

FULL APPLICATION FORM 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	68
Name of the Applicant	
Title of the project	"Cross-border Cooperation for HIV/AIDS Prevention and Impact Mitigation in Sothern Caucasus and Russian Federation"

			Scores	Max
1. Financial and operational capacity	Sub-score	multiplier	18	20
	max 5	*1		
1.1 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient experience of project management ?	5	5		
1.2 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient technical expertise ? (notably knowledge of the issues to be addressed)	5	5		
1.3 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient management capacity ? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)	4	4		
1.4 Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance ?	4	4		
2. Relevance of the action	Score proportionally transferred from CN evaluation (=3/4 of Concept Note relevance score)		26.625	30
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	Sub-score	multiplier	20	20
	max 5	*1		
3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results?	5	5		
3.2 Is the action plan clear and feasible?	5	5		
3.3 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action? Is evaluation foreseen?	5	5		
3.4 Is the partners' level of involvement and participation in the action satisfactory? 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 the guidelines	5	5		
4. Sustainability of the action	Sub-score	multiplier		
	max 5	*1		
4.1 Is the action likely to have a tangible impact on its target groups?	5	5		
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects ?	5	5		

(Including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	5	5		
4.3 Are the expected results of the proposed action sustainable : - financially (<i>how will the activities be financed after the funding ends?</i>) - institutionally (will structures allowing the activities to continue be in place at the end of the action? will there be local “ownership” of the results of the action?) - at policy level (where applicable) (<i>what will be the structural impact of the action — e.g. will it lead to improved legislation, codes of conduct, methods, etc?</i>)	4	4	14	15
5. Budget and cost-effectiveness of the action	Sub-score	multiplier		
	max 5	*2		
5.1 Are the activities appropriately reflected in the budget?	4	8	12	15
	max 5	*1		
5.2 Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?	4	4		
TOTAL SCORE (without relevance)			64	70
TOTAL SCORE with relevance)			90.625	100

If the total average score is less than 12 points for section 1, the proposal <u>will be rejected</u>	ACCEPTED
---	-----------------

score maximum consistency check	check 1.1	OK		check 3.1	OK		check 4.1	OK
	check 1.2	OK		check 3.2	OK		check 4.2	OK
	check 1.3	OK		check 3.3	OK		check 4.3	OK
	check 1.4	OK		check 3.4	OK		check 5.1	OK
							check 5.2	OK

General comments (major strong points and weaknesses)
<p>1.1. Experience of project management: excellent experience of project management, demonstrated not only by the amount of projects implemented over the years by the applicant and its partners, but also by the strong sensitivity to project management issues evident throughout the application (in particular M&E and allocation of responsibilities among project partners).</p> <p>1.2. Technical expertise: excellent technical expertise, demonstrated not only by the amount of similar projects implemented over the years by the applicant and its partners, but also by the number of highly realistic remarks and suggested solutions featured throughout the application.</p> <p>1.3. Management capacity: difficult to assess; the two projects implemented by the applicant and targeting</p>

similar issues are much smaller in terms of yearly budget than the suggested project, and only one (listed twice by mistake) is in an institutional environment (Uzbekistan) similar to those of the ENPI countries targeted by the suggested action. The complexity of the project, in terms of partners and activities, is high, but on the other hand the number of realistic remarks and suggested solutions featured throughout the application suggest that management capacity is good.

1.4. Sources of finance: limited information is provided, but the applicant commits itself to finance 20% of overall project costs if the project is awarded, and seems to be able to do that.

3.1. Activities: ambitious but clearly focused and very effectively described. The clear focus on sustainable capacity building is worth highlighting: the applicant envisages the transfer of knowledge and skills to local counterparts (relying also on contracted external experts when needed), but without taking an overbearing role, and envisaging instead a (gradual) active involvement of local partners, in such a way to make sure that learning by doing, supported by mentoring, complements classroom-based activities.

3.2. Action plan: very well designed, and taking into account with realism both logical and time constraints, although at times the difference between "preparation" and "execution" does not seem entirely convincing.

3.3. Objectively verifiable indicators: the application features a strong emphasis on the M&E framework, not only in the dedicated section of the application form, but also in the careful selection of OVIs and SOV, and (most importantly) in the fact that *four* dedicated activities are featured in the action plan, including a service gap analysis serving as a baseline and a final evaluation entrusted to a contracted external consultant. Activities are explicitly designed to develop much-needed "hands-on" capacity to perform M&E among partners and associates.

3.4. Involvement and participation of partners: excellent and clearly demonstrated throughout the project proposal; worth mentioning are both the gradual empowerment of local partners and the rational distribution of project activities (e.g., "in all activities local partners will take a leading role in order to show local ownership of the project and to increase credibility of advocacy initiatives in the eyes of other stakeholders and the public").

4.1. Impact on target groups: the strong technical expertise of the project applicant and its partners, the excellent project design and the comprehensive M&E framework suggest that the impact is likely to be significant, notwithstanding the tough challenges associated with the topic of HIV/AIDS and migration. In coherence with the transparent accountability framework envisaged by the applicant, the size of different target groups that the applicant expects to target throughout the project is explicitly mentioned in the project proposal.

4.2. Multiplier effects: the project is designed to build inasmuch as possible on the results of previous investments (e.g. envisaging the review and - where necessary - the upgrade of existing IEC materials and training tools), and in turn to make its deliverables widely available for online dissemination, also beyond the project life, through one of the project partners, the International Charitable Organization "East Europe and Central Asia Union of PLWH". One specific project activity focuses on best practice reviews, "to ensure that lessons are really learned, shared and potentially replicated".

4.3. Sustainability: a careful and realistic identification of the internal management and external relations challenges faced traditionally by NSAs, together with realistic solutions on how to address these challenges, suggest that the institutional and policy-level sustainability of the suggested project is going to be very good (at least considering the intrinsic challenges of dealing with HIV/AIDS and migration). Sound arguments are provided also to explain how the project could address the issue of financial sustainability.

5.1. Activities appropriately reflected in budget: the budget is comprehensive and tries to clarify the link with individual activities (costs are highlighted in such a way to clarify the task they are meant to contribute to). Different staffing levels, though, are envisaged in different target countries, and the rationale for these differences is not justified in the project proposal.

5.2. Ratio estimated costs / expected results: good, taking into account the importance attached to the services to be delivered, the well-targeted activities and the strong potential for sustainability and replication.

Strong Points

- Focus on an unserved, especially challenging area of need.
- Carefully designed activities and action plan.
- Excellent M&E framework.

Weak Points

- No justification for the different staffing levels envisaged in different target countries.
- No other weaknesses to be highlighted.

Signature:	
Date:	