


## Annex C7: Evaluation Grid Twinning Selections



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

### **PROJECT DATA**

<b>Publication number</b>	EuropeAid/167889/DD/ACT/UA
<b>Twinning fiche title and number</b>	“Approximation of national legislation of Ukraine in the fields of state supervision (control) of GMOs in open systems, protection of plant variety rights, and seed and seedling production in line with EU norms and standards”, UA 19 ENI HE 01 20
<b>Financing decision title and number</b>	ENI/2019/041-718 Technical Cooperation Facility 2019, Direct management
<b>Applicant (lead Member State)</b>	
<b>Applicant 2 (junior Member State, if applicable)</b>	
<b>Applicant 3 (junior Member State, if applicable)</b>	
<b>Duration</b>	21 Months
<b>Total Budget</b>	1,100,000 EUR
<b>Date selection Meeting</b>	

**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 registered semi-public or 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 ☐**



## **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.

<b><u>1. Operational capacity</u></b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>A. Resident Twinning Adviser and Project Leader</b>	
1.1 How satisfactory is the technical expertise of the proposed RTA? (Knowledge of the issues to be addressed and experience in implementing the <i>Union acquis</i> /area of cooperation)	/2 x 5
1.2 How satisfactory is the management capacity of the proposed project leader (including staff and its ability to handle the project budget)?	/5
1.3 How satisfactory is the previous project management experience of the Resident Twinning Adviser? Can 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?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/25</b>

### **Comments**

<b>B. Component Leaders and their availability</b>	<b>Score</b>
1.5 How satisfactory is the availability of Component Leaders from the Member States own resources	/5
1.6 How satisfactory is the technical expertise of the proposed Component Leaders	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/10</b>

**Comments**

<b>C<sup>1</sup>. MS Junior Partner</b>	<b>Score</b>
1.7 Complementarity with the Lead MS Partner	/5
1.8 How satisfactory is the technical expertise of the proposed MS Junior Partner?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/10</b>

**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.**

<b><u>2. Relevance</u></b>	<b>Score</b>
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 relevant are the ideas for communication and visibility. How relevant are the plans for initial and subsequent work-plan preparations?	/5
2.3 How well does the MS administration administrative model correspond to the needs identified in the Twinning Project Fiche?	/5
2.4 How does the proposal take into account other sector initiatives and / or – previous projects and hence avoids duplication and creates synergies?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/20</b>

**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.**

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

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

**Comments**

<b><u>4. Sustainability</u></b>	<b>Score</b>
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: Are ideas/strategies/requirements for sustaining results realistic?	/ 5
<b>Total Score:</b>	<b>/15</b>

**Comments**

**TOTAL SCORE** **/100**

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

## 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:* .....