

<b>Organisational Capacity (20 POINTS)</b>	<b>RATING (1-5)</b>	<b>WEIGHT (20:5)</b>	<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>MAX SCORE</b>
The extent to which the applicant's strategy, annual report, and project references reflect capacity for grant management, including financial management, monitoring and reporting (including experience with funding and sub-granting to local partners ) <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		4	0,2	0	4
The degree to which applicant's current strategy, portfolio, and organisation structures reflect focus, experience and capacity relevant to the DDI and lot specific thematic priorities and competencies <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		4	0,3	0	6
The degree to which experience of working with the targeted geography and lot specific target group is evidenced in the applicants' current strategy and portfolio <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		4	0,3	0	6
Indication of existing global or local strategic partnerships relevant to the objective of the DDI and lot specific priorities and target group, and the extent to which expertise and experience working with partnerships and local leadership is documented <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		4	0,2	0	4
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Context Analysis and Theory of Change (15 POINTS)</b>	<b>RATING (1-5)</b>	<b>WEIGHT (15:5)</b>	<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>MAX SCORE</b>
The degree to which the problem and needs analysis is clear and establish a relevant development problem, including specific opportunities and barriers relevant to the priorities and target group of the proposed lot <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		3	0,2	0	3
The extent to which problem identification and correlating project ambition is justified, aligned with the DDI and thematic lot, builds on previous learning, and reflects existing policy or programmatic challenges and opportunities <i>(relative weight 30%)</i> .		3	0,3	0	4,5
The extent to which ToC balances lot specific priorities, presents a coherent and logic link between problem identification, outcomes and immediate outcome areas, and identifies relevant risks and assumptions <i>(relative weight 20%)</i> .		3	0,2	0	4,5
The extent to which identification of beneficiaries, target groups, stakeholders, and geographic priorities are clearly defined, justified and aligned to the lot specific priorities <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		3	0,3	0	3
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Programme Design, Partnerships, and Intervention Areas (25 Points)</b>	<b>RATING (1-5)</b>	<b>WEIGHT (25:5)</b>	<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>MAX SCORE</b>
The extent to which elaborations of mechanism and modalities for implementation are clear, relevant, feasible, build on existing engagement, and include relevant reflections on synergies with other projects within or external to the DDI <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		5	0,3	0	7,5
The extent to which reflection of implementing partners is clear and include relevant considerations for local implementing partnerships, sub-granting, or other mechanism to ensure local leadership <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		5	0,2	0	5
The degree to which description of project approaches are clear, relevant and reflect DDI cross-cutting priorities. The cross-cutting priorities are outlined in the DDI Program Document. <i>(relative weight 10%)</i>		5	0,1	0	2,5
The extent to which description of interventions and types of activities/outputs are logic, adequate, feasible within the timeframe of the project, and include clear and relevant targeting and reach indication. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		5	0,2	0	5
The extent to which intervention areas reflect knowledge and understanding of the priorities and needs of the lot specific target group, existing engagement, and established approaches to ensure relevant targeting and reach. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		5	0,2	0	5
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>MEAL and Results Framework (15 Points)</b>	<b>RATING (1-5)</b>	<b>WEIGHT (15:5)</b>	<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>MAX SCORE</b>
The extent to which the results-framework presents a relevant and logic flow between outcomes, immediate outcomes, and outputs. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		3	0,2	0	3
The extent to which the results framework elaborates relevant and measurable indicators, relevant baseline estimates, and expected reach targets are appropriate to the project design and budget envelope. <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		3	0,3	0	4,5
The extent to which description of MEAL arrangements clearly show how activities are monitored, outcomes are assessed, and feedback, learning, stakeholder inclusion, and adaptation is ensured. <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		3	0,3	0	4,5
The extent to which the project has elaborated a relevant strategy for communication of learning and results. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		3	0,2	0	3
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Budget and Financial Management (10 Points)</b>	<b>RATING (1-5)</b>	<b>WEIGHT (10:5)</b>	<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>MAX SCORE</b>
The extent 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> .		2	0,4	0	4
The extent to which systems for financial management are elaborated and sound, including management arrangement for funding to partners <i>(relative weight 30%)</i> .		2	0,3	0	3
The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granted to local partners (within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		2	0,3	0	3
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Project Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)</b>	<b>RATING (1-5)</b>	<b>WEIGHT (15:5)</b>	<b>RELATIVE WEIGHT</b>	<b>SCORE</b>	<b>MAX SCORE</b>
The extent to which project governance and management setup is clear, includes relevant roles and functions, and reflects relevant inclusion of stakeholders and local partners and engagement with DDI programme structures. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		3	0,2	0	3
The extent to which thematic expertise, project management and direct or indirect implementation capacity in priority country is outlined in the project document. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		3	0,2	0	3
The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. <i>(relative weight 10%)</i>		3	0,1	0	1,5
The extent to which the project have identified relevant risks and corresponding approaches for management of risks and ensuring safety and security of staff, partners, and beneficiaries. <i>(relative weight 20%)</i>		3	0,2	0	3
The extent to which the project is justified in terms of relevance, impact, effectiveness, efficiency, coherence, and sustainability and provides reflections for entry, exit and closure relevant for the duration of the project. <i>(relative weight 30%)</i>		3	0,3	0	4,5
<b>Total Score</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>0</b>	<b>100</b>