

Annex 5C: Full proposal assessment criteria

Note that only proposals that include activities in at least one of the relevant countries, Burkina Faso, Mali or Niger, will be accepted for assessment. Proposals may cover one, two or all three countries. Proposals from individual NGOs or consortia comprising several NGOs are welcome. Proposals not living up to these requirements will be disqualified.

1.	Relevance and coherence of the project	Total score	Score
1.1	How well is the proposal aligned with the development objective, specific objectives, and priority areas of the CfP?	5	
1.2	Does the proposal demonstrate a context/problem and stakeholder analysis outlining the problems to be addressed?	5	
1.3	How clearly defined and strategically chosen are the needs of the most vulnerable groups in project areas?	5	
1.4	How well is the proposal harmonised, coordinated and complementing with/to other relevant initiatives within SO1 and SO2 in the relevant country(ies) Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger to reap synergy and avoid duplication?	5	
	Subtotal	20	
2.	Project design	Total score	Score
2.1	Does the proposal present a clear, articulated and logical link from a sufficiently comprehensive analysis of context, needs and relevant stakeholders to the specification and outline of objectives as outlined in the Information Note, expected outcomes and planned activities? Are activities proposed appropriate and consistent with envisioned outputs and outcomes? If the proposal builds on already existing engagements, it must be clear how the proposal adds value.	10	
2.2	Does the proposal include a robust analysis of risks and vulnerabilities associated with climate change and conflict?	5	
2.3	Is the ToC simple and logic and are causalities and assumptions aligned with the results path as laid out in the Results Framework?	4	
2.4	Does the proposal include relevant exit strategies and considerations about the sustainability of proposed activities and results?	3	
2.5	How well does the proposal present assumptions and analysis of risk, and how appropriate are the risk mitigation proposed measures?	3	
	Subtotal	25	

3.	Implementation approach, reporting and management	Total score	Score
3.1	Does the proposal present a workable and appropriate methodology for the selection of beneficiaries? Does it present and argue well for the selected project locations?	4	
3.2	Does the proposal include local implementing partners?	3	
3.2	Does the proposal include an effective and efficient monitoring and reporting system, including adequate MEAL capacity and appropriate arrangements for monitoring project implementation in areas where access may be constrained by security conditions??	3	
3.3	How appropriate are the approaches to adaptability and flexibility that respond to possible contextual changes and lessons learned described in the proposal?	3	
3.4	Is the management set-up, including coordination between consortium members or intra-organisational coordination and quality assurance, clearly described and well adapted to the scope, volume, and context of the project?	2	
	Subtotal	15	
4.	Budget and cost-effectiveness	Total score	Score
4.1	Is the outcome-based budget structured in a comprehensible and structured manner, so outcomes and outputs are clearly reflected in the budget?	3	
4.2	How is expected efficiency and Value for Money consideration described?	2	
4.3	Are context-driven security-related operational costs for duty of care specified	3	
4.3	Is there an appropriate balance between operational costs and administrative costs in the budget? Note that administration costs cannot exceed 7% of total <u>direct</u> costs.	3	
4.4	Is the suggested financial accounting and reporting system able to demonstrate follow-up on the output-based budget?	4	
	Subtotal	15	
5.	Cross-cutting issues (green, gender, minorities)	Total score	
5.1	Does the proposal clearly and in relevant ways integrate issues on environment, climate change and gender equality as well as issues around minorities and youth?	5	
	Subtotal	5	

6.	Capacity (operational and financial)	Total score	
6.1	How convincing is the proposal in describing the capacity of the organisation or the lead applicant and consortium members in relation to the project and geographical area, including previous experience with the proposed types of activities as well as documented relevant experience, procedures and guidelines for project management?	10	
6.2	How well described is the applicant's management model in terms of roles and responsibilities as well as knowledge sharing between consortium members or the organisation and donors?	5	
6.3	What is the lead applicant's experience and capacity in terms of compliance with Danida Aid Management Guidelines or similar from other donors?	5	
6.4	Assessment of CVs for key staff of the organisation or the consortium lead: project manager, MEAL lead and head of finance/admin	5	
	Subtotal	25	
	Total	100	

Geographical and thematic coverage: The selection may comprise one or two projects. **In all cases, the selected projects taken together must ensure coverage of all three countries and both Specific Objectives (SOs).** Complementarity between the projects will therefore be taken into account in the selection process: if the first selected project does not cover all three countries and/or both SOs, the second project, if selected, must ensure that the remaining geographical and/or thematic coverage is addressed.