involved, and the capacities of the relevant stakeholders? | / 5 |
| **Total score:** | /15 |
| **Comments & justification:** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Implementation approach** | **Section in the full application** | **Comments** | **Score** |
| 4.1 Is the action plan for implementing the action clear and feasible? Is the timeline realistic? |  |  | / 5 |
| 4.2 Does the proposal include an effective and efficient monitoring system? Is there an evaluation planned (previous, during or/and at the end of the implementation)? |  |  | / 5 |
| 4.3 Is the co-applicant(s)'s and affiliated entity(ies)'s level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory? |  |  | / 5 |
| **Total score:** |  |  | **/ 15** |
| **Comments & justification:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5. Sustainability of the action** | **Section in the full application** | **Comments** | **Score** |
| 5.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups? |  |  | / 5 |
| 5.2 Is the action likely to have multiplier effects, including scope for replication, extension capitalisation on experience and knowledge sharing)? |  |  | / 5 |
| 5.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable?:  - Financially *(e.g. financing of follow-up activities, sources of revenue for covering all future operating and maintenance costs)*  - Institutionally *(will structures allow the results of the action to be sustained at the end of the action? Will there be local ‘ownership’ of the results of the action?)*  - At policy level (where applicable) *(what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods)*  - Environmentally (if applicable) (will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?) |  |  | / 5 |
| **Total score:** |  |  | **/ 15** |
| **Comments & justification:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action** | **Section in the full application** | **Comments** | **Score** |
| 6.1 Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget? |  |  | / 5 |
| 6.2 Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory? |  |  | / 5x2 |
| **Total score:** |  |  | **/ 15** |
| **Comments & justification:** | | | |

**General comments (major strong points and weaknesses).**

**If the evaluation is made by the delegation: [Please add any other relevant information, including other actions (whether financed by the EU or not) which are relevant to the proposed action.]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **7. Total score and recommendations** | | **Score** |
| 7.1 Financial and operational capacity | | / 20 |
| 7.2 Relevance of the action | | / 20 |
| 7.3 Design of the action | | / 15 |
| 7.4 Implementation approach | | / 15 |
| 7.5 Sustainability of the action | | / 15 |
| 7.6 Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action | | / 15 |
| **TOTAL :** | | **/ 100** |
| Recommendation: | Not provisionally selected : | |