

Annex A3: Evaluation Grid

| Member of the Committee : [Name, Surname, Title] | | Date of score: dd/mm/yyyy | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|--|
| AID: | | Country: Lebanon | | | |
| Applicant: | | Proposal submission date: dd/mm/yyyy | | | |
| NGO Project Evaluation Parameter | Score (0/10) | Percentage | Weighted Score | Score justifications | |
| 1. COMPETENCE of the Applicant | 1.1. * Does the Body have a consolidated presence on site and an in-depth knowledge of the local situation? In any experiences of collaboration with the local Office program, has the Body demonstrated an adequate professional capacity? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 1.2. * Does the Body have experience in the intervention sector? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 1.3. Does the Body have a consolidated relationship with the partners and the community in the intervention area? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | Total COMPETENCE | 0 | 13,00% | 0,00 | |
| 2. RELEVANCE of the project proposal | 2.1.1. * To what extent are the strategy, sector(s), objectives, expected results, activities, places, and duration relevant to the Call for Proposals? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 2.1.2. * Is the project in line with the principles of aid effectiveness and GHD? | | 2,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 2.2.1. Is the project proposal consistent with sectoral strategies and policies at local and national level, including non-institutional ones in case of fragile countries? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 2.2.2. * The needs analysis is sufficiently complete and effective. Does it take into account the needs of the beneficiaries and is it adequately supported by context indicators (base line)? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| 2.RELEVANCE of the project proposal | 2.2.3. * Are the beneficiaries and stakeholders clearly identified and involved in the formulation phase? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 2.2.4. * Are the project and its objectives consistent with the local needs? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 2.2. Relevance level of the Project Proposal with respect to the priorities and pre-eminent needs in the Country and in the area of action. | | | | |
| | Total RELEVANCE | 0 | 21,00% | 0,00 | |
| 3. EFFECTIVENESS AND TECHNICAL VALIDITY (Feasibility) | 3.1. * Are the objectives, results, and activities clear and logical? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.2. * Are the indicators of impact, result, output and achievement adequately identified? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.3. * Is the logical framework matrix consistent and realistic? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.4. * Does the project proposal foresee an adequate involvement of local authorities, beneficiaries, and local communities? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.5. * Is the timing indicated in the chronogram realistic and is the work plan sufficiently detailed? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.6. * Is the risk analysis correct? Have the external conditions been adequately assessed (absence of "killing assumption")? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.7. * Does the implementing entity, including management and coordination, appear correct in relation to local conditions, including security? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.8. * Is the monitoring system clear and practical? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.9. * Did any problems emerge in previous phases / similar experiences have been taken into consideration? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 3.10. * Does the project proposal integrate with other initiatives in the area by avoiding duplication? Does the project proposal foresee complementarity and synergies with other local and international entities operating in the area? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| Total EFFECTIVENESS AND TECHNICAL VALIDITY | 0 | 34,00% | 0,00 | | |
| 4. SUSTAINABILITY AND EXIT STRATEGY | 4.1. Does the project appear financially, managerially, socially, and environmentally sustainable? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 4.2. * Are there defined and feasible exit strategies that facilitate the link between humanitarian aid and development? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| Total SUSTAINABILITY AND EXIT STRATEGY | 0 | 6,00% | 0,00 | | |
| 5. EFFICIENCY AND FINANCIAL VALIDITY | 5.1. * Are the resources clearly identified, proportionate, and suitable for achieving the expected results? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 5.2. * Is the cost estimate congruous with respect to the expected results and expected activities (unit costs, management and administrative costs)? | | 2,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 5.3. * Is the cost / benefit ratio compared to the purposes of the proposal reasonable? | | 2,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 5.4. * Are the management and administrative costs clear, contained, and proportionate, and do they respect the thresholds established in the Call for Proposals? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 5.5. Does co-financing exist? To what extent do these cofinances represent an added value for the project proposal? | | 5,00% | 0,00 | |
| Total EFFICIENCY AND FINANCIAL VALIDITY | 0 | 17,00% | 0,00 | | |
| 6. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES | 6.1. * Are gender issues adequately taken into account? | | 2,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 6.2. * Is the protection of vulnerable groups (minors and / or disabled) adequately taken into consideration? | | 2,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 6.3. * Is the protection of refugees, displaced persons, and minorities adequately taken into consideration? | | 3,00% | 0,00 | |
| | 6.4. Are environmental issues (biodiversity, mitigation, and adaptation to climate change, desertification, etc.) adequately taken into consideration? | | 2,00% | 0,00 | |
| Total CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES | 0 | 9,00% | 0,00 | | |
| Total score | 0 | 100,00% | 0,00 | | |

*Questions marked with an asterisk must receive a minimum score of 6.