

ORGANISATION:

<p>Lot Specific Organisational Alignment and Capacity (20 POINTS)</p> <p>The degree to which there is existing strategic and organisational alignment to the lot-specific priorities (relative weight 10%)</p> <p>The extent to which existing organisational capacity relevant to the lot-specific priorities and target group is described (relative weight 10%) .</p> <p>The extent to which relevant operational experience and capacity in countries prioritised by the application is explained (relative weight 15%) .</p> <p>The extent to which existing global or local partnerships relevant to the priorities and target group of the proposed lot is illustrated (relative weight 25%) .</p> <p>The extent to which the applicant has described experience and capacity for reach and relevant engagement with the lot-specific target group (relative weight 20%) .</p> <p>The extent to which the applicant has explained existing experience and capacity for implementing through or sub-granting to local partners (relative weight 20%)</p> <p>Total Score</p>	<p>RATING (1-5)</p>	<p>WEIGHT (20:5)</p>	<p>RELATIVE WEIGHT</p>	<p>SCORE</p>
		4	0,1	
		4	0,1	
		4	0,15	
		4	0,25	
		4	0,2	
		4	0,2	
				0
<p>Context Analysis (15 POINTS)</p> <p>The degree to which the problem and needs analysis is clear, including specific opportunities and barriers relevant to the priorities and target group of the proposed lot (<i>relative weight 40%</i>)</p> <p>The extent to which project problem identification and correlating project ambition is justified, aligned with the objective of the DDI, and reflects existing policy or programmatic challenges and opportunities (<i>relative weight 30%</i>).</p> <p>The extent to which geographic priorities are relevant and justified (<i>relative weight 30%</i>).</p> <p>Total Score</p>	<p>RATING (1-5)</p>	<p>WEIGHT (15:5)</p>	<p>RELATIVE WEIGHT</p>	<p>SCORE</p>
		3	0,4	0
		3	0,3	0
		3	0,3	0
				0
<p>Project Objective and Design (20 Points)</p> <p>The extent to which ToC presents a clear link between problem identification, outcomes and immediate outcome areas and is supported by clear and relevant assumptions. (<i>relative weight 40%</i>).</p> <p>The extent to which elaboration of types of activities/outputs and design reflections on e.g. project modalities, TA, etc. are clear, relevant and present considerations and choices relevant to lot-specific priorities and target group (<i>relative weight 40%</i>)</p> <p>The degree to which it is clear how the proposed project will prioritise the DDI cross-cutting priorities – outlined in the DDI Programme Document, pages 6 – 7 (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)</p> <p>Total Score</p>	<p>RATING (1-5)</p>	<p>WEIGHT (20:5)</p>	<p>RELATIVE WEIGHT</p>	<p>SCORE</p>
		4	0,4	0
		4	0,4	0
		4	0,2	0
				0
<p>Beneficiaries, Target Groups, and Geographic Priorities (15 Points)</p> <p>The degree to which prioritisation of geographic priority countries is clear and justified (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)</p> <p>The extent to which selection of project beneficiaries, target groups, and other stakeholders is justified and relevant to the lot-specific priorities (<i>relative weight 40%</i>)</p> <p>The degree to which elaborations of mechanism and modalities to reach beneficiaries/stakeholders is clear, relevant, and efficient (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)</p> <p>Total Score</p>	<p>RATING (1-5)</p>	<p>WEIGHT (15:5)</p>	<p>RELATIVE WEIGHT</p>	<p>SCORE</p>
		3	0,3	0
		4	0,4	0
		3	0,3	0
				0

Project Management and Partnership Arrangement (15 Points)	RATING (1-5)	WEIGHT (15:5)	RELATIVE WEIGHT	SCORE
The extent to which organisational set-up for governance and management of the project is clear and allows for stakeholder inclusion (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		3	0,3	0
The extent to which the project documents has a relevant approach to selection of partners, partnerships and local leadership (<i>relative weight 40%</i>)		3	0,4	0
The degree to which the procedures for monitoring learning, quality assurance and reporting is clear, support adaptation, and present clear links to implementing partners (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		3	0,3	0
Total Score				0
Budget and Financial Management (15 Points)	RATING (1-5)	WEIGHT (15:5)	RELATIVE WEIGHT	SCORE
The degree to which the project's cost level and overall budget are justified and seem proportionate with planned activities and expected results (<i>relative weight 40%</i>).		3	0,4	0
The extent to which overall procedures and mechanisms for financial management, including sub-granting, are clear (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		3	0,3	0
The extent to which the proportion of funding sub-granted to/implemented through local partners seems proportionate to the project design and DDI prioritisation of local leadership (<i>relative weight 30%</i>).		3	0,3	0
Total Score				0
TOTAL				0

MAX SCORE
2
2
3
5
4
4
20
MAX SCORE
6
4,5
4,5
15
MAX SCORE
8
8
4
20
MAX SCORE
4,5
6
4,5
15

MAX SCORE
4,5
6
4,5
15
MAX SCORE
6
4,5
4,5
15
100