**EurAAP Working Group**:

**Title of proposed activity**:

**Applicant**:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspect** | **Evaluator’s Comments** | **Mark[[1]](#footnote-1)** |
| Relevance to Association Aims  (*Is the proposal in line with the WG’s and EurAAP’s global objectives? Does the proposal show a benefit to EurAAP? Is the proposal fully supported by the WG?*) |  |  |
| Clarity of objectives  (*Is the proposal well defined and structured? Is the schedule of activities realistic?*) |  |  |
| Feasibility of proposed approach and verifiability of the results  (*Which are the expected outcomes? How will these outcomes be measured and reported?*) |  |  |
| Suitability of the financial request  (*How sound is the financial plan? Is the budget realistic? If not, by how much should it be reduced?*) |  |  |
| Comments on any other aspect. |  | **Overall mark:** |

**Date**:

**Evaluator’s Signature:**

**Evaluator’s Name:**

1. 1 - very bad; 2 – bad; 3 – fair; 4 – good; 5 - very good [↑](#footnote-ref-1)