



Co-funded by
the European Union



Qudra 2 – Resilience for refugees, IDPs, returnees and host communities in response to the protracted Syrian and Iraqi crises

ANNEX H OF THE CALL FOR PROPOSALS GUIDELINES

PROPOSAL VERIFICATION AND EVALUATION GRID

Call for Proposals: JOR180011T/AP/001

PART A VERIFICATION

Grid completed by:

Date:

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Call for Proposals file number ¹ :	
Title of action:	
Name of lead applicant:	
Targeted governorate(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Amman <input type="checkbox"/> Irbid <input type="checkbox"/> Mafraq <input type="checkbox"/> Ma'an <input type="checkbox"/> Zarqa <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Camps (where applicable): <input type="checkbox"/> Zaatari camp

¹ The number allocated to the application by the contracting authority during 1st stage



Co-funded by
the European Union



	<input type="checkbox"/> Azraq camp
Duration of the action:	Months
Amount requested:	EUR

II. VERIFICATION

	Yes	No
1. Administrative verification		
1. The correct proposal application form was used		
2. The form is fully completed, and the applicant's declaration signed		
3. The proposal is typewritten and in the required language (English)		
4. One original application and 1 copy are attached		
5. The required annexes are attached.		
6. An electronic version (CD-ROM or USB stick) of the proposal is attached		
7. Each co-applicant (where relevant) has completed and signed the mandate, which is attached		
8. The budget is attached, balanced and presented in the required format and denominated in EUR		
9. The logical framework is completed and attached		
2. Verification of admissibility		
10. The duration of the action is between 9 and 12 months		
11. The costs presented in the action's budget are eligible costs		
12. The contribution requested is between the authorized minimum and maximum.		



Co-funded by
the European Union



Conclusion: The proposal <will/will not> be taken into account for the evaluation

Comments:

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



PART B EVALUATION

Grid completed by:

Date:

I. IDENTIFICATION DATA

Call for Proposals file number:	
Title of action:	
Name of lead applicant:	
Name(s) of co-applicant(s):	
Targeted governorate(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Amman <input type="checkbox"/> Irbid <input type="checkbox"/> Mafraq <input type="checkbox"/> Ma'an <input type="checkbox"/> Zarqa <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Camps (where applicable): <input type="checkbox"/> Zaatari camp <input type="checkbox"/> Azraq camp
Funding window	<input type="checkbox"/> Lot 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Lot 2
Amount requested:	EUR
Target number beneficiaries (male\female, refugee\host):	
Unit cost ² :	

² The unit cost is the total amount requested divided by the total number of targeted trainees



Co-funded by
the European Union



II. EVALUATION

Instructions

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

These scores must be added up to obtain the total score for the section in question. Total scores of sections must be added up to obtain the overall score for the proposal 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.

Financial and operational capacity	Max score	Score
1. Does the lead applicant have sufficient experience in managing projects?	5	
2. Does the lead applicant and, where applicable, the co-applicants, have sufficient technical expertise? (particularly, an understanding of the issues/points to be addressed)	5	
3. Do the lead applicant and, where applicable, the co-applicants, have adequate management capacity vis a vis the proposed targets? (particularly, regarding staff, facilities and the capacity to manage the action’s budget)	5	

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

5

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



4. Does the lead applicant have stable and sufficient sources of financing?	5	
Total score	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.





Co-funded by
the European Union



Relevance of the action and alignment with the guiding principles of the Call	Max score	Score
1. Does the proposal satisfactorily demonstrate that its training offer addresses local labour market skills needs and/or local employment opportunities?	5	
2. Does the action integrate clear, comprehensive and relevant/effective social inclusion and gender strategies aimed at enhancing access and inclusion of both vulnerable Jordanian youth, refugee youth, and women?	5	
3. Does the action integrate a clear and comprehensive outreach and awareness or sensitization approach to ensure and support access and participation of the target groups?	5	
4. Does the proposal include a meaningful collaboration with the private sector/the labour market? Is the private sector involved in a meaningful way in the design, set-up and/or implementation (i.e. training delivery and assessments) of the action/training programmes?	5	
5. Does the proposed action include a clear, comprehensive and well thought out approach to work-based learning?	5	
6. Do the proposed training programmes allow certification and licensing embedded in the national qualification framework, and/or where relevant, adhering to international or alternative standards? If not, does the proposal demonstrate a link to employment opportunities that compensates for the lack of accreditation?	5	
7. Does the proposed action adopt a comprehensive strategy to sustainably facilitate beneficiaries' transition into the labour market, for both wage-and self employment? Does the action include relevant transversal employability skills and training or employment support mechanisms based on well-integrated methods? Does the action have a clear and relevant strategy to ensure the employment of minimum 30% of trained beneficiaries?	5	
8. Bonus: Does the action integrate innovative components in its approach directed towards an accelerated and and sustainable integration of beneficiaries in the labour market? (e.g. innovation in training content/development of new skills, innovation in training modalities/delivery, integration of other cross-cutting skills such as technology or digital skills, green economy skills, etc.)	5	

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



Total score	40	
Comments		

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



Methodology & Effective management	Max score	Score
1. Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical and coherent with the expected outputs and objectives?	5	
2. Are the outputs and objectives realistic, measurable and ambitious enough?	5	
3. Are the main means proposed adequate?	5	
4. Are the roles and responsibilities of all implementing actors and stakeholders clear and defined? Is the level of involvement of partners satisfactory? Is an organisational structure proposed?	5	
5. Is an adequate internal monitoring system in place? Is evaluation provided for?	5	
6. Is the logical framework complete, containing objectively verifiable indicators to evaluate the results of the action?	5	
7. Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	
Total score	35	
Comments		

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action	Max score	Score
1. Are the activities adequately reflected in the budget?	5	
2. Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory (value for money)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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? 	10	
Total score	15	
Comments		

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



Risk analysis	Max score	Score
1. Relevant risks are analysed and adequate mitigation measures are proposed?	5	
2. The action demonstrates flexibility to respond to risks related to the COVID-19 pandemic?	5	
Total score	10	
Comments		

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



Sustainability of the action	Max score	Score
1. Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on the target groups?	5	
2. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable? - from a financial point of view (<i>how will the activities be funded at the end of the grant?</i>) - 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>) - from an environmental point of view (where applicable) (<i>will the action have a positive/negative impact on the environment?</i>)	5	
Total score	10	
Comments		

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by





Co-funded by
the European Union



Overall score and recommendation		Max score	Score
1. Financial and operational capacity		20	
2. Relevance of the action		40	
3. Methodology and effective management		35	
4. Budget and report on the cost-effectiveness of the action		15	
5. Risk analysis		10	
6. Sustainability of the action		10	
Overall Score		130	
Recommendation:		Not provisionally selected:	

ENABEL JOR 180011T/AP/001 Verification and Evaluation Grid – Proposal

Implemented by

