



This project is funded
by the European Union



Empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

Evaluation Sheet

To SARD LEADER Proposals for financial support

LAG name: Bugeac Kilim

1. Overall evaluation criteria (Weight in evaluation 30 %)

Criteria	Max. Score	Given Score
Is the submitted proposal clearly described and the objectives clearly stated?	20	20
Is the Action Plan designed to be successfully completed within one year?	20	20
Does the strategy documents meet basic crosscutting criteria (gender balance, sustainability and inclusiveness)?	20	20
Sum	60	60

2. Criteria to evaluation of LAGs' participatory Strategic Action Plan (Weight in evaluation 40%)

Criteria	Max. Score	Given Score
Is the local assessment and SWOT analyses included in the Strategic Action Plan relevant to the given LAG territory?	10	10
Does the submitted strategic documents meet LEADER/CLLD principles?	10	10
Is the Mission Statement and Vision of the LAG relevant to the local values and challenges?	10	10
Are the Objectives relevant to the Mission Statement and Vision of the LAG?	10	10



This project is funded by the European Union



Empowered lives. Resilient nations.

Are the selected strategic priorities clear and relevant to the strategic goals and to the collected local actions (measures) and project ideas?	10	10
Is the estimated budget relevant to the planned measures and projects?	10	10
Are implementation plans relevant to the values, needs, mission, vision and priorities of the LAG?	10	10
Are the strategy and the selected flagship projects innovative?	10	10
Sum	80	80

3. Criteria to the evaluation of the one-year LAG Implementation Plan submitted for SARD finance

(Weight in evaluation 30%):

Criteria	Max. Score	Given Score
<i>Relevance 1</i> – Does the plan focus on priorities in the LAG strategy documents?	12	12
<i>Relevance 2</i> – Are the proposed solutions efficient addressing the needs of local inhabitants including vulnerable groups?	12	12
<i>Results and Impact</i> – Does the plan facilitate direct, quick and broad impact at the local level, with clear and measurable results and replicability potential?	12	12
<i>Feasibility</i> - Are the selected measures feasible based on the given technical, financial, social, environmental characteristics and institutional readiness??	12	12
<i>Sustainability criterion</i> – Does potential beneficiaries’ ability relevant to maintain results after completion of donor support and community contribution?	12	12
Sum	60	60
Total	200	200

Date: 14 December 2017

Signature:

.....

Member of the Evaluation Committee