

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	71
Name of the Applicant	
Title of the project	"Building Future for All"

			Scores	Max
1. Financial and operational capacity	Sub-score	multiplier	12	20
	max 5	*1		
1.1 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient experience of project management ?	3	3		
1.2 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient technical expertise ? (notably knowledge of the issues to be addressed)	4	4		
1.3 Do the applicant and partners have sufficient management capacity ? (including staff, equipment and ability to handle the budget for the action)	3	3		
1.4 Does the applicant have stable and sufficient sources of finance ?	2	2		
2. Relevance of the action	Score proportionally transferred from CN evaluation (=3/4 of Concept Note relevance score)		25.5	30
3. Effectiveness and feasibility of the action	Sub-score	multiplier	8	20
	max 5	*1		
3.1 Are the activities proposed appropriate, practical, and consistent with the objectives and expected results?	2	2		
3.2 Is the action plan clear and feasible?	2	2		
3.3 Does the proposal contain objectively verifiable indicators for the outcome of the action? Is evaluation foreseen?	3	3		
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	1	1		
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?	4	4		
4.2 Is the proposal likely to have multiplier effects ?	0	0		

(Including scope for replication and extension of the outcome of the action and dissemination of information.)	2	2		
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>)	2	2	8	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?	2	4	7	15
	max 5	*1		
5.2 Is the ratio between the estimated costs and the expected results satisfactory?	3	3		
TOTAL SCORE (without relevance)			35	70
TOTAL SCORE with relevance)			60.5	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: the applicant implemented four projects, but relatively small as compared with the project applied for and only with funding agencies based in Ukraine (one project is not described, and the largest one - almost 90,000 EUR per year - is described in less than two lines). Limited information about the partner.</p> <p>1.2. Technical expertise: the applicant and its partners did implement similar activities in the past (actually, the application seems targeted to the replication or extension of previous activities, which in itself is positive), but the frequent reliance on tenders to select suitably qualified applicants, although positive in terms of transparency, leads to wonder whether technical capacity is actually available. Important inputs are expected by domestic and foreign institutions which could have been listed as partners (where eligible) or associate partners, but are not.</p>

1.3. Management capacity: the availability of suitable management capacity is unclear; much equipment seems to need replacement, and the ability to handle budgets seems limited.

1.4. Sources of finance: the availability of the external contributions listed in the "External sources of finance" is doubtful, since they seem to refer to funds provided by state actors. They might be willing to contribute to the project, but it is unclear whether they would have such an amount of money available, and whether existing accountability rules would allow them to spend it on a project run by an NSA.

3.1. Activities: individual activities in themselves are meaningful, but a coherent picture is missing: each of them seems to pursue separate goals, linked only by the fact of contributing to the struggle against HIV/AIDS in Donetsk Region (this is especially true for the activities to be implemented by the applicant, whereas many of those entrusted to the partner focus on the challenges associated to HIV/TB coinfection). On top of this, limited capacity building of NSAs is envisaged: training seems to focus either on coordination council members (from both NSAs and SAs) or on "positive leaders", with little institutional-level capacity building. Requirements about visibility have not been understood by the applicant.

3.2. Action plan: the lack of focus of the project proposal translates into an unconvincing action plan, which lists plenty of unrelated activities (probably too many) but with inadequate details. At least in some cases the systematic distinction between "preparation" and "execution" of activities is unclear.

3.3. Objectively verifiable indicators: OVIs are listed in the LFM, but they include primarily process indicators rather than output or outcome indicators, and they do not correspond to the indicators mentioned in the

Strong Points

- The needs tackled are relevant, especially taking into account the heavy burden of disease in Donetsk Region.
- Activities build on previous projects, allowing to consolidate available expertise.
- Reliance on tenders to select project experts is appreciated as it improves transparency.

Weak Points

- Activities do not amount to a coherent project, with little potential for replication and sustainability and very little cooperation among the applicant and its only partner.
- There is sensitivity to the need for M&E, but a clear framework is missing, with different indicators mentioned in different parts of the application.

Signature:	
Date:	