**CONCEPT NOTE EVALUATION GRID**

**Call for proposals: <TITLE>**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Grid completed by** |  |
| **Number of the proposal** |  |
| **Name of the lead applicant** |  |
| **Title of the action** |  |

**Scoring guidelines**

This 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 added together to give the total score for the concept note.

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

|  | **Section in the concept note** | **Comments & Justification** | **Scores** |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Relevance of the action** |  |  | Sub-score | **20** |
| 1.1 **Consistency with the objectives of the call**: How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the call for proposals and to the specific themes/sectors/areas or any other specific requirement stated in the guidelines for applicants? Are the expected results of the action aligned with the priorities defined in the guidelines for applicants (section 1.2)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 1.2 **Relevance to the country/region/sector needs**: How relevant is the proposal to the particular needs and constraints of the target country(ies), region(s) and/or relevant sectors (including synergy with other development initiatives and avoidance of duplication)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 1.3 **Target groups and final beneficiaries**: How clearly defined and strategically chosen are the target groups and final beneficiaries? Have their needs (as rights holders and/or duty bearers) and constraints been clearly defined? Does the proposal address them appropriately? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 1.4 **Added value elements**: Does the proposal contain particular added-value elements (e.g. innovation, best practices)? [and the other additional elements indicated under 1.2. of the guidelines for applicants] |  |  | 5 |  |
| **Sub-score ‘1. Relevance of the action’** | | | |  |
| **2. Design of the action** |  |  | Sub-score | **30** |
| 2.1 **Intervention logic**. Does the proposal indicate the expected results (outputs/outcomes/impacts) to be achieved by the action? Does the design of the proposed action identify explicitly the necessary sequence to achieve the desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes and impacts? |  |  | 5x2\*\* |  |
| 2.2 **Context analysis**. Does the design of the action include a robust analysis of the needs to be addressed, including the capacities of the relevant stakeholders? Are those also embedded adequately in the intervention logic? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2.3 **Risks and assumptions**. Is the design based on clear assumptions (the necessary and positive conditions that allow for a successful cause-and-effect relationship between different levels of results)? Does it take into account also risks (the factors that might hinder the achievement of results)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2.4 **Indicative Activities**. Is the indicative list of activities linked to and consistent with the expected outputs? |  |  | 5 |  |
| 2.5 **Cross-cutting issues**: To which extent does the proposal integrate relevant cross-cutting elements such as environmental/climate change issues, promotion of gender equality and equal opportunities, needs of disabled people, rights of minorities and rights of indigenous peoples, youth, combating HIV/AIDS (if there is a strong prevalence in the target country/region)? |  |  | 5 |  |
| **Sub-score ‘2. Design of the action’** | | | |  |
|  | |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL SCORE** |  |  |  | **50** |

[\* Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal specifically addresses more than the required minimum number of priorities as indicated in section 1.2 (Objectives of the programme) of these guidelines.]

\*\* This score is multiplied by 2 because of its importance

Only the concept notes which have been given a score of a minimum of 30 points will be considered for pre-selection.

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