



Agence de Services
et de Paiement

Assessment Grid

Title of tender submission:

Assessor name:

Technical criteria	Rating (1 to 5) / Qualitative assessment			Observations / Reasoning
Criterion 1: Quality of the operational logic	Criterion rating: _____ / 5			Observations / Reasoning
	Sub-indicator assessment:			
	Weak	Average	Good	
Sub-indicator 1.1 Internal relevance and coherence of the tender				
Sub-indicator 1.2 External relevance and coherence of the tender				
Sub-indicator 1.3 Relevance and coherence of the scope of the initiative				
<i>Your general opinion</i>				

Criterion 2: Operational response (coherence of the executive summary) Sub-indicator 2.1 Coherence of the ASs in addressing the issues/operational objectives (strategic focus areas)	Criterion rating: / 5			Observations / Reasoning
	Sub-indicator assessment: Weak Average Good			
Sub-indicator 2.2 Coherence of the ASs between the expected effects and the types of actions identified in the ASs				
Sub-indicator 2.3 Coherence of the ASs between the financial framework and the types of action identified				
Sub-indicator 2.4 Relevance and quality of the types of action proposed				
<i>Your general opinion</i>				
Criterion 3: Strength of the partnership (technical and operational goals of the partnership)	Criterion rating: / 5			Observations / Reasoning
	Sub-indicator assessment: Weak Average Good			
Sub-indicator 3.1 Involvement of the partners in preparing the tender (design partnership)				
Sub-indicator 3.2 Quality and coherence of the composition and nature of the implementation partnership (programming committee)				
Sub-indicator 3.3 Relevance of the methods for implementing and sustaining the partnership				
<i>Your general opinion</i>				
Criterion 4: Group's capacity to sponsor (effectiveness)	Criterion rating: / 5			Observations / Reasoning
	Sub-indicator assessment: Weak Average Good			

Sub-indicator 4.1 Clear division of technical roles between each entity within the EFF group (who does what?)				
Sub-indicator 4.2 Sponsoring body's capacity to support				
Sub-indicator 4.3 Link between the programming committee and the group's other bodies				
Sub-indicator 4.4 Quality and relevance of the means (human, technical and financial) planned for implementing the strategy				
<i>Your general opinion</i>				
Criterion 5: Written quality of the tender submission	Criterion rating: / 5			Observations / Reasoning
	Sub-indicator assessment			
	Weak	Average	Good	
Sub-indicator 5.1 Writing quality				
Sub-indicator 5.2 Capacity to summarise				
Sub-indicator 5.3 Compliance with the layout set out in the tender specification				
<i>Your general opinion</i>				
Summary with your opinion of the tender submission's coherence and compliance with the overall objective of axis 4 of the EFF				Rating (A,B)
Opinion				

