

CONCEPT NOTE EVALUATION GRID

Call for proposals Europeaid/130355/c/act/Multi

Development Cooperation Instrument (DCI):
Investing in People - Good health for all

Capacity building for non-state actors in relation to HIV-AIDS prevention, treatment and care for the European Neighbourhood and Partnership countries

Scoring guidelines

This evaluation grid is divided into sections and subsections. Each subsection must be given a score between 1 and 5 in accordance with the following guidelines:

Score	Meaning
1	very poor
2	poor
3	adequate
4	good
5	very good

These scores are added to give the total score for the section concerned. The totals for each section are then listed added together to give the total score for the concept note.

Grid completed by	Luca Brusati
Number of the proposal	26
Name of the Applicant	
Title of the project	A Real Improvement of the Quality of Life of People Living with HIV

			Scores	Max
1. Relevance of the action	Sub-score	multiplier	27	40
1.1 How relevant is the proposal to the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals?	max 5	*3		
Note: The maximum score will only be allocated if the proposal addresses the Geographic priorities (see section 1.2.1). For applicants having a nationality other than that of the country of action or International (intergovernmental) organisations, a score of one point only will be allocated if their proposal does not comply with the partnership composition requirements stipulated in section 1.2.1 of these guidelines.	4	12		
1.2 How relevant to the particular needs and constraints of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal? (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication)	Sub-score	multiplier		
	max 5	*2		
	3	6		
1.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved (final beneficiaries, target groups)? Have their needs been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	Sub-score	multiplier		
	max 5	*2		
	3	6		
1.4 Does the proposal contain specific added-value elements , such as environmental issues, promotion of gender equality and equal opportunities, needs of disabled people, rights of minorities and rights of indigenous peoples, or innovation and best practices?	Sub-score	multiplier		
	max 5	*1		
	3	3		
2. Design of the action	Sub-score	multiplier		
2.1 How coherent is the overall design of the action?	max 5	*1		
In particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and relevant stakeholders?	2	2		
2.2 Is the action feasible and consistent in relation to the objectives and expected results?	Sub-score	multiplier		
	max 5	*1		
	3	3		
TOTAL SCORE			32	50

At a first step, only the concept notes which have been given a score of a minimum of 30 out of 40 points in the category "relevance" as well as a minimum total score of 35 points will be considered for pre-selection.

1st threshold: relevance is minimum 30 out of 40	REJECTED
2nd threshold: total score is minimum 35 out of 50	REJECTED

score maximum consistency check	check 1.1	0
	check 1.2	0
	check 1.3	0
	check 1.4	0
	check 2.1	0
	check 2.2	0

General comments (major strong points and weaknesses)

STRENGTHS. The suggested action is aligned with the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals, although the focus is primarily on specific objective 1 (strengthening the advocacy skills of NSAs) and only very limited activities are envisaged for specific objective 3 (strengthening partnerships and coordination) (1.1.). A detailed description is provided of both previous and ongoing actions, including initiatives from the European Commission (1.2.). The fact that the suggested action focuses on the capacity of PLWH can be considered in itself a specific value-added element, whereas the reference to a "gender-sensitive approach" is not convincing, taking into account that there is no reference to this elsewhere in the proposal (taking into account the nature of the suggested action, it is unclear why the applicant plans to "disaggregate relevant indicators - apparently about access? - by sex to measure progress") (1.4.).

WEAKNESSES. The most important doubt about the suggested action is whether the limited capacity of PLWH networks should be used to ensure advocacy at supranational level (where other players are already doing it, with limited practical impact on final beneficiaries) or at sub-national level (where PLWH networks are already active, other players are not, and the practical impact on final beneficiaries is likely to be more significant). Target groups and final beneficiaries are correctly distinguished, and the lack of organizational, technical and advocacy skills in the PLWH community is acknowledged, but the additional constraints faced by PLWH networks in many target countries (e.g. fragmentation, turnover) are not clearly spelled out (1.3.). Due to the nature of the suggested action, it is especially important to outline the functioning of the relationships between grassroots PLWH organizations and national networks, because advocacy is expected to take place at supranational level, but many of the challenges faced by PLWH depend on what happens at local level (e.g., limited access to services and medical treatment, social exclusion, stigma, discrimination, non-respect of basic human rights). Moreover, taking into account the lack of relevant skills in the PLWH community, it is unclear who could actually take the lead in delivering both capacity building (Result 1) and the supranational advocacy plan (Result 2), even more taking into account that there is no reference to the transfer of expertise by countries with a stronger track record to countries with weaker PLWH networks (2.2.). On a broader level, the value of supra-national action seems unclear (2.1.). Result One, i.e. capacity building, is clearly relevant, and there is probably some room for ECUO regional fundraising plans, but capacity building is clearly a national (or probably a subnational) issue. Result Two, i.e. advocacy planning, is also relevant, but a regional campaign would serve primarily to support national (and maybe subnational) campaigns, which are likely to exploit better, in terms of timing, objectives and messages, the opportunity windows created by the political debate. Result Three is ambiguous, because it is not clear whether the "joint Russian-speaking information environment" would be targeted primarily to PLWH organizations or PLWH communities. Here the supra-national dimension is relevant, but if it is targeted to organizations, then it is not clear why the platform should address HIV+ adolescents; if it is targeted to communities, then it is not compatible with specific objective 3 of the Call for Proposals (maybe with specific objective 4, though). Moreover, there is a reference to "consistent" and "reliable" information, but the concept note does not clarify how "the collection, storage and dissemination of information" would ensure consistency and reliability (and there might be duplication with the "resource centres" established in the region by UNAIDS). The potential for "dialogue" with G8, G20 and the SCO is also doubtful, even more taking into account that only one target country (Russia) is represented into these networks. The potential involvement of the Coordination Committee on HIV/AIDS for the Commonwealth of Independent States could be explored instead. The timing of the suggested activities should also be more clearly outlined (only the overall project duration is mentioned).

Signature:

Date: