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# 1. Timetable

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date** | **Time** |
| **Publication of call for proposals** |  | n.a. |
| **Deadline for submission of applications** |  |  |
| **Meeting 1** |  |  |
| **Meeting 2** |  |  |
| **Etc.** |  |  |

# 2. Participants

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Representing** | **Role**[[1]](#footnote-1) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3. Evaluation

This text may be expanded to reflect any discussions on particular cases

In line with Section 2.3 (1) of the guidelines for applicants, the evaluation committee proceeded with the first step of the evaluation process as follows.

In total, <XXX> applications were received. Each one was given a serial number. This number was marked on all copies of the application and will be used throughout the evaluation process as the sole reference. The full list of the applications received is attached in annex.

The originals of the applications have been filed with the contracting authority.

# 3.1 Check that the deadline for submission of [restricted: concept note] [open: application] has been met

The following applications were submitted after the deadline and are therefore excluded from further examination.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applic. No**  | **Lead applicant** | **Date [& time ]of submission** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3.2 Check that the [restricted: concept note] [open: application] satisfies all the criteria specified in the checklist [restricted in Section 2 of Part A] [open: in Section 7 of Part B]

As a result of the checks, the evaluation committee decided to exclude the following applications from further evaluation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applic. No**  | **Lead applicant** | **Reasons for elimination** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Decision on the evaluation of concept notes**

As a result of the checks, the evaluation committee decided to examine the concept notes of the following applications for a total requested contribution of EUR <XXX >.

[The list of administratively compliant applications sorted by sector, issue or geographical area is attached in annex.]

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Applic. No**  | **Lead applicant** | **Requested EU contribution** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**3.3 Concept note evaluation**

The [evaluation committee] [assessors] used the evaluation grid to assess the relevance and design of the action.

The evaluation committee subsequently deliberated on the basis of these analyses.

Insert here the summary of discussions and the approach adopted by the evaluation committee.

Option 1: For open procedures

[The evaluation committee completed the evaluation of the concept notes and drew up a list of pre-selected concept notes for which the corresponding full applications will be evaluated. The concept notes were ranked according to the total [average] of the scores awarded.]

Option 2: For restricted procedures

[The evaluation committee completed the evaluation of the concept notes and drew up a list of pre-selected concept notes whose lead applicants will be invited to submit full applications. The concept notes were ranked according to the total [average] of the scores awarded.]

The concept notes awarded lower [average] scores than those pre-selected are also listed below.

The evaluation grids of all the concept notes examined are annexed to this report.

# 4. Conclusions

# 4.1 Concept notes recommended

 The following concept notes are recommended for pre-selection.

[The list of recommended concept notes sorted by sector, issue or geographical area is attached in annex.]

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applic. No**  | **Lead applicant** | **[Average] score** | **Requested grant** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Number of pre-selected concept notes: <XXX>.

Total requested amount of preselected concept notes: EUR <XXX> (sum of the requested contributions).

Total available amount: EUR <XXX>.

# 4.2 Concept notes not recommended

 The following concept notes are not recommended for pre-selection:

[The list of concept notes not recommended, sorted by sector, issue or geographical area, is attached at annex.]

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Applic. No**  | **Applicant** | **[Average] score** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  | E.g. that the minimum threshold of 30 was not reached |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Number of unsuccessful concept notes: <XXX>.

# 5. Signatures

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Name** | **Signature** |
| **Chairperson** |  |  |
| **Secretary** |  |  |
| **Evaluators** |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Approved by the contracting authority:**

**Name and Signature: Date:**

|  |
| --- |
| **[Approved by the European Commission (only in the case of ex ante control by the European Commission)** |
| Name: |  |
| Title: |  |
| Signature: |  |
| Date: **]** |  |

1. Evaluator, assessor, observer, chairperson, secretary. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)