**Annex H of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals**

PROPOSAL verification and evaluation grid

|  |
| --- |
| This grid is provided for information purposes, so that applicants may be aware of the criteria on the basis of which their application will be assessed. This document will be filled in by Enabel during the verification and evaluation of the applications. |

**Grid completed by: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Date: \_\_/\_\_/\_\_**

1. **IDENTIFICATION DATA**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reference number: |  |
| Title of action: |  |
| Navision no.: |  |
| Applicant (country): |  |
| Target region/regions or country/countries: |  |
| Amount requested  |  **EUR** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**Local currency**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Duration: | \_\_\_ months |

1. **VERIFICATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Administrative verification**
 | Yes | No |
| 1. The correct proposal form was used.
 |  |  |
| 1. The form is completed and signed.
 |  |  |
| 1. The form is typewritten and in the required language.
 |  |  |
| 1. The required annexes are attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. Each co-applicant (where relevant) has completed and signed the mandate, which is attached.
 |  |  |
| 1. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR.
 |  |  |
| 1. **Verification of admissibility**
 |  |  |
| 1. The applicant fulfils the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1.
 |  |  |
| 1. The legal status of the applicant corresponds to the requirements of the guidelines.
 |  |  |
| 1. The duration of the action shall end no later than 31/12/2022.
 |  |  |
| 1. The costs presented in the budget for the action are eligible costs.
 |  |  |
| **Conclusion: proposal <will/will not> be taken into account in the evaluation**Comments:  |

1. **EVALUATION**

**Scoring guidelines**

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **sub-sections**. For each sub-section, a score is given.

These scores must be added up to obtain the total score for the section in question. Total scores of sections must be carried forward to point 3 and added up to obtain the overall score for the application in question.

For each section, a box is provided for writing comments – which must concern the points covered in the section in question. Comments should be made for each **section**. If an evaluator gives a score of 1 (very inadequate), 2 (inadequate) or very good (5, 10 or 15, according to scale) for a sub-section, they must justify this in the “comments” box. These boxes may be enlarged as needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Organizational assessment Entrepreneurial dynamism, economic and commercial development potential | **Max****score** | **Score** |
| 1. Financial viability of the organization (stable and sufficient sources of funding)
 | 10 |  |
| 1. Number of members/suppliers
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Client portofolio
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Portfolio of services (social, financial...) for members, employees or the community
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Environmental impact (waste management, soil and water conservation, protection of biodiversity, protection of forests and other natural ecosystems, etc.)
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Presence of women among members/suppliers and decision-making bodies
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Capacity to manage a grant
 | 10 |  |
| 1. Ability to sustain investments over time (maintenance, license, etc.)
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (1)** | **50** |  |
| **Comments:**  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluation of the actionRelevance of the action | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. Adequacy of the proposed actions with the development strategy (business plan, marketing plan...) of the organization.
 | 15 |  |
| 1. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Is the action plan clear and feasible?
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Impact on the viability/sustainability of the organization
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Impact on improved management and/or market access
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Impact on the living conditions of producers
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects?(particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)
 | 5 |  |
| 1. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for?
 | 5 |  |
| **Total score (2)** | **50** |  |
| **Comments:** |
| If the application obtains a total score below “average” (12 points) for section (1) financial and operational capacity, it will be eliminated by the evaluation committee. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Overall score and recommendation | **Max score** | **Score** |
| 1. Evaluation of the organization: entrepreneurial dynamism, potential for economic and commercial development
 | 50 |  |
| 1. Evaluation of the action : Relevance of the action
 | 50 |  |
| **OVERALL SCORE** | **100** |  |
| Recommendation: | Not provisionally selected: |