

## Evaluation Grid for EEP Mekong Second Calls for Proposals

NOTE: Assess each item on a scale from 0 to 5 0 = "Poor" <-----> 5 = "Best"		Weight % (Sum must be 100%)	Remarks
<b>1) Project / business idea or concept and logic</b>		<b>25%</b>	
1.1	The benefits to be produced by the project are clearly identified, and the technology / methodology / mechanism for producing the benefits is clear, appropriate and likely to be successful.	5%	
1.2	The main beneficiaries are clearly identified, there is a clear and direct mechanism through which the beneficiaries will receive the benefits, and this is likely to work successfully.	5%	
1.3	The project has a clear understandable and relevant purpose which leads or contributes to the project's overall objective.	3%	
1.4	The project has clearly defined outputs which are necessary and sufficient to achieve the project's purpose.	3%	
1.5	The project has a clearly defined and understandable set of main activities which are feasible and necessary and sufficient to produce all the project outputs.	3%	
1.6	The likely social, environmental, economic and other risks have been identified and appropriate mitigation measures have been proposed.	3%	
1.7	The project Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) approach / system proposed shows a good understanding of M&E and is likely to be effective in building understanding and learning about the project, and identifying potential problems in a timely manner.	3%	
<b>2) Impact, sustainability, replicability and spread</b>		<b>20%</b>	
2.1	The project is coherent with the national development plan on energy and environment. It provides access to, and supply of, reliable, affordable and clean energy. It contributes to the improvement of water, sanitation, education, health, agriculture/ forestry, rural development, etc.	4%	
2.2	The project has a sustainable impact on local / national income generation. <i>(Social sustainability)</i>	3%	
2.3	The project contributes to the improvement of the living conditions of the rural poor, ethnic minorities, women, children, and other marginalised groups. <i>(Social sustainability)</i>	3%	
2.4	The project has a positive impact on the environment, such as reducing deforestation, pollution and depletion of resources, or helping to mitigate climate change by contributing to the reduction of GHG emissions. <i>(Environmental sustainability)</i>	3%	
2.5	The project has a strong potential for scaling up through e.g.: proving technology feasibility, providing a model for replication, improving funding mechanisms and opportunities, etc. <i>(Economic sustainability)</i>	3%	
2.6	The project will put in place the measures required to achieve the sustainability of operations: e.g. established local enterprises continue, external funding for the next stage secured, etc. <i>(Economic sustainability)</i>	4%	
<b>3) Innovation, learning and dissemination</b>		<b>10%</b>	
3.1	<b>Innovation:</b> The Project will help to develop some new and innovative technology and includes technology / know-how transfer. AND / OR: The Project will help to develop some new and innovative approaches, linkages, financial / credit instruments, etc, and this is likely to support the development of policy and spread of new RE technologies.	5%	
3.2	There is a well defined plan to capture, document and disseminate the knowledge to be generated by the project. The plan should identify the knowledge expected, its usefulness and the target groups concerned.	5%	
<b>4) Budget, cost-effectiveness and financing</b>		<b>20%</b>	
4.1	The budget appears to be sufficient for and justified by the proposed activities and expected outputs.	5%	
4.2	The main resources needed have been clearly identified and the project costs are properly estimated.	5%	
4.3	The financing contributions from the lead partner, other partners and other confirmed sources of financing are appropriate.	5%	
4.4	All the necessary sources of financing have been confirmed.	5%	

<b>5) Management / Resources / Partnership</b>		<b>25%</b>	
5.1	The applicant and partners have sufficient technical expertise (full score if all the required expertise is available among the partners).	5%	
5.2	The applicant and partners have sufficient management experience and capacity (full score for sufficient experience within the region/country/location and for the technical area/sector and type of project).	4%	
5.3	There are clear operational and management arrangements between the lead applicant and partners, and the divisions of responsibilities for implementation of activities and financing are clear and appropriate.	3%	
5.4	The project includes a market sector partner.	3%	
5.5	The proposed project enhances co-operation between local project developers and partners from donor countries.	10%	
<b>EVALUATOR'S OVERALL RECOMMENDATION AND COMMENT</b>			
<b>A</b>	Recommended as possible for EEP Funding (Yes / No) If no, what are the main reasons?		
<b>B</b>	If recommended for funding, what Items should be addressed and elaborated in the Full Project Proposal Document?  If NOT recommended for funding, what are the main improvements needed for re-submission of this Concept Proposal in the next call?		

**EVALUATOR'S DETAILS**

**Evaluator's name:**

**Organisation:**

**Date:**

**Place:**