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The Principle of gender equality is incorporated into the “Guidelines for the Work of Evaluation Commission” for CSOs’ project proposals review as one of the basic principles. In this regard, the terms used in this methodology for persons in masculine gender (e.g. "citizen", "mayor", "officer", "representative", etc.) are neutral and apply to both men and women.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 Basic terms

The Guidelines for the work of the Evaluation Commission for the CSOs project proposals were designed as a simple manual with basic instructions and rules for the process of selecting the best project proposals that have been submitted by CSOs/NGOs to the public call from municipalities. In that sense, it is necessary to define the basic terms which define this process.

* **Project or Project proposal**

The project proposal is a document or a set of documents that define the field of work, the beneficiaries, results, activities and costs required to reach the desired results. The basic project documents are: the project proposal form, logical framework, budget and the annual work plan. It is also customary to enclose documents that prove the financial and regulatory background of the organization as well as other relevant information. The number of documents and/or forms requested varies from donor to donor, while the basic required project documents are common to all grant donors.

* **Evaluation of projects**

By definition, the evaluation of projects is a process in which project proposals are evaluated in an objective and impartial manner and in accordance with the predefined criteria and scoring system. Compliance with the criteria for the evaluation of the project proposal is determined through sub-criteria, usually in the form of questions. Each question or sub-criteria carries a certain number of points whose sum ultimately represent the overall evaluation of each criterion, and the sum of all points received for each criterion is the final result of the evaluation (evaluation table is given as Annex 1). Often when evaluating projects, the threshold of “acceptability” is defined as a minimum score that needs to be achieved and only the projects with a score above the threshold are eligible for funding. The ranking of such projects is done on the basis of obtained scores while the funds are distributed in accordance with the place on the ranking list

* **Evaluation commission**

The evaluation commission represents the body responsible for the evaluation of projects. The commission has an odd number of members, usually five persons. Members of the commission are persons with relevant expertise, necessary knowledge and skills in project cycle management.

The evaluation process is described in the following chapters.

# 2. EVALUATION PROCESS

## 2.1 Statement of impartiality and confidentiality

All members of the Evaluation commission have to sign a ***written statement of impartiality and confidentiality***. This act obliges them to full confidentiality of information contained in project proposals and impartiality in the process of projects evaluation. Signing the statement ensures integrity of all information within the process of evaluation, until the results are published and made available to the general public. This protects the interests of applicants as well as of all other participants in the process.

## 2.2 Evaluation commission

**Representatives of all interested parties**, to the allowed limitations of members, should be included in the composition of the Evaluation commission. This is important in order to ensure objectivity and transparency within the evaluation process. When funding projects of the CSOs, it is necessary that one member of the commission is selected from the civil society sector. Representatives of the civil society should be well known and esteemed activists from the local community, able to conduct an impartial evaluation.

The Evaluation commission comprises of a minimum of two municipal representatives and one representative of the civil society sector. It is important to nominate one more representative of the civil society sector that will act as an alternate member in cases of absence of the regular CSO member or in the cases where the regular CSO member has abstained for reasons of conflict of interest. All members of the Evaluation commission have equal rights and obligations.

The municipal representatives are nominated by the Mayor and/or the relevant department within the Municipality through an internal act signed by the authorized officer. This internal act represents an integral part of the mandatory evaluation documentation.

Selection of the CSO representative is made in a transparent manner and in consultation with all CSOs. The representative of the civil society sector is nominated in a democratic manner, through a consensus and agreement of the majority of organizations from the Municipality. The municipality supports the democratic process of CSOs representatives’ election.  
This includes a public invitation to all civil society organizations to nominate their representatives and to organize, on a pre-determined date, the election of a representative and one alternate representative by public or secret vote. The municipality fully supports this process, keeps all relevant documentation, and provides adequate space for the meeting (municipal hall or similar) if necessary.

## 2.3 The first step in the evaluation process

The first step in the evaluation process, which precedes the detail study of submitted project proposals, is the examination of whether technical criteria set in the Guidelines for applicants are met by all applicants. The commission checks weather the mandatory documentation is provided in the application, including the necessary number of copies, existence of electronic copy, etc. In a case where the project proposal does not meet technical criteria, it is eliminated from further evaluation and declared disqualified. All such project proposals are separately recorded and minutes are made describing shortcomings. Upon completion of evaluating technical criteria, the process of the actual evaluation can commence. This is explained in the next chapter 2.4.

## 2.4 Ranking and selection of project proposals

Evaluating project proposals is done in line with the criteria shared with all potential applicants as part of the Guidelines for applicants. In order to expedite the evaluation process, all members of the commission are issued with **the evaluation form**, (Annex 1) which consists of criteria and sub-criteria laid down in a form of a table. After this, the process of examining/reading project proposals is to begin.

The municipality and CSO representatives are issued with one copy of each project proposal. The order of reading the project proposals corresponds to the order of opening project applications, performed during the technical evaluation.

In this phase of the process, project proposals are evaluated through two groups of criteria: **selection criteria** (Section 1 and 2 in the evaluation table) and **funds allocation criteria**.

The goal of the selection criteria is to help in the assessment of financial and operational capability of the applicants in order to ensure that they:

* have stable and sufficient funds for their own work during the entire project implementation period;
* possess professional capability and the qualifications necessary for the successful implementation of the project. This also applies to the applicant's partners.

Funds allocation criteria ensure that the quality of submitted projects is evaluated based on the defined priority areas, and that funds are approved on the basis of activities which maximize the general impact of the public call for project proposals. The criteria refers to the significance of the proposed project, harmonization of the project with the goal of the public call and the priority areas, project quality, expected results, project sustainability and cost-effectiveness of requested funds.

***The final goal of the evaluation is the selection of projects that are the most significant for the local community and that, through defined public call priorities, address distinct needs of the local population and local community as a whole.***

## 2.5 Scoring system

Scoring criteria is divided into sections and subsections. ***Each subsection is assigned scores between 1 and 5 in the following way: 1 = very bad; 2 = bad; 3 = appropriate; 4 = good; 5 = very good.*** Each member of the commission scores a project proposal individually in line with the criteria (the form for individual evaluation is enclosed as Annex 1) while the summary evaluation table (enclosed as Annex 2) contains an average value of all single criteria and sub-criteria scores ***(note: mean values are rounded - decimal values from X.1 to X.4 are rounded down, and values from X.5 to X. 9 are rounded up).*** Each member of the commission completes and signs an individual evaluation table, and all members sign the summary evaluation table for each project proposal. Ranking the project proposals is carried out in a manner so that the first ranked project proposal is the one with the highest score, followed by the project proposal with the next lowest score up until the project proposal with the lowest scores obtained.

Only projects with a score of 50 or more points will be taken into further consideration, as the proposals below this threshold have not met the set standards and the efficiency of their implementation might be questionable.

In order to be taken into consideration for funding, projects with budgets over 20,000 BAM have to receive 75 or more points during evaluation process. The decision on grant approval is based on the total number of projects that can be financed by the available funds. These limits are set in order to define the minimum quality of project proposals and ensure the best value for money. Projects with the highest scores will have priority in grants disbursement.

**Note on Section 1. Financial and operational capacity of the applicant**

In the case that the total score in Section 1 is lower than 10 points, the project will be excluded from further evaluation process, as the organization does not have the minimum capacities for quality implementation of the proposed project.

**Note on Section 2. Relevance**

In the case that the total score in Section 2 is lower than 18 points, the project will be excluded from further consideration as such evaluation implies that, although the applicant meets financial and operational capacities, the project idea is not relevant or in line with the defined priorities of the public call, and the project does not address the needs of the local community.

**NOTE: THE SCORE CAN NOT BE LOWER THAN ONE (1) UNDER ANY OF THE CRITERIA!**

## 2.6 Closing the evaluation process

After completing the scoring and ranking of the project proposals, it is also necessary to complete the minutes of the Evaluation commission work (the template of Evaluation commission minutes is enclosed as Annex 3). The minutes must contain all information relevant to the evaluation process:

1. Members of the commission (names).
2. Time and place of the evaluation session.
3. Total number of submitted project proposals.
4. List of CSOs with 50 or more points.
5. List of CSOS’ project proposals recommended for financing without modifications of the proposal. This list is incorporated in the form of a table made of following columns:
   1. Ordinal number.
   2. Name of the CSO.
   3. Name of the proposed project.
   4. Total value of the budget.
   5. Project duration in months.
   6. Total score.
6. The list of projects that can be the subject of further consideration pending minor budget or project proposals modifications (in case where the commission agrees that some of the proposed project proposals are of good quality and have reached sufficient score to be placed in this category). This overview is also made in the form of the table and it contains identical columns as the table described above.
7. Evaluation session conclusion time.
8. Signatures of all Commission members.

A special part of the minutes is a recommendation/s for the financing of the highest ranked project proposals. The minutes are signed by all members of the commission, and represent an official conclusion of the commission’s work. All applicants are informed in writing on the results i.e. information on their rank and status of their project proposal. Such letters are signed by the official representative of the donor. The final list of approved projects is published on the municipal website. This ranking list does not contain information on scores, ranks and results given by individual members of the commission, in order to protect their integrity.

# **ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION OF THE EVALUATION TABLE**

*The template of the evaluation table is enclosed as Annex 1 of these guidelines. The following text offers an explanation for each question contained in the table.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Se Section** |
| **1. Financial and operational capacities** |
| * 1. 1.1 Are the applicant and partners **experienced enough in project management**? * *Previous experience of the applicant is assessed, including number of implemented projects, their value, etc. For example, if the average value of previously implemented projects is 10,000 KM and project proposal is 30,000 KM, the applicant can receive 1 or 2 points and vice-versa (points are higher if the value and complexity of previous successfully implemented projects is higher).* |
| * 1. 1.2 Do applicant and partners have sufficient **professional capacities**? (specific knowledge in the relevant field) * *Is the number of professionally engaged personnel included in documentation? Are CVs enclosed? What types of projects has applicant implemented? Is documentation proving the expertise of the applicant in the desired field enclosed? For example, if the project is addressing social inclusion, higher value of points is assigned if a social worker, psychologist, etc. is engaged. In case there are no relevant professionals employed in the organization, the value of points is lower, but not lower than 1.* |
| 1.3 Do applicant and partners have sufficient **management capacities**? (Including staff, equipment and capacities for financial management)?   * *What is the number of permanent staff in the organization and what type of contract do they have? Is there a steering board, advisory board, etc.? E.g. if an organization has only one employee, points given are closer to the lowest, and if there is a clear organizational and management structure with higher number of employees, external associates etc. the grade is higher or equals maximum.* |
| **2. Relevance** |
| 2.1. How relevant is the project compared to **the goal** and one or more **priorities** defined in the Public call?   * *Does the project clearly define activities that will contribute to the achievement of the goal relevant for the chosen priorities of the call? E.g. if priorities of the pubic call are poverty reduction, youth and support to the people with disabilities, the project that addresses employment of young people with disabilities, and solves their existential problems will be awarded with higher points then the project which only addresses youth employment, etc. Bearing in mind that this criteria is eliminatory, the project needs to address at least one of the defined priorities.* |
| 2.2 Are stakeholders clearly defined and strategically selected? ( (agents, final beneficiaries, **target groups**)?   * *Are final beneficiaries and target groups relevant for the targeted priority? E.g. population of xx municipality is not a target group, but “20 young people with disability from the rural part of xx municipality” is a clearly defined group.* |
| 2.3 Are the **needs of the target group** and final beneficiaries clearly defined and does the project address them in the right way?   * *Does the project describe activities which will address needs of final beneficiaries and target groups? E.g. in case the need described in the project is defined as inability to access public institutions, the activities should include construction of an access ramp, awareness rising, etc. Activities described in such a way should bring maximum value of points and vice-versa.* |
| 2.4 Does the project incorporate **added value**, like innovative approach and good practice models?   * *Has identical or similar project been already implemented in the area? Is the project based on successful implementation of some other project? E.g. to use the previous example again, more points will be awarded to the project which is a continuation of activities or a project that has already achieved results or in case it uses expertise applied in another local community.* |
| 2.5 Does the project proposal advocate for **rights based approach** and does it have a positive influence on vulnerable groups?   * *Does the project promote gender equality, environmental protection? Does it promote international or cultural cooperation, minority rights, youth problems, etc? E.g. projects that involve equal number of men and women, regardless of the project idea deserve additional points under this criterion and vice versa.* |
| **3. Methodology** |
| 3.1 Does the **plan of activities** and proposed **activities** logically and practically corresponds with goals and expected results?   * *Are expected results clearly defined? Is there a logical link between activities and expected results (what activities contribute to the achievement of which result)? Is there a link between activities, results and main goal of the project?* ***This is primarily determined by an analysis of the log frame. For an adequate assessment of this criteria commission member needs to possess project cycle management skills.*** |
| 3.2 How consistent is the overall project design?   * *Does it reflect problem analysis, risks and context factors? Is evaluation incorporated in the project design? E.g. project proposal should analyze all external and internal factors that could influence project implementation, such as legal requirements and framework, willingness of the local community to take part in activities, etc. Projects which have these elements score more points.* |
| 3.3 Is the level of **involvement of partners** satisfactory? **Note: if there are no partners the score will be 1.**   * *Does the partner selection process clearly define their future involvement in project implementation? Has the expertise of partners been clearly defined and is it clear how this expertise will contribute to the project implementation? E.g. if the project is addressing social inclusion, association of disabled people or a Social protection institute are adequate partners and the project will score more points compared to the project of another organization that does not have such expertise. If the role of the partner organization is not clearly defined and if there is no need for or importance of partnership, the score will be one.* |
| 3.4 Are **objectively measurable indicators** included in the project??   * *In what way will the results be measured? Indicators need to be simple, measurable, achievable, relevant and time specific.* ***This is primarily determined through logical framework. For an adequate estimate of these criteria, the evaluator needs to have necessary project cycle management skills. E.g. exact number of participants at trainings, numbers of access ramps, etc.*** |
| **4. Sustainability** |
| 4.  4. 4.1 Will the activities proposed by the project have **concrete influence** on target groups?   * *Do project activities and results have long term, positive and concrete influence on defined target group? E.g. the project includes river basin cleaning, but is not addressing the source of pollution, thus it is not sustainable and is given lower points. If the project includes awareness rising of local population, etc. it is evaluated as sustainable and is awarded with higher or maximum points.* |
| 4.2 Will the project have **multiple effects**?   * *Is it possible to apply the same project on other target groups or can it be implemented in other locations? Is it possible to prolong the effects of activities or exchange information on experiences gained during implementation? E.g. the project that proposes involvement of other target groups or different locations in next phases and presents eventual modalities of implementation it could earn higher points.* |
| 4.3 Are the expected results of suggested activities **institutionally sustainable**?   * *Will the structures enabling project activities exist after the project is finished? Will there be a local ownership over project results? E.g. project is proposing establishment of the daycare center for children with special needs. In the case where the Social protection institute will continue to support and manage the Center, the project is deemed institutionally sustainable and is awarded maximum number of points.* |
| 4.4Are the expected results of proposed activities **sustainable?**   * *Will there be improvement in legal framework, methods and rules of behavior, etc.? e.g. if the gender based violence project incorporates preparation and adoption of a protocol on prevention of gender based violence which will serve as a basic system of cooperation among relevant institutions, such project could earn a maximum number of points.* |
| 4.5 Is it likely that the expected long term results will have an influence on local economic conditions and/or quality of life in target areas?   * *Do project activities improve economic conditions or influence quality of life of chosen beneficiaries and how safely can this be concluded from project proposal? E.g. if the project is addressing poverty reduction through establishment of greenhouse production it improves economic conditions and quality of life of its beneficiaries because it brings income, and it could earn higher number of points.* |
| **5. Budget and cost efficiency** |
| 5.  5.1 Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory?   * *Do planned costs enable best value for planned resources? E.g. the project is planning to offer IT education for women from certain area and there are 50 beneficiaries in total, and the plan is to purchase 50 laptops. This kind of planning is not efficient because costs are too high for expected results. The simplest method of estimation is to divide the total budget with the number of direct beneficiaries and compare with planned results. In this example cost per beneficiary is 10.000 KM and the result is a basic IT course. It is clear that ratio between estimated costs and an expected result is not satisfactory and as such cannot be awarded with higher number of points.* |
| 5 5.2 Are suggested costs **necessary** for project implementation?  *If we use the previous example, and the budget includes TV sets or a meat processing machines, it is evident that such costs are not necessary for project implementation and can bring minimum points under this criteria.* |
| 5.3 Budget?  - is the budget clear and does it incorporate narrative part as well?  *E.g. explain the purchase of technical equipment in the narrative part etc.*  *Narrative part of the budget needs to track the budget, providing explanations for all budget items.*  - are administrative and personnel costs under 20 %?  - g -are CVs and job descriptions enclosed? |
| **Maximum total score** |

**NOTE: UNDER ANY OF THE CRITERIA THE TOTAL SCORE CAN NOT BE LOWER THAN ONE!**

# **ANNEX 1**

**Municipality XXXXX**

**Name of the Civil Society Organization:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Name of project:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Evaluation table**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Maximum score** | **Average score** |
| **1. Financial and operational capacity** | **15** |  |
| 1.1 Are applicant and partners sufficiently **experienced in project management**? | 5 |  |
| 1.2 Do applicant and partners have sufficient **professional capacities**? (specific knowledge in the relevant field) | 5 |  |
| 1.3. Do applicant and partners have sufficient **management capacities**?  (including staff, equipment and capacities for financial management)? | 5 |  |
| **2. Relevance** | **25** |  |
| 2.1. How relevant is the project compared to the **goal** and one or more **priorities** defined in the Public call?  Note: score 5 (very good) can be assigned only if the project is addressing at **least one of the priorities.** | 5 |  |
| 2.2 Are stakeholders clearly defined and strategically selected (agents, final beneficiaries, **target groups**)? | 5 |  |
| 2.3 Are the **needs of the target group** and final beneficiaries clearly defined and does the project address them in the right way? | 5 |  |
| 2.4 Does the project incorporate **added value**, like innovative approach and good practice models? | 5 |  |
| 2.5 Does the project proposal advocate for **rights based approach** and does it have a positive influence on vulnerable groups? (Promotion of gender equality and women’s empowerment, protection of environment, international cooperation, youth, etc.). | 5 |  |
|  | | |
| **3. Methodology** | **20** |  |
| 3.1 Does the **plan of activities** and proposed **activities** logically and practically corresponds with goals and expected results? | 5 |  |
| 3.2 How consistent is the overall project design? (especially, does it reflects analysis of identified problems, possible external factors) | 5 |  |
| 3.3 Is the level of **involvement of partners in project implementation** satisfactory? Note: if there are no partners the score will be **1.** | 5 |  |
| 3.4 Are **objectively measurable indicators** included in the project? | 5 |  |
|  | | |
| **4. Sustainability** | **25** |  |
| 4.1 Will proposed activities have **concrete influence** on target groups? | 5 |  |
| 4.2 Will the project have **multiple effects**? *(including possibility for application on the other target groups or implementation at the different location and/or extending the effects of the activities as well as exchange of information on the experience gained through the implementation of the project)* | 5 |  |
| 4.3 Are expected results of suggested activities **institutionally sustainable**? *(will the structures that enable project activities exist after the completion of the project? Will there be a local ownership over the project results?)* | 5 |  |
| 4.4Are expected **results sustainable**? (if applicable, name the *structural impact of implemented activities – improvements of legal frameworks, methods, code of conduct, etc.)* | 5 |  |
| 4.5 Is it likely that expected long term results/outcomes will influence local economic conditions and/or quality of life in target areas? | 5 |  |
|  | | |
| **5. Budget and cost efficiency** | **15** |  |
| 5.1 Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory? | 5 |  |
| 5.2 Are suggested costs **necessary** for project implementation? | 5 |  |
| 5.3 Budget  - is the budget clear and does it include narrative part? (including explanations for technical equipment)  - meets the principle that administrative and personnel costs cannot be above 20% of the total budget?  - is the budget gender-sensitive?  - have CVs and job descriptions been enclosed where applicable? | 5 |  |
| **Maximum total score** | **100** |  |

Name and surname\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Signature:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# **ANNEX 2**

***Obrazac štampati dvostrano!***

**Municipality XXXXX**

**Name of the Civil Society Organization:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Name of the Project:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Summary Evaluation Table**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Maximum score** | **Average score** |
| **1. Financial and operational capacity** | **15** |  |
| 1.1 Are applicant and partners sufficiently **experienced in project management**? | 5 |  |
| 1.2 Do applicant and partners have sufficient **professional capacities**? (specific knowledge in the relevant field) | 5 |  |
| 1.3. Do applicant and partners have sufficient **management capacities**?  (including staff, equipment and capacities for financial management)? | 5 |  |
| **2. Relevance** | **25** |  |
| 2.1. How relevant is the project compared to the **goal** and one or more **priorities** defined in the Public call?  Note: score 5 (very good) can be assigned only if the project is addressing at **least one of the priorities.** | 5 |  |
| 2.2 Are stakeholders clearly defined and strategically selected (agents, final beneficiaries, **target groups**)? | 5 |  |
| 2.3 Are the **needs of the target group** and final beneficiaries clearly defined and does the project address them in the right way? | 5 |  |
| 2.4 Does the project incorporate **added value**, like innovative approach and good practice models? | 5 |  |
| 2.5 Does the project proposal advocate for **rights based approach** and does it have a positive influence on vulnerable groups? (Promotion of gender equality and women’s empowerment, protection of environment, international cooperation, youth, etc.). | 5 |  |
|  | | |
| **3. Methodology** | **20** |  |
| 3.1 Does the **plan of activities** and proposed **activities** logically and practically corresponds with goals and expected results? | 5 |  |
| 3.2 How consistent is the overall project design? (especially, does it reflects analysis of identified problems, possible external factors) | 5 |  |
| 3.3 Is the level of **involvement of partners in project implementation** satisfactory? Note: if there are no partners the score will be **1.** | 5 |  |
| 3.4 Are **objectively measurable indicators** included in the project? | 5 |  |
|  | | |
| **4. Sustainability** | **25** |  |
| 4.1 Will proposed activities have **concrete influence** on target groups? | 5 |  |
| 4.2 Will the project have **multiple effects**? *(including possibility for application on the other target groups or implementation at the different location and/or extending the effects of the activities as well as exchange of information on the experience gained through the implementation of the project)* | 5 |  |
| 4.3 Are expected results of suggested activities **institutionally sustainable**? *(will the structures that enable project activities exist after the completion of the project? Will there be a local ownership over the project results?)* | 5 |  |
| 4.4Are expected **results sustainable**? (if applicable, name the *structural impact of implemented activities – improvements of legal frameworks, methods, code of conduct, etc.)* | 5 |  |
| 4.5 Is it likely that expected long term results/outcomes will influence local economic conditions and/or quality of life in target areas? | 5 |  |
|  | | |
| **5. Budget and cost efficiency** | **15** |  |
| 5.1 Is the ratio between estimated costs and expected results satisfactory? | 5 |  |
| 5.2 Are suggested costs **necessary** for project implementation? | 5 |  |
| 5.3 Budget  - is the budget clear and does it include narrative part? (including explanations for technical equipment)  - meets the principle that administrative and personnel costs cannot be above 20% of the total budget?  - is the budget gender-sensitive?  - have CVs and job descriptions been enclosed where applicable? | 5 |  |
| **Maximum total score** | **100** |  |

COMMISSION MEMBERS:

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE MUNICIPALITY \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

REPRESETNATIVE OF CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS (CSO)

1. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

In \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_,date\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/20\_\_

# **ANNEX 3**

***MINUTES***

**From the Evaluation commission session for CSOs project proposals assessment related to the Public call for submission of project proposals**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

The Evaluation commission consisting of representative of the Municipality \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_; and representative of civil society from the same municipality; on \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/ 20\_, at \_\_\_:\_\_\_ , concludes as follows:

Total number of project proposals: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

On the basis of the assessment of project proposals and the tanking list, members of the Evaluation commission propose the following projects for financing:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Name of the organization | Name of the project | Total budget | Total Score |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

The project proposals marked with an asterisk will undergo minor changes.

The summary evaluation table is an integral part of the Minutes.

The session was closed on: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_\_/ 20\_\_ at \_\_\_:\_\_\_\_.

Members of the Evaluation commission:

1. **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**, representative of the Municipality \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

2. **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**, representative of the Municipality \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

3. **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**, representative of civil society sector \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_