

**ANNEX C7  
(for IPA)**

**SELECTION FACT SHEET**



*This Evaluation Grid covers both the written proposal and the presentation*

**PROJECT DATA**

|  |              |
|--|--------------|
| <b>Twinning Number</b>                             |              |
| <b>Project Title</b>                               |              |
| <b>Administration of BC</b>                        |              |
| <b>Applicant (lead country)</b>                    |              |
| <b>Applicant 2 (junior partner, if applicable)</b> |              |
| <b>Duration</b>                                    | _____ Months |
| <b>Total Budget</b>                                |              |
| <b>Number RTAs</b>                                 |              |
| <b>Date selection Meeting</b>                      |              |

**FORMAL CRITERIA** (to be checked before the selection meetings)

|   |  |
|---|--|
| The institutions proposed by the MS are public administrations or/and accepted mandated bodies? |  |
| The proposal contains the CVs of PL and RTA?  |  |
| Do the PL and RTA fulfil the minimum requirements?  |  |
| Are the Full details of a contact person for lead MS provided?                                  |  |

**Does the MS proposal fulfil the formal criteria? YES  NOT**

---

## **EVALUATION GRID for TWINNING – SELECTION AND AWARD CRITERIA**

**Selection criteria** consider the **operational capacity of the key experts** mentioned in the proposal; the assessment is expressed on a **Yes/No** basis and a single negative evaluation of one criterion disqualifies the proposal.

**Award criteria** consider the **merit of the main qualifying aspects** of the proposal and are evaluated applying a **scoring system** based on the following **scoring table**:

| Score | Meaning   |
|-------|-----------|
| 1     | very poor |
| 2     | poor      |
| 3     | adequate  |
| 4     | good      |
| 5     | very good |

### **1. Operational capacity**

| <u>(A single negative assessment of one of the following criteria disqualifies the proposal)</u>   | Yes/No |
|--|--------|
| 1.1 Does the proposed <b>Project Leader</b> have sufficient <b>management capacity</b> (including staff and ability to handle the project budget)? |        |
| 1.2 Does the proposed <b>Project Leader</b> have sufficient previous <b>project management experience</b> ?  |        |
| 1.3 Is the level of <b>staff of the MS Administration and/or mandated body</b> sufficient to ensure the proper implementation of this Project?     |        |
| 1.4 In case of a consortium, does the proposed <b>Junior MS Project Leader</b> have sufficient management capacity?                                |        |

**Comments**

## 2. Qualifying Aspects of the Proposal

| <b><u>2.1 Technical Expertise</u></b>   | <b>Score<br/>1 to 5</b> |
|---|-------------------------|
| 2.1.1 Technical expertise of the proposed RTA (Knowledge of the issues to be addressed and experience in implementing the acquis/area of cooperation) | /5                      |
| 2.1.2 Previous project management experience of the Resident Twinning Adviser   | /5                      |
| 2.1.3 Technical expertise of the proposed MS Junior Partner   | /5                      |
| 2.1.4 Technical expertise of the proposed Key Short Term Experts  | /5                      |

|                 |
|-----------------|
| <b>Comments</b> |
|-----------------|

| <b><u>2.2 Relevance</u></b>   | <b>Score<br/>1 to 5</b> |
|---|-------------------------|
| 2.2.1 Relevance of the proposal when compared to the objectives of the Twinning Project Fiche   | /5                      |
| 2.2.2 Aptitude of the proposal to cover all areas stated in the Twinning Project Fiche  | /5                      |
| 2.2.3 Adequateness of the MS administration(s) to satisfy the needs identified in the Twinning Project Fiche  | /5                      |
| 2.2.4 Consideration given by the proposals to other assistance provided in the same area (for example previous Twinning projects) and suggestions on how to avoid duplication or on how to create synergies | /5                      |

|                 |
|-----------------|
| <b>Comments</b> |
|-----------------|

| <b><u>2.3 Methodology</u></b>  | <b>Score<br/>1 to 5</b> |
|--|-------------------------|
| 2.3.1 Overall coherence of the project design  | /5                      |
| 2.3.2 Adequateness of the proposed methodology with regard to the specific project   | /5                      |
| 2.3.3 Formulation of the mandatory results in measurable terms   | /5                      |
| 2.3.4 Clearness of the formulation of proposed activities and adherence of the latter to the objectives and the expected results | /5                      |

|                 |
|-----------------|
| <b>Comments</b> |
|-----------------|

| <b><u>2.4 Sustainability</u></b>  | <b>Score<br/>1 to 5</b> |
|---|-------------------------|
| 2.4.1 Possibility that the action produces a tangible impact on its target groups   | /5                      |
| 2.4.2 Possibility that the proposal produces a multiplier effects (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information)   | /5                      |
| 2.4.3 Indications contained in the proposal about the sustainability of the action (strategies foreseen in order to safeguard the achievement of the mandatory results in the beneficiary administration, i.e. a sustainability plan) | /5                      |

|                 |
|-----------------|
| <b>Comments</b> |
|-----------------|

The theoretical maximal score is 75. If the proposal comes from a single MS, the qualifying aspect referred to under 2.1.3 (*Technical expertise of the proposed MS Junior Partner*) is irrelevant and is not scored. In such case, in order to ensure comparability with other proposals, the sum of all scores attributed to the 14 other aspects must be divided by 70 and multiplied by 75.

|                    |            |
|--------------------|------------|
| <b>TOTAL SCORE</b> | <b>/75</b> |
|--------------------|------------|

## CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**STRONG POINTS:**

**WEAK POINTS:**

**Particular comments:**

## ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION

### CONCLUSION

*Please write your conclusion using one of the following options: Selected/Not Selected*

*CONCLUSION: .....*

|                   |                   |                   |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <i>Name</i>       | <i>Name</i>       | <i>Name</i>       |
| <i>Signature:</i> | <i>Signature:</i> | <i>Signature:</i> |

*Date: .....*