

## **Appendix A. Evaluation Procedures – 2022 National Call for CSO Proposals under Component 3**

### **Steps and criteria**

Applications will be evaluated by the EUACI technical evaluation team according to the following steps and criteria:

#### **Step one: Eligibility evaluation and administrative check**

The following will be evaluated:

- The applicant is a legal entity registered in Ukraine, non-profit-making civil society organization;
- The submission deadline has been respected;
- The project proposal including the budget form is duly filled out;
- The proposal is relevant to the stated goal and specific objective including identified themes (fields) as mentioned in the Call for CSO Proposals under Component 3.

If the first assessment of the application reveals that any of the above points have not been fulfilled, any of the requested information is missing or incorrect, the application may be rejected solely on that basis and the application will not be evaluated further.

#### **Step two: Technical assessment of project proposal and budget**

The evaluation will be done by the assigned members of the Evaluation Committee, comprising a panel from all three EUACI Components' Teams.

The quality of the project proposals will be assessed in accordance with the evaluation criteria set out in the evaluation grid below.

### **Scoring**

The evaluation criteria are divided into sections and subsections.

Each subsection will be given a score between zero and five in accordance with the following

This programme is financed by the **European Union**  
and co-financed and implemented by  
**the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark**



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
OF DENMARK**

guidelines:

0 = required information not provided or irrelevant to the criteria;

1 = poorly meets the criteria;

2 = partially meets the criteria;

3 = adequately meets the criteria;

4 = satisfyingly meets the criteria;

5 = entirely meets the criteria.

Subsections 1.2, 2.2, 2.6, 2.8 and 4.2 scores will be multiplied by two because of sections' importance and value.

In order to be considered for the grant, applicants must meet the **minimum threshold**. The minimum threshold is 3 points for subsections 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.7, 2.8, 3.1, 3.2, 4.1 and 6 points for subsections 1.2, 2.2, 2.5, 2.6, 4.2 (multiplied by two subsections).

**Evaluation grid with included maximum scoring for each subsection as an example**

No	Evaluation criteria	Maximum scoring
<b>1</b>	<b>THE ORGANIZATION</b>	
1.1	Previous experience with the implementation of anti-corruption projects ( <i>Check against Section 1, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
1.2	Financial and operational capacity ( <i>Check against Section 1, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5x2=10
	<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>THE PROJECT</b>	
2.1	The project logically responds to the themes (fields) in the Call for CSO Proposals under Component 3, identifies and addresses a problem that is relevant and significant ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5

This programme is financed by the **European Union** and co-financed and implemented by **the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark**



MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
OF DENMARK



2.2	The stated project goal and objectives are clear, realistic and obtainable ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5x2=10
2.3	The project description demonstrates a good knowledge and understanding of the chosen anti-corruption theme ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
2.4	The target groups and beneficiaries that will be involved/reached by the project are significant in terms of numbers and the prospects of reducing the impact of the identified problem ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
2.5	The outputs intended delivered by the project are clear and measurable ( <i>Check against Section 4.1, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
2.6	The proposed activities are clearly described and linked to the outputs, action plan is feasible and timeline is realistic ( <i>Check against Section 4.2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5x2=10
2.7	The personnel involved has the capability to implement the proposed activities and deliver the expected results ( <i>Check against Section 3, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
2.8	The project results of proposed actions might be sustained after the project ends and are likely to have impact on its target groups and beneficiaries ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5x2=10
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>55</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>MONITORING &amp; COMMUNICATION PROVISIONS</b>	
3.1	Monitoring and evaluation arrangements appear adequate ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
3.2	Key risks and risk management steps are identified ( <i>Check against Section 2, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
3.3	Adequate steps are taken to ensure documentation and communication of results ( <i>Check against Section 2 and Section 5, Annex 2. Project Proposal</i> ).	5
<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>		<b>15</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>BUDGET (IN EUR)</b>	
4.1	Clear, justified, detailed and consistent with proposed project outputs and activities ( <i>Check against Annex 3. Project Budget</i> ).	5

This programme is financed by the **European Union**  
and co-financed and implemented by  
**the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark**



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
OF DENMARK**



4.2	The ratio between the estimated costs and expected results is satisfactory ( <i>Check against Annex 3. Project Budget</i> ).	5x2=10
	<b>SUB-TOTAL</b>	<b>15</b>
	<b>OVERALL TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

### **Provisional selection**

Following the evaluation of eligible full project proposals, a table listing the applications ranked according to their scores is established.

A list of provisionally selected applications is developed, taking into consideration the financial envelope available and the geographical reach and balance. Where applicable, consultation with relevant staffs or partners of the applicant will be made to solicit more information and guidance.

No applicant will receive more than one grant under the EUACI National Call for CSO Proposals under Component 3.

### **Approval and award**

The provisionally selected project proposals are reviewed by the EUACI Management Team based on which the approval will be granted.

Applicants are informed in writing of the EUACI's decision concerning their application.

The following documents will be signed as part of the grant agreement between the EUACI and grant recipients:

- Development Engagement Document, which is an agreement based on the standard EUACI grant agreement
- Project Proposal
- Project Budget

This programme is financed by the **European Union**  
and co-financed and implemented by  
**the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark**



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS  
OF DENMARK**