**FULL APPLICATION Evaluation Grid**

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

**I. IDENTIFICATION DATA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference number: |  |
| Budget line/EDF: |  |
| Applicant (country): |  |
| Title of the action: |  |
| Region(s) or country/ies targeted: |  |
| Requested EU contribution as an amount and as a percentage of the total eligible costs of the action *(indicative)* (only necessary where the grant takes the form of reimbursement of costs, totally or partially) | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | [Reimbursement of costs] | EUR <…> | <…>% | | [Financing not linked to costs] | EUR <…> | N/A | | [Total requested EU contribution] | EUR<…> | N/A | |
| 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 **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? Is the indicative list of activities linked to and consistent with the expected outputs? | / 5 |
| 3.2 **Logical Framework Matrix**: Is the logical framework provided in Annex C complete? Does each result (output, outcome, impact) include an adequate number of indicators that are sufficient in scope to measure its achievement? Is each indicator RACER (Relevant, Accepted, Credible, Easy to monitor, Robust)? Does each indicator have a baseline value (with year), target value (with year), and a credible source of data? If baselines and targets are not available, this is to be justified and a study (or other relevant tools) to be foreseen and budgeted in the proposal? In the case of use of FNLC, are the FNLC results and indicators clearly marked? | / 5 |
| 3.3 **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 |
| **Total score:** | **/15** |
| **Comments & justification:** | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Implementation approach** | **Section in the full application** | **Comments** | **Score** |
| 4.1 **Action plan**: Is the action plan for implementing the action clear and feasible? Are types of activities clearly clustered by output in the Activities Matrix? Is the timeline realistic? |  |  | / 5 |
| 4.2 **Monitoring, reporting and evaluation**: Does the proposal include an effective and efficient monitoring and reporting system? Is the system in place adequate to update the values of the indicators included in the Logical Framework Matrix - thus informing regularly on progress towards the achievement of impact, outcomes and outputs? Is there an evaluation planned and budgeted (previous, during or/and at the end of the implementation)? If relevant, is the role of third party assessor included? |  |  | / 5 |
| 4.3 **Project management (technical)**: Do the co-applicant(s) and (if applicable) their affiliated entities have the necessary technical skills to attain the objectives of the action? Are the co-applicant(s)’s and affiliated entity(ies)’s adequately involved in the implementation (e.g. advocacy, research, capacity building, outreach related activities)? |  |  | / 5 |
| **Total score:** |  |  | **/ 15** |
| **Comments & justification:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **5. Sustainability of the action** | **Section in the full application** | **Comments** | **Score** |
| 5.1 **Long-lasting benefits**: Is the action likely to ensure long lasting and transformative benefits to the target groups and the final beneficiaries? |  |  | / 5 |
| 5.2 **Multiplier effects**: Is the action likely to have multiplier effects, including scope for replication, extension, cross-fertilisation of experience and knowledge sharing? |  |  | / 5 |
| 5.3 **Sustainability** How likely the effects are to last after the intervention ends?  - Financial sustainability: which financial resources are available to fund the continuation of the services provided by the intervention? How long are they likely to be available and from which sources?)  - Institutional sustainability: which institutional arrangements allow for maintaining the benefits achieved? Is there any measure in place to ensure local ownership?  - Policy level sustainability (if applicable): is there any expected policy related effect from the action, e.g. improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods  - Environmental sustainability (if applicable): will the action have a negative/positive environmental impact?  - Risk analysis and mitigation measures: will the action be accompanied by a good risk analysis (including physical, environmental, political, economic and social risks) and relevant mitigation measures? |  |  | / 5 |
| **Total score:** |  |  | **/ 15** |
| **Comments & justification:** | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **6. Budget and efficiency of the action** | **Section in the full application** | **Comments** | **Score** |
| 6.1 **Budget**: Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget? In the case of entire of partly use of financing not linked to costs, are the results and performance indicators adequately reflected in the budget? |  |  | / 5 |
| 6.2 **Efficiency:** Is the relation between the estimated amounts as per budget and the expected results adequate? |  |  | / 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 efficiency of the action | | / 15 |
| **TOTAL:** | | **/ 100** |
| Recommendation: | Not provisionally selected: | |