

**Annex F of the Guidelines for Calls for Proposals in one phase without concept note**

Green and Decent Jobs for Youth (WeWork) in the Busoga region - UGA22007

**PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID**

CALL FOR PROPOSAL UGA22007-10113

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

**I. IDENTIFICATION DATA**

Reference number:	
Title of action:	
Project no.:	
Applicant (country):	
Target region(s):	
Amount requested	EUR _____
Duration:	____ months

**II. VERIFICATION**

<b>1. Administrative verification</b>	Yes	No
1. The correct proposal form was used and completed.		
2. Applicant's declaration is filled and signed		
3. The form is typewritten and in the required language.		
4. The required annexes are attached.		
5. Each co-applicant has completed and signed the mandate, which is attached.		
6. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in Euro		

7. The logical framework is completed and attached.		
<b>2. Verification of admissibility</b>		
8. The applicant (and the co-applicants) fulfill (s) the admissibility criteria referred to in point 2.1.1. of the guidelines		
9. 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)		
10. The action will be implemented in the eligible district(s).		
11. The proposed action and activities are admissible under point 2.1.3 of the guidelines		
12. The duration of the action is between 18 and 24 months.		
13. The requested contribution is between the minimum (250,000 EUR) and the maximum (500,000 EUR) authorized.		
14. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs		
<p><b>Conclusion: proposal &lt;will/will not&gt; be taken into account in the evaluation</b></p> <p>Comments:</p>		

### 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.

<b>1. Financial and operational capacity</b>	<b>Max score</b>	<b>Score</b>
15. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient experience in managing projects?	5	
16. Do the applicant and, where applicable, its partners, have sufficient technical expertise? (particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed)	5	
17. 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	
18. Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing?	5	
<b>Total score (1)</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		

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	Max score	Score
<p>19. How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and expected results of the call for proposals?</p> <p><i>Does the action properly target the groups and final beneficiaries targeted by the Call for Proposals?</i></p> <p><i>Does the action adopt a holistic approach to skills development, including transversal employability skills, 40% WBL, and officially recognized assessment and certification?</i></p> <p><i>Does the proposed action adopt comprehensive and relevant post training employment support strategies/mechanisms to sustainably facilitate beneficiaries' transition into the labour market after graduation? Including detailed description of sub-grants methodology if applicable</i></p>	10	
<p>20. How relevant is the proposal to the particular needs and constraints of the target country and region? (including synergy with other Belgian cooperation initiatives and the avoidance of duplication)</p>	5	
<p>21. To what extent are the parties involved (final beneficiaries, target groups) clearly defined and strategically chosen? Have their needs been clearly defined and are they adequately addressed in the proposal? To what extent does the action include clear and balanced gender and vulnerability strategies aimed at enhancing access and inclusion of vulnerable youth, refugees, women?</p>	5	
<p>22. Does the proposed action include a clear, comprehensive and well thought out approach to work-based learning?</p> <p><i>Including a selection methodology for identifying and engaging with private sector actors</i></p>	5	
<p>23. Does the proposed action promote partnerships or meaningful engagement with the private sector in Skills Development?</p>	5	
<p>24. Does the proposal contain specific elements providing added value, such as environmental aspects, the promotion of equal opportunities and gender equality, the needs of the disabled, the rights of minorities and indigenous populations or innovation and best practices [as well as other additional elements mentioned in section 1.2 of the guidelines for applicants]?</p>	5	
<p><b>Total score (2)</b></p>	<b>35</b>	
<p><b>Comments:</b></p>		

<b>3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	<b>Score</b>
25. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and consistent with the expected objectives and results?	5	
26. Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	
27. Does the application contain objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action? Is an evaluation provided for?	5	
28. Is the level of involvement and participation in the action of the partners satisfactory?	5	
<b>Total score (3)</b>	<b>20</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		

<b>4. Sustainability of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	
29. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?	5	
30. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- from a financial point of view (<i>how will the activities be funded at the end of the grant?</i>)</li> <li>- from an institutional point of view (<i>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?</i>)</li> <li>- at the political level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action – for example, will it lead to better laws, codes of conduct, methods, etc.?</i>)</li> <li>- from an environmental point of view (where applicable) (<i>will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?</i>)</li> </ul>	5	
<b>Total score (4)</b>	<b>10</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		
<b>5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action</b>	<b>Max score</b>	
31. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	10	
32. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?	5	
<b>Total score (5)</b>	<b>15</b>	
<b>Comments:</b>		

Overall score and recommendation	Max score	Score
1. Financial and operational capacity	20	
2. Relevance of the action	35	
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	20	
4. Sustainability of the action	10	
5. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action	15	
<b>OVERALL SCORE</b>	<b>100</b>	
Only proposals that have achieved a score of 6/10 for criterion 19 and 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.