**Annex 5 – Evaluation Grid**

 **for evaluating proposals to the Call for Proposals**

**“Establishing an Africa-Europe Research Partnership”**

**AEF – 2024**

1. STEP 1: OPENING & ADMINISTRATIVE CHECKS AND CONCEPT NOTE EVALUATION

During the opening and administrative check, the following will be assessed:

* If the deadline has been met. Otherwise, the application will be automatically rejected.

If the concept note satisfies all the criteria specified in the checklist in Annex 1 Section. III, Instructions for drafting the Concept Note form. This also includes an assessment of the eligibility of the project. If any of the requested information is missing or is incorrect, the application may be rejected on that **sole** basis and the application will not be evaluated further.

* The concept notes that pass this check will be evaluated on the relevance and design of the proposed research project.

The concept notes will receive an overall score out of 85 using the breakdown in the evaluation grid below.

The evaluation criteria are divided into headings and subheadings. Each subheading will be given a score between 1 and 5 as follows:

1 = very poor; 2 = poor; 3 = adequate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.

**Evaluation Grid**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Maximum score** |
| 1. **Relevance of the proposed research project**
 | **25** |
| * 1. How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals and to the specific themes/sectors/areas or any other specific requirement stated in the guidelines for applicants?

Are the expected results of the project aligned with the priorities defined in the guidelines for applicants (Part I, Section 4.5)? | \*\* 5 x 2 |
| * 1. How relevant is the proposal to the particular needs and constraints of the target country(ies), region(s) and/or relevant sectors (including synergy with other development initiatives and global policy and political dialogues and avoidance of duplication)? Would the project benefit from the experience and network already built up by the applicants, as part of a shared long-term partnership?
 | 5 |
| * 1. How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (target groups)? Have their needs and constraints been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?
 | 5 |
| * 1. Does the proposal contain particular added-value elements (e.g. innovation, best practices, strengthening Africa-Europe partnership)? [and the other additional elements (Part I, Section .4.9) of the guidelines for applicants]?
 | 5 |
| 1. **Design of the proposed research project**
 | **30** |
| * 1. How coherent is the overall design of the project? Does the proposal indicate the expected results to be achieved by the project? Does it take into account global political calendar identifying opportunities to amplify the outcomes of the research projects? Does the intervention logic explain the rationale to achieve the expected results?
 | \*\* 5x2 |
| * 1. Does the design reflect a robust analysis of the problems involved, and the capacities of the relevant stakeholders?
 | 5 |
| * 1. Does the design take into account external factors (risks and assumptions)?
 | 5 |
| **2.4** Are the activities feasible and consistent in relation to the expected results (including timeframe)? Are results (output, outcome, and impact) realistic? | 5 |
| * 1. To which extent does the proposal integrate relevant cross-cutting elements such as promotion of gender equality, good governance, support to youth, environmental sustainability…
 | 5 |
| 1. **Financial and operational capacity**
 | **20** |
| **3.1** Do the applicants (lead applicant and co-applicant) have sufficient in-house experience of project management?  | 5 |
| **3.2** Do the applicants (lead applicant and co-applicant) have sufficient technical in-house expertise (especially knowledge of the issues to be addressed?  | 5 |
| **3.3** Do the applicants (lead applicant and co-applicant) have sufficient management in-house capacity (including staff, equipment, and ability to handle the budget for the project)?  | 5 |
| **3.4** Does the lead applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance?  | 5 |
| 1. **Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action**
 | **10** |
| **4.1** Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget?  | 5 |
| **4.2** Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory? | 5 |
| **Maximum total score** | **85** |

\*\*: this score is multiplied by 2 because of its importance.

Note: A score of 5 (very good) will only be allocated if the proposal specifically addresses more than the required minimum number of priorities as indicated in Part I. Section 4.1&2 (objectives of the programme) of these guidelines.

If the score for Section 3 (Financial and operational capacity) is less than 10 points, the application will be rejected. If the score for at least one of the subsections under Section 3 is 1, the application will also be rejected.

Once all concept notes have been assessed, a list will be drawn up with the proposed actions ranked according to their total score.

Only the concept notes with a score of at least 40 will be considered for pre-selection.

Lead applicants of the partnership will receive by email a letter indicating the application reference number and the respective results.

The pre-selected “1+1 partnership” (lead applicant and co-applicant) will subsequently be directly contacted by the AEF.