

**Evaluation call 2013 Safer Internet  
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)  
Thematic network – Action 3.1 NGO network for Child Protection on the internet**

<b>Proposal Acronym:</b>	<b>Proposal No.:</b>
--------------------------	----------------------

*Score 1="Unsatisfactory" to 10="Excellent". Half marks may be given.*

<b>1. Relevance and impact (Weighting = 2.5)</b>	
<p><b>- Contribution to achieving the objectives of the Safer Internet programme and the relevant action as set out in the call.</b></p>	
<p><b>- Expected impact of the proposed action.</b></p>	
<p><b>- Adequacy of the dissemination plans to ensure optimal use of the project results, also beyond the participants in the project.</b></p>	

**1. Mark:**

**Evaluation call 2013 Safer Internet  
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)  
Thematic network – Action 3.1 NGO network for Child Protection on the internet**

<b>2. Quality of the technical part of the proposal (Weighting = 3.0)</b>	
<p>- Clear description of the problems and the proposed solutions.</p>	
<p>- Adequacy of the methodology and work plan for achieving the objectives stated in the proposal.</p>	
<b>2. Mark:</b> <input data-bbox="1792 1348 2038 1404" type="text"/>	

**Evaluation call 2013 Safer Internet  
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)**  
Thematic network – Action 3.1 NGO network for Child Protection on the internet

**3. Resources and management (Weighting =2.0)**

- Quality of the coordinating team and partnerships to achieve the coordination envisaged, adequacy of the management and decision-making structures, communication flow and cooperation mechanisms within the network and resources available

- Adequacy of the measures and indicators for monitoring progress and assessing results and impact.

**3. Mark:**

**Evaluation call 2013 Safer Internet  
Individual Assessment Report (IAR)**  
Thematic network – Action 3.1 NGO network for Child Protection on the internet

**4. Quality of the proposed network and European added value (Weighting = 2.5)**

- Adequacy of the organisations participating in the network in terms of relevance, competences, combination of complementary expertise.

- European added value of the network.

- Links with relevant external organisations or projects

**4. Mark:**

**Evaluator:**

**Signature<sup>1</sup>:**

**Date:**

<sup>1</sup> By signing this evaluation form I declare that I have no conflict of interest with this particular proposal (point 4 of the Code of Conduct for Independent Experts Appointed as Evaluators).