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# INTRODUCTION

This guide is based on the practical guide (PRAG) and in particular its Chapter 6 and related annexes.

The purpose of this document is to guide assessors on how to conduct their evaluations so that all assessments are made in a coherent and consistent way.

It is recalled that the evaluation committee has to base its decisions on the individual assessments of the assessors and therefore needs to ensure compliance with the criteria defined in the call for proposals and that these are commonly understood and applied by all assessors, whether they be internal to the European Commission (based in EU delegations or at headquarters) or external (external experts).

To this end, all assessors should independently from each other carry out the assessment of the proposals assigned to them in a consistent manner by applying the same methodology, interpretation and understanding of the objectives and criteria described in the guidelines for applicants. This does not necessarily mean that the scores of two different assessors are expected to be identical, but rather that each assessor applies the same standards and provides a well substantiated opinion supporting his/her individual scores. This may be achieved by applying the following standards and good practices.

Before starting the examination of the proposals (concept note or full application), all assessors must familiarise themselves with the following documents:

* The present guidelines for assessors;
* The guidelines for applicants responding to this call for proposals, available at:

<insert the weblink>, including the annexes and eventual FAQs

* Chapter 6 of the practical guide: <insert the weblink>

insert other references as required for the specific call for proposals:

* <……………>

# OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES FOR THIS ALL FOR PROPOSALS

Assessors must familiarise themselves with the documents related to the call for proposals. The information below refers to certain key points but does not substitute a thorough reading of e.g. the guidelines for applicants, their annexes and the FAQs published for the call.

## Specific background

<Provide the relevant background info concerning the call>

## Specific objectives of the call for proposals

<Present the objectives of the call>

## Specific priorities

<Detail the specific priorities/objectives of the call>

# EVALUATION

Applications submitted for the call for proposals will be evaluated to identify the best proposal which merit EU funding.

The proceedings of the evaluation exercise are confidential and all parties involved are bound to adhere to the principles of confidentiality, impartiality and no conflict of interest. The assessors must sign a declaration to this fact.

Only the chairperson of the evaluation committee may authorise contacts with an applicant during and after the evaluation process. This includes communications related to clarifications, the announcement of the results of each phase as well as dealing with requests for information and questions raised by any applicant about the results.

Lead applicant whose applications have not been pre- or provisionally selected will be informed about the scores obtained in the evaluation including a breakdown by section and sub-section of the evaluation grid. They may also be given the comments and justifications provided by the assessors and/or the evaluation committee.

Specify any other considerations: <………>

## The evaluation process

Recommendations on the proposals are to be provided to the contracting authority by an appointed evaluation committee, comprising a non-voting chairperson, a non-voting secretary and an odd number of voting members (minimum of three). The role of the assessors is to carry out all or part of the detailed examination so as to assist the evaluation committee in its deliberations.

Assessors are used for this call for proposal

* [For the administrative checks.]
* [For the evaluation of concept notes and proposals.]
* [For the eligibility checks.]

Assessors work under the supervision of the chairperson of the evaluation committee.

For each submission step (concept note and, in the case of restricted procedures, the full application), there is an administrative check to be carried out.

Concept notes submitted and which duly passed the administrative checks are evaluated for the relevance and design of the action, using an evaluation grid (see Annex E5\_a). As a first step, only the concept notes which receive a score of at least 30 points in the evaluation are considered for pre-selection. The final score is the arithmetical average of the scores given by the assessors.

The secretary draws up the first report containing the result of the administrative checks and the concept note evaluation, ranked by score.

In restricted procedures, any pre-selected lead applicant is invited to submit full applications. These are subject to another administrative submission check.

For the proposals that pass this check, and all the pre-selected proposals in an open procedure, the quality of the application forms is assessed using the evaluation grid (see Annex E5\_b) containing the selection and award criteria. The score for relevance is transferred from the concept note evaluation to the full application evaluation grid and is not assessed again (unless permitted in accordance with the practical guide). The final score is the arithmetical average of the scores given by the assessors.

The secretary draws up the second report containing the results of the administrative check and the evaluation of the full applications, ranked by score. The evaluation committee will make a recommendation for provisionally selected proposals as well as a reserve list of applications, should additional funds become available within a defined time period.

For the provisionally selected applications and those on the reserve list, an eligibility check will be undertaken on the basis of submitted supporting documents to confirm earlier statements in checklists and declarations.

The secretary draws up the third report containing the results of the eligibility checks and the evaluation committee makes a final recommendation to the contracting authority.

<Provide other information on the evaluation process, which is specific to the call for proposals, such as the timetable, the role of the coordinator, if applicable. If a coordinator is used, ensure that his/her role and tasks are clearly defined and that there are no elements which will compromise the principles of the procedure, notably the need to have separate, individual assessments by two assessors for the technical evaluation>

## Content of the evaluation

If assessors are used for the administrative checks:

* [For the administrative checks, the assessors should verify each proposal against the checklist and the declaration by the lead applicant (see Annex E3b). The criteria published in the checklist with the call may under no circumstances be modified. Each proposal need only be checked by one assessor. Each evaluation grid must be initialled, signed and dated by the assessor having carried out the evaluation. ]

If assessors are used for the evaluation of concept notes and full applications:

[For the evaluation of concept notes and full applications, assessors should write an assessment using the published evaluation grids (see annexes E5a and E5b) without modification. At least two assessors must assess each concept note and each full application, working independently of each other. The assessors must not discuss the evaluation of specific proposals between themselves. [In the context of this call for proposals, one of the assessors is the concerned EU-delegation.]

Assessors are fully responsible to complete their evaluation grids in compliance with the quality evaluation standards described in these guidelines and the criteria listed in the evaluation grid available. Each application must be assessed on its own merits and not by comparing different applications. Each criterion of the evaluation grid should be evaluated only once by the assessor and should not influence assessment of other criteria. The assessor must give concise, pertinent and well justified comments for each sub-section of the evaluation grid, in a wording that may be given directly to the lead applicant, if requested. Strong and weak points must be reflected. In particular, comments should not include only a summary of the proposal, but should provide a short critical analysis in line with the respective questions of the evaluation grid. Each evaluation grid must be initialled, signed and dated by the assessor having carried out the evaluation. ]

If assessors are used for the eligibility checks:

* [For the eligibility checks, the assessors should verify each proposal against the checklist, the declaration by the lead applicant (see annex E3b) and submitted supporting documents. The criteria published in the checklist with the call may under no circumstances be modified. Each proposal need only be checked by one assessor. Each evaluation grid must be initialled, signed and dated by the assessor having carried out the evaluation.]

If the assessor has any doubts about the compliance of an applicant or affiliated entity, the issue should be raised to the chairperson of the evaluation committee for further advice and/or necessary clarification requests to the lead applicant.

The evaluation grids should be completed in <specify language(s)>.

<Describe any other tasks while ensuring coherency with sections 6.4.7. and 6.4.8. of the practical guide>

# SCORING

The applications will be ranked in accordance with the final score they are attributed by the evaluation committee.

The concept note will receive an overall score out of 50 using the breakdown in the evaluation grid. Only the concept notes with a score of at least 30 will be considered for pre-selection.

The list of concept notes will be reduced, taking account of the ranking, to those for which the total of requested contributions is <insert number the number indicated in the guidelines> the available budget for this call for proposals, based on the indicative financial envelopes for each lot, where relevant.

The full application will receive an overall score out of 80. The score received for ‘relevance’ in the concept note evaluation will be transferred to the full application evaluation grid as this aspect will not be assessed again (unless permitted in accordance with the practical guide).

## General

Comments and scores must be coherent and consistent with the corresponding score. Therefore, a high score combined with critical or negative comments or a low score accompanied by positive comments would be incomprehensible and rather confusing for the evaluation committee to appreciate and the conclusion may be that it is not possible to rely on the assessment. Remember also that the comments provided may be communicated to the lead applicant upon request.

Scores between 1 and 5 (not 0) must be given. Half points are not accepted. The calculation of the sub- and total scores must be verified carefully.

The evaluation grid is divided into sections and subsections.

The first section contains the selection criteria which evaluate the financial, professional and technical capacity of the applicants to implement the action proposed. Applicants and their affiliated entity(ies) must have the necessary professional competencies and qualifications to complete the proposed action. The lead applicant must also have stable and sufficient sources of funding to keep operating throughout the action period and to participate, where appropriate, in its funding. The assessments are made considering the action proposed, the applicable payment schedule of the contract and on the basis of the relevant supporting documents defined in the guidelines for applicants. These may include an external audit report of the lead applicant, the profit and loss account and the balance sheet for the last financial year for which the accounts have been closed. If the answer is negative to one or more of the criteria, the evaluation of the other subsections must still be carried out by the assessor.

The other subsections will be given a score between 1 and 5 (never 0) in accordance with the following guidelines: Each subsection will be given a score between 1 and 5 as follows:

1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

If the assessor has any doubts about the scoring of applicants, the issue should be raised to the chairperson of the evaluation committee for further advice and/or necessary clarification requests to the lead applicant.

## Specific issues to be examined during the assessment

<In this section identify all information concerning specific issues that the assessors should take into consideration in the context of this call for proposals.

In particular, you might want to give further details for the evaluation and scoring of specific sub-sections of the evaluation grid and/or highlight any other consideration like priorities and facts that the assessors should take into account.

The evaluators have additionally to check that the amounts proposed for simplified cost options and financial support to third parties are in line with the provisions of the call for proposals (including general conditions of the grant contract and specific requirements mentioned in the guidelines for applicants and in annex K)>

Contact person: <Insert reference info of the chairperson of the evaluation committee of this call>.