

**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>	_____ <i>Months</i>
<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– 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 <sup>1</sup> How satisfactory is the <b>technical expertise</b> of the proposed RTA? (Knowledge of the issues to be addressed and experience in implementing the acquis/area of cooperation)	/2 x 5
1.2 <sup>2</sup> How satisfactory is the <b>management capacity</b> of the proposed Project Leader (including staff and its ability to handle the project budget)?	/5
1.3 How satisfactory is the <b>previous project management experience</b> of the <b>Resident Twinning Adviser</b> ?	/5
1.4 How satisfactory is the <b>previous project management experience</b> of the <b>Project Leader</b> ?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/25</b>

<sup>1</sup> When 1.1 and 1.3 of section A are not applicable (in case of a Twinning Light project), the 10 points for question 1.1 will be transferred to 1.2 and the 5 points for 1.3 will be transferred to 1.4.

<sup>2</sup> The same rule as in the above mentioned footnote will apply.

<b>Comments</b>	
<b>B. Pool of Short Term Experts</b>	<b>Score</b>
1.5 Availability of a sufficient number of Short Term experts	/5
1.6 How satisfactory is the <b>technical expertise</b> of the proposed Short Term Experts?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/10</b>

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

<b>C<sup>3</sup>. MS Junior Partner</b>	<b>Score</b>
1.7 Complementarity with the Lead MS Partner	/5
1.8 How satisfactory is the <b>technical expertise</b> of the proposed MS Junior Partner?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/10</b>

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

<b><u>2. Relevance</u></b>	<b>Score</b>
2.1 How relevant is the proposal to the <b>objectives of the Twinning Project Fiche?</b>	/5
2.2 Does the proposal cover all areas stated in the Twinning Project Fiche?	/5
2.3 How well does the MS administration correspond to the needs identified in the Twinning Project Fiche?	/5
2.4 Does the proposal take into account other EC initiatives – previous Twinning projects and how does it suggest avoiding duplication or creating synergies?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/20</b>

<sup>3</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>Comments</b>
-----------------

<b><u>3. Methodology</u></b>	<b>Score</b>
3.1 Is the overall <b>project design coherent</b> ?	/5
3.2 Is the proposed <b>methodology adequate</b> for the project?	/5
3.3 Are the <b>mandatory results expressed in measurable terms</b> ?	/5
3.4 Are there clear proposed activities which are consistent with the objective and the expected results?	/5
<b>Total Score</b>	<b>/20</b>

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

<b><u>4. Sustainability</u></b>	<b>Score</b>
4.1 Is the action likely to have a <b>tangible impact</b> on its target groups?	/5
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have <b>multiplier effects</b> ? (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 <b>sustainable</b> :  Which strategies are you foreseeing in order to safeguard the achievement of the mandatory results in the BA? (sustainability plan).	/5
<b>Total Score:</b>	<b>/15</b>

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

<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>	<b>/100</b>
--------------------	-------------

<b>1. Operational Capacity</b>	
<b>A. Resident Twinning Adviser and Project Leader</b>	<b>/25</b>
<b>B. Pool of Short Term Experts</b>	<b>/10</b>
<b>C. MS Junior Partner</b>	<b>/10</b>
<b>2. Relevance</b>	<b>/20</b>
<b>3. Methodology</b>	<b>/20</b>
<b>4. Sustainability</b>	<b>/15</b>

<b>5. Conclusion and Recommendations</b>
<p><b>STRONG POINTS:</b></p>   <p><b>WEAK POINTS:</b></p>   <p><b>Particular comments:</b></p>   

**ASSESSMENT CONCLUSION**

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

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

*Signatures:* .....  
.....

*Date:* .....