### 1. DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Description/requirements under criteria</th>
<th>Max value of criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Project Concept</strong></td>
<td>The project proposal shall describe the main concept/idea of the project that will be addressed by the project by clearly identifying the problem issue and its topicality, describing its relevance to the support area, outcome(s) and output(s) selected, capacity building of the applicant organisation and strengthening of the NGO sector. If relevant, there shall be a brief note included on the originality of project idea and innovations to be brought to applicant organisation/sector. The concept shall entail the narrative description of the objective, tasks to be carried and intended results explaining how the project will contribute to the achievement of chosen programme outcome(s) and output(s), capacity development of the applicant’s organisation that will lead to increased capacity and improved performance contributing to NGO sector development. The description shall also entail a narrative brief on project’s contribution or adherence to horizontal concerns, including hate speech, hate crimes and extremism, racism and xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism, tolerance and multicultural understanding, Roma, sexual harassment, violence against women and domestic violence, and trafficking in persons. Concept description shall equally encompass the main components/building blocks of the proposed project by grouping the activities. Actions of the project should be directed towards citizen’s participation in decision-making processes, including legislative/policy initiatives; multicultural dialogue and awareness-raising; capacity building of NGOs, including strengthened advocacy, watchdog and monitoring role, fundraising and sustainability; development of NGO services for vulnerable groups; empowerment of vulnerable groups; coalition building and networking; sustainable development; strengthened bilateral relations between Lithuania and the Donor States (see Guidelines for more). If the project will be implemented in partnership/-s there shall be reasoning for opting the partnership approach, clear role distribution among partners including responsibilities (Note that inclusion of partners in order to avoid public procurement procedures is strictly prohibited and will be not tolerated). Comment: Project activities may cover activities as described in Guidelines for Applicants; partnerships will be counted in the higher rate of scoring for bilateral projects only.</td>
<td>50 points maximum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Project Implementation Plan | The implementation plan shall be detailed and structured describing in succession the stages of project implementation including the listing of activities of each implementation stage and the explanation of their relation to Project objectives and tasks. This description shall have a reference to the role/s of the applicant/partner in each stage of project implementation. The expected results to be achieved at the end of every stage shall be particularly emphasized. The proposed project plan shall identify the duration of the project including the calendar schedule of its’ planned implementation based on the stages of project. The potential risks that might threaten the implementation of the project shall be identified as per their severity level proposing adequate risks mitigation/management solutions. The composition of project implementation team and their responsibilities shall be described. | 20 points maximum |

Project Impact and Sustainability of the Results Achieved | The project proposal shall include the description of the expected project impact and sustainability of the results to be achieved by describing the expected changes in the outcome area (changes in people’s lives), the applicant organisation (changes in financial flows, mobilised human and financial resources, organisational structure, internal/external processes of the organisation, increased capacities, improved performance), the NGO sector (changes in behaviours, norms), as a result of this project. The description shall also quantify and/or qualify the project results to be achieved. The description shall entail a short note on sustainability of the results achieved (going beyond the project financing) and may describe potential/planned replicability/continuity of the project (horizontal, vertical, functional) upon its success. Plan for Project publicity, communication and dissemination of results is provided. | 20 points maximum |

The Adequacy of Financial Proposal vs. Results Planned | The estimated project costs shall be planned realistically, based on average market prices and clearly linked to implementation of the planned activities. The cost-benefit ratio shall be appropriate. | 10 points maximum |

2. SCORING GRID FOR THE INDEPENDENT EXPERTS

1) The Evaluation of the Project Concept (max 50 points)

Satisfactory (11 - 20 points): in the proposed concept description the applicant aims at solving problem that is only slightly relevant or not relevant to:
   a) selected support area, outcome(s) and output(s);
   b) applicant’s organisation’s mandate areas, working practises and capacities associated with organisation’s role and functions;
   c) NGO sector development;
   d) horizontal concerns (hate speech, hate crimes and extremism, racism and xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism, tolerance and multicultural understanding, Roma, sexual harassment, violence against women and domestic violence, and trafficking in persons).
The described objective, tasks and intended results are not interrelated; there is no clear link/is not described at all between expected results and their contribution to support area, outcome(s) and output(s)/applicant’s organization/NGO sector/or target actions (citizen’s participation in decision-making processes, including legislative/policy initiatives; multicultural dialogue and awareness-raising; capacity building of NGOs, including strengthened advocacy, watchdog and monitoring role, fundraising and sustainability; development of NGO services for vulnerable groups; empowerment of vulnerable groups; coalition building and networking; sustainable development); results are not realistic; project’s contribution/adherence to the identified horizontal issues is not described or not adequate and relevant; the project idea is not original and innovations are not foreseen/described; the proposed project components are not at all presented or are presented in unclear manner and/or lack important linkages; proposed project components are not relevant to meeting project’s objective, the need for partnership approach is not described (if applicable), partner engagement is formal or is very limited, their roles and responsibilities are not clearly defined.

Average (21 - 30 points): in the proposed concept description the applicant aims at solving problem that is only partially relevant to:

a) selected support area, outcome(s) and output(s);

b) applicant’s organisation’s mandate areas, working practices and capacities associated with organisation’s role and functions;

c) NGO sector development;

d) horizontal concerns (hate speech, hate crimes and extremism, racism and xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism, tolerance and multicultural understanding, Roma, sexual harassment, violence against women and domestic violence, and trafficking in persons).

The described objective, tasks and intended results are only partially interrelated; there can be identified only a weak link between expected results and their contribution to support area, outcome(s) and output(s)/applicant’s organization/NGO sector/or target actions (citizen’s participation in decision-making processes, including legislative/policy initiatives; multicultural dialogue and awareness-raising; capacity building of NGOs, including strengthened advocacy, watchdog and monitoring role, fundraising and sustainability; development of NGO services for vulnerable groups; empowerment of vulnerable groups; coalition building and networking; sustainable development); results are only partially realistic; project’s contribution/adherence to the identified horizontal concerns issues is not very relevant or minor; the project idea is not original or only partially original, there’s no added value; the proposed project components are only partially relevant to meeting project’s objective, the need for partnership approach is described but not necessarily relevant/needed for achieving expected results or proposed partnership is rather limited having the complexity of the project (if applicable), partner engagement is only partial and more formal, their roles and responsibilities are insufficiently defined.

Good (31 - 40 points): in the proposed concept description the applicant aims at solving problem that is relevant to:

a) selected support area, outcome(s) and output(s);

b) applicant’s organisation’s mandate areas, working practices and capacities associated with organisation’s role and functions;
c) NGO sector development;
d) horizontal concerns (hate speech, hate crimes and extremism, racism and xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism, tolerance and multicultural understanding, Roma, sexual harassment, violence against women and domestic violence, and trafficking in persons).

The described objective, tasks and intended results are interrelated; there is a clear link between expected results and their contribution to support area, outcome(s) and output(s)/applicant’s organization/NGO sector/or target actions (citizen’s participation in decision-making processes, including legislative/policy initiatives; multicultural dialogue and awareness-raising; capacity building of NGOs, including strengthened advocacy, watchdog and monitoring role, fundraising and sustainability; development of NGO services for vulnerable groups; empowerment of vulnerable groups; coalition building and networking; sustainable development); results are realistic within the proposed project scope; project’s contribution/adherence to the identified horizontal concerns is relevant, built-in project’s logics adequately, addresses multiple issues; the project idea built upon successive earlier project experiences (national or foreign) and/or has original elements, added value is likely; proposed project components can be linked to project’s objective, the partnership is relevant and reasoned (if applicable), partners roles and responsibilities are clearly defined, the project involves cooperation with bilateral partners of the EEA financial mechanism donor states.

Excellent (41 - 50 points): in the proposed concept description the applicant aims are very clear and focus on solving problem that is very relevant to and might significantly contribute towards the achievement in:

a) selected support area, outcome(s) and output(s);
b) applicant’s organisation’s mandate areas, working practices and capacities associated with organisation’s role and functions;
c) NGO sector development;
d) horizontal concerns (hate speech, hate crimes and extremism, racism and xenophobia, homophobia, anti-Semitism, tolerance and multicultural understanding, Roma, sexual harassment, violence against women and domestic violence, and trafficking in persons).

Project proposes high quality target actions (citizen’s participation in decision-making processes, including legislative/policy initiatives; multicultural dialogue and awareness-raising; capacity building of NGOs, including strengthened advocacy, watchdog and monitoring role, fundraising and sustainability; development of NGO services for vulnerable groups; empowerment of vulnerable groups; coalition building and networking; sustainable development). The described objective, tasks and intended results are clearly interrelated and are relevant for achieving the set objective; the link between expected results and their contribution to programme area, outcome, outputs/applicant’s organisation/NGO sector is notably showed; results are realistic within the scope of the project; project’s contribution/adherence to the identified horizontal concerns is maximised; the project idea is original and the project proposes novelistic ways towards problem solving through actualizing certain approaches to be employed or project idea is built upon successive earlier project experiences (national or foreign) and addresses the obvious need, added value is plausible; the project components are relevant to meeting project’s objective and their description is exhaustive, the
partnership is proved as necessary for meeting project objective because of specific roles and responsibilities assigned to partners as per their comparative advantages/expertise, partnership is likely to produce synergies, the project involves cooperation with bilateral partners of the EEA financial mechanism donor states.

2) The Evaluation of the Project Implementation Plan (max 20 points)

Satisfactory (4 - 8 points): The implementation plan is not detailed and has no clear structure, the proposed implementation stages are not successive and/or sufficient or are overlapping, there is no clear relation with Project objective and tasks; the applicant does not describe or not sufficiently describes the applicant’s or partner’s (if relevant) role in implementing each stage of the project. The expected results to be achieved at the end of every stage are not indicated or are not the ones that should be expected, the duration of the project is not relevant having in mind proposed scope/intensity of activities, potential risks and their management strategies are not identified and if identified the management strategies are not responsive to the severity of risks. The proposed composition of project team is not adequate for quality and timely managing of the proposed project/their responsibilities are not clearly defined.

Average (9 - 12 points): The implementation plan is only partially detailed and structured, the proposed implementation stages are not sufficient for achieving the objective in timely manner, the project stages are not exhaustive and lacks several important links between them, only partially linked to the achievement of Project objective; the applicant only partially describes the applicant’s or partner’s (if relevant) role in implementing each stage of the project. The expected results to be achieved at the end of every stage are only partially described, the proposed project plan is only partially relevant having in mind proposed scope/intensity of activities, potential risks and their management strategies are not enough described. The proposed composition of project team is only partially adequate for quality and timely managing of the proposed project/their responsibilities are not complete.

Good (13 - 16 points): The implementation plan is detailed and structured, including clear description of successive implementation stages having logical ties, the implementation of the stages is clearly linked to the achievement of the Project objective. The applicant’s/partner’s role in each stage of project implementation is defined and described. The expected results to be achieved at the end of every stage are described. The proposed project plan including calendar schedule is adequate and in line with project’s scope. The risks management plan is described and is realistic given that risks monitoring will be ensured. The project implementation team is formed and their responsibilities identified are relevant for the tasks to be accomplished.

Excellent (17 - 20 points): The implementation plan is detailed, structured and feasible; the described project stages are logically inter-connected and notably leading towards the achievement of the Project’s objective and tasks. The applicant/partner roles are instrumental and clearly described for each stage of project implementation. The expected results to be achieved at the end of every stage are described as relevantly stemming out of the implementation of each component. The proposed project plan, the calendar schedule is realistic and manageable given the project’s scope and timeframe foreseen. The risk management plan is realistic and controllable given the severity of
risks identified, concrete risks management ways are presented. The composition of project implementation is formed; there is clear division of tasks among team members avoiding any potential duplication, the experience of the project team is fully appropriate for the results to be achieved by the team.

3) The Evaluation of the Project Impact and Sustainability of the Results Achieved (max 20 points)

**Satisfactory (4 - 8 points):** The sustainability measures are not sufficiently planned and described, thus the actual impact of results and their sustainability is questionable. The project results to be achieved are not quantified and/or qualified or this is done not properly. The project results sustainability beyond the project is not described or indistinguishable. Plan for Project publicity, communication and dissemination of results is not provided or is rudimentary.

**Average (9 - 12 points):** The sustainability measure for ensuring the results achievement by describing the expected changes in the applicant organisation, or the NGO sector, or the outcome area as a result of this project is described partially or missing some important linkages. The expected project results are only partially put in quantity or quality expression. The sustainability of the results beyond the project is questionable. Plan for Project publicity, communication and dissemination of results is weak, not related to the core activities.

**Good (13 - 16 points):** The project proposal describes the expected project impact and sustainability of the results to be achieved with regard to the applicant organisation, the entire NGO sector, the outcome area as a result of this project. The relevant quantitative and qualitative results to be achieved are provided but their list might be subject to complement. The sustainability of the results achieved is potential but not certain. The replicability scenario/-s is described. Plan for Project publicity, communication and dissemination of results is clear, meets the requirements.

**Excellent (17 - 20 points):** The project proposal clearly describes the expected project impact that is very likely to happen given the logics of the project; the sustainability measures are sufficiently planned and described in a logical sequence from the expected changes in the applicant organisation to contribution to the NGO sector’s development and/or change in people’s lives in certain areas as per the selected outcome, thus the actual suitability of the results is not questionable and going beyond the project timeframe. The list of relevant quantitative and qualitative results is exhaustive. The project replicability scenario/-s and their potential financing sources under concrete financing mechanisms are identified and the project has clear replicability potential. Plan for Project publicity, communication and dissemination of results is focused on the best exposure of the project results and provides added value to the project, fully meets the requirements (including multiple formats of verbal/visual products), reveals the contribution of the EEA Grants extensively.

4) The Evaluation of the Adequacy of financial proposal vs. Results planned

**Satisfactory (2 - 4 points):** The proposed project expenditures are not realistically planned, exceeding or are very much below (that threatens the quality of results to be
achieved) the average market prices and not clearly linked to the implementation of planned activities. The ratio between estimated costs and the expected results is not adequate.

**Average (5 - 7 points):** The proposed project expenditures are partially realistically planned, few proposed costs are questionable and are not grounded on market prices; not all the proposed costs are directly linked to the implementation of planned activities.

**Good/excellent (8 - 10 points):** The proposed project expenditures are planned realistically, based on average market prices and clearly linked to the implementation of planned activities. The proposed costs are adequate to the achievement of the planned results.