The case model is a pulse of a subset of any part of a subset of a	Organisational Capacity (20 POINTS)	RATING	WEIGHT	RELATIVE WEIGHT	SCORE	MAX SCORE
add appeint galding nuessions with family and not gaunding model partial of (appeint of a constraints) and appeint of an appeint of a appeint of appei		(1-5)	(20:5)	WEIGHT		SCORE
after framework protection and agreed in the DM and by youth humanic protection and agreed in the signate plaquely	and reporting (including experience with funding and sub-granting to local partners) (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)		4	0,2	0	4
species gauge is evidenced in the applicant learner sangle and profile is all control and applicable interaction sample profile with the decore of all control and applicable interaction and applicable is such to shore of applicable interaction and applicable interaction and applicable is such to shore of applicable interaction and applicable interaction and applicable is such to shore of applicable is all control applicable is all contr	reflect focus, experiene and capacity relevant to the DDI and lot specific thematic priorities and competencies (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		4	0,3	0	6
the DBI and bugsifier provision and bugsifier may and if prestore is a whole operation of the set o	specific target group is evidenced in the applicants' current strategy and portfolio (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		4	0,3	0	6
IndustryTend source00 </td <td>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</i></td> <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>0,2</td> <td>0</td> <td>4</td>	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</i>		4	0,2	0	4
Cancel A control Control Control Control Control Control Control Control Control Control Control Control Control 					0	
decispense and ages provides ages of the space of the spa	Context Analysis and Theory of Change (15 POINTS)				SCORE	
natile dependence is a serie of the DDD and the matches (by leakly or provision and consist or provis	development problem, including specific opportunities and barriers relevant to the		3	0,2	0	3
The extent to which Tuc Lakess to specify priority proteins a denome trans, and the betwee policy denomination of the priority of the signed 20%. The extent of which definitions (mage regardle and ligned to the lot specific definition of the specific definition of	justified, aligned with the DDI and thematic lot, builds on previous learning, and reflects existing policy or programmatic challenges and opportunities (<i>relative weight</i>		3	0,3	0	4,5
group projection is net learning defined, justified and algord to the lot specific priorities (nation and performs)30.30.03Teal ScoreRRIGHTREATING (REAT)REATING (REAT)SCOREMAX SCOREProgramme Design, Partnerships, and Intervention Areas (23 Points) the extent to which elaborations of mechanism and anothdices for implemented prior the elaboration of implementing primers is decire and include relevant consideration for Action angle approaches within or exercision to the DDI (relevant prior the algore to which relevants or implementing primers is decire and include relevant consideration for Action angle approaches are ducir, relevant and affect DDI consideration for Action angle approaches are ducir, relevant and affect DDI consideration for Action angle approaches are ducir, relevant and affect DDI consideration for Action angle approaches are ducir, relevant and affect DDI consideration for Action angle approaches are ducir, relevant and affect DDI consideration for Action angle approaches and conduction angle approaches and accide and independent and accide and and action (Adder wight ACM)88 </td <td>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>).</td> <td></td> <td>3</td> <td>0,2</td> <td>0</td> <td>4,5</td>	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
Programme Design, Partnerships, and Intervention Areas (25 Points) RUTON (1.5) VEICHT (2.5) RELATIVE (2.5) SCORE (2.5)	geographic priorities are clearly defined, justified and aligned to the lot specific priorities (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		3	0,3		
The extent to which elaborations of mechanism and modulities for implementation and easy relevant, feasible, huld or resisting engagement, and include relevant functions of programs with other programs in the DDD (profile relevant to which enderication of implementing praners is clear and include relevant considentions for the langementation sub-gramme in the DDD (profile relevant to build in description of program approxes in clear and include relevant on constructions for hole calculation of any learnes in the profile profile sub-profile discription of profile approxels are clear, relevant and reflect DDD (conservations for the conservations profiles are outlined in the DDD) (program Document, fuelds wight 20%) The extent to which description of profiles are outlined in the DDD (program Document, fuelds wight 20%) The extent to which description of profiles are outlined in the DDD (program Document, fuelds wight 20%) The extent to which description of profiles are outlined in the DDD (profile approaches to ensure relevant targeting and reach-(relative wight 20%) Total Score Extent to which the procein clear and relative might 20%) Total Score Extent to which the procein clear and relative might 20%) The extent to which the procein clear and relative might 20%) The extent to which the procein clear and relative might 20%) The extent to which the procein clear and relative might 20%) The extent to which the procein clear and relative might 20%) The extent to which the project clear and regions might 20%) The extent to which the project clear and regions measure indications, relevant backline clear and relative might 20%) The extent to which the project clear and regions measure indications are suscered. (relative wight 20%) The extent to which the project clear and regions measure indications are suscered. (relative wight 20%) The extent to which the project clear and regions measure indications are suscered. (relative wight 20%) The extent to which the project clear and relative the wight 40%) The extent to wh						MAX
Indecision on synegies with onler projects within or external to the DDI (<i>ndule wigh 1955</i>). S 0.2 0 7.5 The extent to which reflection of implementing partners is clar and include relevant considentions for local implementing partners by, subgranting, or other mechanism of the project approaches are clar, relevant and reflect DDI (<i>ndule wigh 2076</i>) 5 0.2 0 5 The extent to which description of project approaches are clar, relevant and reflect DDI (<i>ndule wigh 2076</i>) 5 0.2 0 5 The extent to which description of project approaches are clar, relevant and reflect not project approaches are class wigh 2076 5 0.2 0 5 The extent to which description of project approaches are look wigh 2076 5 0.2 0 5 Total Score 6 0 2 0 5 0 0 0 5 Total Score 7 0.2 0 3 0.2 0 3 0 0 3 0 3 0.2 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 3 0 <		(1-5)	(25:5)	WEIGHT	SCORE	SCORE
considerations for local implementing partnerships, sub-granting, or other mechanism50.20.05in cance local lackesh (value angle 20%)The degree to which discription of interventions and tops of activities/outputs are local, relative and reflect50.10.02.5DD cross-cutting priorities are consolitied priorities and encoded and machanization (radius wight 20%)50.20.05The extent to which discription of interventions and tops of activities/outputs are local induce dear and encode to flags englagement, and encoded and and encoded and and encoded and induce dear and encode to the local encode and and encoded and encode and and encoded and encode and e	reflections on synergies with other projects within or external to the DDI (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)		5	0,3	0	7,5
DDI cross-cutting priorities. The cross-cutting priorities are outlined in the DDI program Document. (Indiate surgite) 10% [). The extent to which description of interventions and types of activities/outputs are descripted in the project stage group, existing engineering, and extends indication. (Indiate surgity 20%) is provides and index index indication. (Indiate surgity 20%) is provides and index	considerations for local implementing partnerships, sub-granting, or other mechanism to ensure local leadership (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)		5	0,2	0	5
logic alequate, feasible within the timeframe of the project, and include clear and relevant targeting and reach indication. (<i>relative wight 20%</i>)50.205The extent to which intervention areas reflect knowledge and understanding of the provinces and needs of the lot specific target group, existing engagement, and established approxahes to ensure relevant targeting and reach. (<i>relative wight 20%</i>)RATING (1.5)WEIGHT WEIGHT WEIGHT WEIGHT (1.5)80.03Total ScoreRATING (1.5)WEIGHT WEIGHT (1.5)NO.203304The extent to which the results framework (15 Points)RATING (1.5)WEIGHT (1.5)WEIGHT WEIGHTSCORE (1.5)MAX SCORE30.203The extent to which the results framework elaborates relevant and meanable infactoro, relevants, ender aready 100%, The extent to which description of MLPAL arrangements (clearly show how activities are monitored, outcomes are assessed, and feedback, learning, stackholder inclusion, and adaptitotio is ensude. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)RATING (1.5)WEIGHT WEIGHTRELATIVE (1.5)MAX (1.5)04Budget and Financial Management (10 Points)RATING (1.5)WEIGHT (1.5)RELATIVE (1.5)01The extent to which the project has elaborated relative field are skipt 10%. The extent to which hold project words are sub-grint of to clearly and area sub-grint of to clearly and area clearly shift and approximative skipt 20%.20.33The extent to which the project words area relative skipt 10%. The extent to which hold project words area clear	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
pionine and needs of the lot specific target group, existing engagement, and exablished approaches to ensure relevant targeting and reach. (<i>relativ wighl 20</i> %), <i>I</i> Constant of Constant ender and Const	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
MEAL and Results Framework (15 Points) RATING (1-5) VEIGHT (1-5) RELITIVE (155) SCORE WEIGHT SCORE (0-5) MAX SCORE The extent to which the results framework above presents a relevant and legic flow between outcomes, immediate outcomes, and outputs. (relative wigh 20%) 3 0.2 0 3 The extent to which the results framework (above presents are appropriate to the project description of MLAL arrangements clearly show how activities are monitored, (relative wigh 20%) 3 0.2 0 3 The extent to which description of MLAL arrangements clearly show how activities are monitored, (relative wigh 20%) 3 0.2 0 15 Budget and Financial Management (10 Points) RATING (1-5) WEIGHT RELATIVE (10:5) SCORE MAX SCORE The extent to which the project's cost level and overall budget are justified and seem proportionate with planned activities and expected results (relative wigh 40%). RATING (1-5) WEIGHT RELATIVE (10:5) SCORE MAX SCORE The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or subgranted to local partners (within or bycond consortin partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. (relative might 90%). RATING (1-5) WEIGHT SCORE MAX SCORE Total Score 0 10 3 0.2	priorities and needs of the lot specific target group, exsisting engagement, and established approaches to ensure relevant targeting and reach. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)		5	0,2		
Ice extent to which the results-framework presents a relevant and logic flow between outcomes, and outputs. (<i>rkaline wigh 20%</i>)ICE<		RATING	WEIGHT	RELATIVE		
outcomes, immediate outcomes, and outputs. (<i>inlaitiv night 20%</i>)SS0,20SThe extent to which the results framework alborates relevant and measurable indicators, relevant baseline estimates, and expected reach targets are appropriate to the project design and budget envelope. (<i>inlaitiv night 20%</i>)SS0,204,5The 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>inlaitiv night 20%</i>)RATING (10.5)WEIGHTSCORESCOREBudget and Financial Management (10 Points)RATING (1.5)WEIGHTSCORESCORESCOREThe extent to which the project's cost level and overall budget are justified and seem proportionate with planned activities and expected results (<i>relativ night 40%</i>).20,304The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granned to local partners (<i>relativ night 40%</i>).20,303The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granned to local partners (within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI prionity of local leadership. (<i>relativ night 10%</i>).20,303The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granned to local partners (within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI prionity of local leadership. (<i>relativ night 10%</i>).8S0330,203The extent to which budgets managed.SSS0330,203The extent to which budgets in project gov		(1-5)				
The extent to which description of MIEAL arrangements clearly show how activities and adaptation is ensured. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>) 3 0,3 0,0 4,5 The extent to which the project has elaborated a relevant strategy for communication of clearning and results. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>) 70 3 0,2 00 3 Total Score 70	outcomes, immediate outcomes, and outputs. (<i>relative wight 20%</i>) The extent to which the results framework elaborates relevant and measurable indicators, relevant baseline estimates, and expected reach targets are appropriate to					
of learning and results. (relative weight 20%)ofofofTotal Score015Budget and Financial Management (10 Points)RATING (1-5)WEIGHT (10:5)RELATIVE WEIGHTSCORE SCOREThe extent to which the project's cost level and overall budget are justified and seem proportionate with planned activities and expected results (relative weight 40%).20,404The extent to which systems for financial management are elaborated and sound, including management for funding to partners (relative weight 30%).20,303The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granted to local partners (within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. (relative weight 30%).WEIGHT (15:5)RELATIVE (15:5)SCOREMAX SCOREProject Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)RATING (1-5)WEIGHT (15:5)RELATIVE WEIGHTSCOREMAX SCOREThe extent to which horojcet 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. (relative weight 20%)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant nonsiderations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners, (relative weight 20%)30,101,5The extent to which the project presents relevant ronsiderations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners, (relative weight 20%)30,101,5The extent to which	The extent to which description of MEAL arrangements clearly show how activities are monitored, outcomes are assessed, and feedback, learning, stakeholder inclusion,		3	0,3	0	4,5
Budget and Financial Management (10 Points)RATING (1-5)WEIGHT (10-5)RELATIVE WEIGHTSCOREMAX SCOREThe extent to which the project's cost level and overall budget are justified and seem proportionate with planned activities and expected results (relative weight 40%).20,404The extent to which systems for financial management are elaborated and sound, including management arrangement for funding to partners (within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. (relative weight 30%)20,303The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granted to local partners (within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. (relative weight 30%)RATING (1-5)20,303Total Score010Project Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)RATING (1-5)WEIGHT (15:5)RELATIVE WEIGHTSCOREMAX SCOREThe extent to which thematic expertise, project management setup is clear, includes relevant roles and functions, and reflects relevant inclusion of stakeholders and local partners. (relative weight 20%)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and condination with other DDI partners. (relative weight 10%)30,101,5The extent to which the project have identified relevant its kand corresponding approaches for management of risks and ensuring safety and security of staff, partners, and beneficiares. (relative weight 20%)30,203The extent to which t			3	0,2	0	3
Budget and Financial Management (10 Points)(1-5)(10:5)WEIGHTSCORESCOREThe 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>).20,404The extent to which systems for financial management are elaborated and sound, including management arrangement for funding to partners (<i>relative weight 30%</i>).20,303The 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</i> <i>weight 30%</i>). RATING (1-5) WEIGHTRELATIVE WEIGHTSCOREMAX SCOREProject Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)RATING (1-5) WEIGHTSCORE WEIGHTSCORE The extent to which hematic expertise, project management and licet or indirect implementation capacity in priority country is outlined in the project downern. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>) SCORE 30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and condition with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>)30,101,5The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, end coordination with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and conditive weight 20%)30,101,5The extent to which the project p		RATING	WEIGHT	RELATIVE		
proportionate with planned activities and expected results (<i>relative weight 40%</i>).20,404The extent to which systems for financial management are elaborated and sound, including management arrangement for funding to partners (<i>relative weight 30%</i>).20,303The 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>).20,303Total Score010Project Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)RATING (1.5)WEIGHTRELATIVE (15:5)SCOREMAX SCOREThe 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>)30,203The extent to which thermatic expertise, project management and direct or indirect implementation capacity in priority country is outlined in the project document. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>)30,203The 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>)30,30,44The extent to which the project is justified in terms of rele	Budget and Financial Management (10 Points)				SCORE	
including management arrangement for funding to partners (<i>relative weight 30%</i>). The extent to which budgets managed, transferred, or sub-granted to local partners (<i>relative weight 30%</i>) Total Score 2 0,3 0 3 WEIGHT 2 0,3 0 3 WEIGHT 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	proportionate with planned activities and expected results (relative weight 40%).		2	0,4	0	4
(vithin or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. (relative weight 30%) Total Score20,303Total Score010Project Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)RATING (1-5)WEIGHTRELATIVE WEIGHTSCOREMAX SCOREThe 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. (relative weight 20%)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (relative weight 10%) 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. (relative weight 20%)030,203The 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. (relative weight 30%)30,30,304,5Total Score015	including management arrangement for funding to partners (relative weight 30%).		2	0,3	0	3
Project Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (IS Points)(1-5)(15:5)WEIGHTSCOREThe 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>)30,203The 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>)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>) 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>)30,203The 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>)30,304,5Total ScoreImagement of the project is provides reflections for entry, exit and closure relevant for the duration of the project. (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)Imagement of 15Imagement of 15	(within or beyond consortia partners) reflects DDI priority of local leadership. (<i>relative weight 30%</i>)					10
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>)30,203The 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>)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>)30,101,5The 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>)30,203The 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>)30,304,5Total Score015	Project Management, Risks, and Aid Effectiveness (15 Points)				SCORE	
implementation capacity in priority country is outlined in the project document. (relative weight 20%)30,203The extent to which the project presents relevant considerations of reporting, donor relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (relative weight 10%)30,101,5The 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. (relative weight 20%)30,203The 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. (relative weight 30%)30,304,5Total Score015	relevant roles and functions, and reflects relevant inclusion of stakeholders and local		3	0,2	0	3
relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>) 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>) 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>) Total Score	implementation capacity in priority country is outlined in the project document. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>)		3	0,2	0	3
and beneficiaries. (<i>relative weight 20%</i>) 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>) Total Score 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	relations, and coordination with other DDI partners. (<i>relative weight 10%</i>) The extent to which the project have identified relevant risks and corresponding					
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>) Total Score 0 15	and beneficiaries. (relative weight 20%)		3	0,2	0	3
	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		
	Total Score TOTAL				0	15 100