ANNEX C7: Evaluation Grid Twinning Selections

This Evaluation Grid covers both the written proposal and the presentation

PROJECT DATA

Publication number	
Twinning fiche title and number	
Financing decision title and number	
Applicant (lead Member State)	
Applicant 2 (junior Member State, *if applicable)*	
Applicant 3 (junior Member State, *if applicable)*[1]	
Duration	_____*Months*
Total Budget	
Date selection Meeting	

Selection committee is to note that the FULL SELECTION SHEET will be shared with NCP through which the proposal was submitted.

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

The institutions proposed by the MS are public administrations or/and have registered as mandated bodies?	
The proposal contains the CVs of PL, RTA and the CVs of the Component Leaders?	
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 ☐

[1] If applicable, in case of even larger consortiums, insert additional rows for assessment of more junior member states.

EVALUATION GRID– SUBSTANTIAL CRITERIA

Scoring guidelines

This evaluation grid is divided into **sections** and **subsections**. Each subsection must be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following guidelines:

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

These scores are added to give the total score for the section concerned. The totals for each section are then listed in section 4 and added together to give the total score for the proposal.

1. Operational capacity **A. Resident Twinning Adviser and Project Leader**	**Score**
1.1 How adequate is the expertise of the proposed RTA to the task foreseen (Knowledge of the issues to be addressed and experience in implementing the *Union acquis*/reform area of cooperation)?	/2 x 5
1.2 How satisfactory is the management experience and capacity of the EU proposed project leader and the administration to which the PL belong (including staff and its ability to handle the project budget)?	/5
1.3 How satisfactory is the previous project coordination and management experience of the Resident Twinning Adviser? Could any potential lack of experience (although meeting minimum) be compensated by other members of the team?	/5
1.4 How satisfactory is the previous project management experience of the project leader and the administration to which the PL belong?	/5
Total Score	/25

Comments

B. Component Leaders and their availability	Score
1.5 How adequate for the tasks (specific expertise) are the proposed Component Leaders from the Member States and do they all come from "own staff"?	/5
1.6 How satisfactory is the technical experience of the proposed Component Leaders?	/5
Total Score	/10

Comments

C[2]. MS Junior Partner	Score
1.7 How good is the complementarity with the Lead MS Partner?	/5
1.8 How adequate is the expertise of the proposed MS Junior Partner for the tasks foreseen to be covered by them?	/5
Total Score	/10

Comments

If a total score lower than "adequate" (27 points) is obtained for section 1, the proposal will be eliminated by the Evaluation Committee.
The evaluation grid must nevertheless be completed.

2. Relevance	Score
2.1 How relevant are the concepts and ideas behind the strategy and methodology presented to the needs of the Beneficiary administration and how does it link with the Twinning Project Fiche?	/5
2.2 How adequate are the plans for initial and subsequent work-plan preparations including the plans/ideas for communication and visibility actions?	/5
2.3 How well does the MS administration **administrative model** correspond to the needs identified in the Twinning Project Fiche?	/5

[2] When section C is not applicable (when there is no Junior Partner), the 5 points of 1.7 will be transferred to 1.5 and the 5 points from 1.8 will be transferred to 1.6.

2.4 How does the proposal take into account other sector initiatives and / or – previous projects avoiding duplication and creating synergies?	/5
Total Score	/20

Comments

If a total score lower than "good" (16 points) is obtained for section 2, the proposal will be eliminated by the Evaluation Committee. The evaluation grid must nevertheless be completed.

3. Methodology	**Score**
3.1 Is the overall concept behind the ideas and the proposal coherent?	/5
3.2 Is the proposed methodology adequate for the needs as expressed in the project Fiche?	/5
3.3 Are the results (in terms of concrete mandatory results/outputs and impact on specific and overall objectives) possible to measure?	/5
3.4 Do the Member State(s) foresee to cover all Components areas stated in the Twinning Project Fiche? Are there examples of key activities proposed which are consistent with the mandatory results/outputs and the objectives?	/5
Total Score	/20

Comments

4. Sustainability	**Score**
4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	/ 5
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects? (including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	/ 5

4. 3. Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable and are ideas/strategies/ for sustaining results realistic?	/ 5
Total Score:	/15

Comments

TOTAL SCORE **/100**

1. Operational Capacity A. Resident Twinning Adviser and Project leader B. Component Leaders C. MS Junior Partner	 **/25** **/10** **/10**
2. Relevance	**/20**
3. Methodology	**/20**
4. Sustainability	**/15**

5. Conclusion and Recommendations
STRONG POINTS: **WEAK POINTS:** **Particular comments:**

ASSESSMENT & CONCLUSION

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

CONCLUSION: **.....**
.....

Signatures: **.....**

.....

Date:**.....…**