Annex G of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals

PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID

CALL FOR PROPOSALS

Incubation and acceleration support for green business growth

UGA22003-10040

PART A – VERIFICATION

Grid completed by: Date:

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Call for Proposals file number[1]:	
Title of action:	
Name of lead applicant:	
Location of the action	(districts)
Duration of the action	(months)
Amount requested	EUR

II. VERIFICATION

	Yes	No
Administrative verification		
1. Instructions on the concept note have been followed. The correct application form was used and completed.		
2. Applicant's declaration has been completed and signed		
3. The mandated of the co-applicant is completed and signed		
4. The proposal is typewritten and in the required language.		
5. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the		

[1] The number allocated to the application by the contracting authority after the opening

required format and denominated in Euro		
6. The logical framework is completed and attached		
Verification of admissibility		
7. The applicant and co-applicants fulfil the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1.		
8. The applicant is not on an Enabel exclusion list (exclusion ground no. 6) or on a financial sanctions list, BE, EU or UN (exclusion ground no. 7)		
9. The legal status of the applicant and co-applicants meets the guidelines' requirements.		
10. The action will be implemented in the eligible region(s).		
11. The action and activities proposed are admissible under point 2.1.3 of the guidelines.		
12. The duration of the action is between - 15 to 24 months (lot 1) - 15 to 36 months (lot 2)		
13. The contribution requested is between the authorised minimum and maximum amount and has not been modified by more than 20% from the amount requested at the concept note stage.		
Conclusion: proposal <will/will not> be taken into account in the evaluation Comments :		

PART B – EVALUATION

III. EVALUATION

Scoring guidelines

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **sub-sections**. For each sub-section, a score between 1 and 5 is given, in accordance with the assessment scale below:

Score	Assessment
1	Very inadequate
2	Inadequate
3	Average
4	Good
5	Very good

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 6 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 5 (very good) for a sub-section, they must justify this in the "comments" box. These boxes may be enlarged as needed.

1. Financial and operational capacity	Max score	Score
14. Do the applicant and its partner(s) have sufficient experience in managing projects?	5	
15. Do the applicant and its partner(s) have sufficient technical expertise? (particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed)	5	
16. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have adequate management capacity? (particularly, regarding staff, facilities and the capacity to manage the action's budget)	5	
17. Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing?	5	
Total score (1)	**20**	
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.

2. Relevance of the action (considering both submissions relating to relevance from concept note and potential additions/elaborations in proposals)	Max score	Score
18. To what extent is the proposal relevant to the expected objectives and outputs, sectors, themes and priorities of the Call for Proposals?	5*2	
19. To what extent does the proposed action have potential to foster green business growth, develop/scale sustainable and market-driven solutions, develop/scale innovations, and to promote decent job creation?	5	
20. To what extent is the proposal relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the country, target region and/or sectors?	5	
21. To what extent have the parties involved (final beneficiaries, target groups) been clearly defined and strategically selected? Have their	5	

needs been clearly defined and properly addressed in the proposal?		
22. To what extent does the concept note promote innovations, good practices and elements of added value?	5	
Total score (2)	**30**	
Comments:		

3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	**Max score**	**Score**
23. Are the activities proposed logical, clear, appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results?	5	
24. Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	
25. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an adequate internal monitoring system in place? Is an evaluation provided for?	5	
26. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the partners satisfactory?	5	
Total score (3)	**20**	
Comments:		

4. Sustainability of the action	Max score	Score
27. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?	5	
28. Is the application likely to have multiplier effects? (particularly, the likelihood of replication and extension of action results, and the distribution of information)	5	
29. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable? - from a financial point of view (*how will the activities be funded at the end of the grant?*) - from an institutional point of view *(are there structures that will allow the activities to be continued at the end of the action ? Will there be local "ownership" of action results?)* - from an environmental point of view (where applicable) *(will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?)*	5	
Total score (4)	**15**	
Comments:		

5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action	Max score	Score
30. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	5 (x 2)**	
31. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory? Are the proposed costs acceptable and necessary? What is the ratio between operational and management costs? Are the expected results realistic? How many people are positively impacted by the proposed project? And is this impact sufficiently high?	5	
Total score (5)	**15**	
Comments:		

** score multiplied by 2 due to its importance.

Overall score and recommendation	Max score	Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	20	
2. Relevance of the action	30	
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	20	
4. Sustainability of the action	15	
5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action	15	
OVERALL SCORE	**100**	
Only proposals that have achieved an overall score of 60/100 will be pre-selected.		
Recommendation:	Not provisionally selected:	

	YES/NO
Supporting documents relating to the grounds for exclusion provided	

Proposals for which the requested documents have not been provided are not included in the list of successful proposals.