

# 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.

<b>Grid completed by</b>	<b>Luca Brusati</b>
<b>Number of the proposal</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Name of the Applicant</b>	
<b>Title of the project</b>	<b>Cross-border Cooperation for HIV/AIDS Prevention and Impact Mitigation in Southern Caucasus and Russian Federation</b>

			Scores	Max
<b>1. Relevance of the action</b>	Sub-score	multiplier	35	40
1.1 How relevant is the proposal to the <b>objectives</b> and <b>priorities</b> of the Call for Proposals?	<b>max 5</b>	*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.	5	15		
	Sub-score	multiplier		
1.2 How relevant to the particular <b>needs and constraints</b> of the target country/countries or region(s) is the proposal? (including synergy with other EC initiatives and avoidance of duplication)	<b>max 5</b>	*2		
	5	10		
	Sub-score	multiplier		
1.3 How clearly defined and strategically chosen are those involved ( <b>final beneficiaries, target groups</b> )? Have their <b>needs</b> been clearly defined and does the proposal address them appropriately?	<b>max 5</b>	*2		
	3	6		
	Sub-score	multiplier		
1.4 Does the proposal contain <b>specific added-value elements</b> , 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?	<b>max 5</b>	*1		
	4	4		
	Sub-score	multiplier		
<b>2. Design of the action</b>	Sub-score	multiplier		
2.1 How coherent is the overall design of the action?	<b>max 5</b>	*1		
In particular, does it reflect the analysis of the problems involved, take into account external factors and relevant stakeholders?	4	4		
	Sub-score	multiplier		
2.2 Is the action feasible and consistent in relation to the objectives and expected results?	<b>max 5</b>	*1		
	3	3		
	<b>TOTAL SCORE</b>			<b>42</b>

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.

<b>1st threshold: relevance is minimum 30 out of 40</b>	<b>QUALIFIED</b>
<b>2nd threshold: total score is minimum 35 out of 50</b>	<b>QUALIFIED</b>

score maximum consistency check	check 1.1	<b>0</b>
	check 1.2	<b>0</b>
	check 1.3	<b>0</b>
	check 1.4	<b>0</b>
	check 2.1	<b>0</b>
	check 2.2	<b>0</b>

## General comments (major strong points and weaknesses)

**STRENGTHS.** The focus on tailored mobility-exacerbated HIV response capacity enhancement coupled with long-term institutional capacity strengthening of the PLWHA network in target countries makes the suggested action fully coherent with the objectives and priorities of the Call for Proposals (1.1.). The concept note features an excellent analysis of the needs and constraints of the target countries, which appropriately includes behavioural aspects (e.g., mobility as a coping strategy) and institutional features (e.g., leading role of AIDS centres and affiliated hospitals in the response) rather than mere epidemiological indicators (1.2.). Added-value elements include sensitivity to gender issues, peace building and cultural values (1.4.). The design of the action is coherent with project objectives; it is commendable that the applicant plans to screen existing IEC materials and training tools rather than develop new ones, and that NSA partners will be linked with existing EC-supported bodies, such as the HIV/AIDS Civil Society Forum and the HIV/AIDS Think Tank (2.1.).

**WEAKNESSES.** The acknowledgement of "the complete absence of GO-NSA dialogue" should be fully taken into account to ensure the feasibility of the suggested action, even more taking into account that establishing a real dialogue is likely to be even more difficult if activities are going to be coordinated by PLWHA networks, rather than "mainstream" AIDS-service NSAs. For this purpose, the analysis of the needs and constraints of target groups should pay closer attention to these obstacles (1.3.), and the design of the action should clarify how they could be cleared (2.2.). The number of GOs to be involved appears low taking into account the nature and complexity of project objectives, and it might be useful to clarify the mix of local vs. national GOs (as far as the Russian Federation is concerned, the involvement of federal bodies in such a small project appears unrealistic); national entities responsible for the definition of funding mechanisms should also be engaged to address possible access barriers associated to reimbursements. The concept note also fails to clarify how the 25 additional NSAs to be engaged would be selected (1.3.). The experience of the applicant in the Southern Caucasus is a major asset, but the establishment of a formal Regional Working Group involving GOs seems difficult, taking into account the relationships between Armenia and Azerbaijan and between Georgia and the Russian Federation: maybe the Working Group could be established involving NSAs only, and inviting GOs as observers. Alternatively, the involvement of the Coordination Committee on HIV/AIDS for the Commonwealth of Independent States should be explored (at least as far as Armenia, Azerbaijan and the Russian Federation are concerned).

**Signature:**

**Date:**