

Proposal Assessment Form

SECTION A: HARP-F reviewers should complete basic information and complete the Eligibility check in Part 2 BEFORE proceeding to Section B. If project or Partner is not eligible, please reject the application and do NOT complete Section B.

PART 1: BASIC PROJECT INFORMATION: Please complete using information from Proposal			
1.1	Partner Name		
1.2	Project Name		
1.3	Region (and localities if relevant)		
1.4	Sectors		
1.5	Total Funding Requested in GBP (and as a % of total project funds)		
1.6	Partner Contact Name & Email		
<p>PART 2: Eligibility: Complete this section to confirm eligibility of the Partner and application BEFORE proceeding to complete assessment. Narrative only required for any No (N) answers. If the Partner or project is ineligible, do NOT proceed with the assessment. Contact the Partner to advise of the reasons for the rejection of their application. Note that a project may be eligible under a different funding instrument or call; if so, note if referred or kept on file in 2.5.</p>			
2.1	<p>Is the Partner eligible?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partner is Registered (if applicable)? 	Yes/No	
2.2	Does the project meet geographic focus specified?	Yes/No	

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

2.3	Does the project meet thematic priorities specified?	Yes/No	
2.4	Does the project meet current humanitarian priorities?	Yes/No	
2.5	If project is considered ineligible, will this project be kept on file for future consideration or referred to a different funding instrument?	Yes/No	

SECTION B: HARP-F reviewers should evaluate the Proposal using the criteria in the questions below. For each question consider whether the proposal adequately addresses each key criterion and provide a brief narrative response. Using the scale below, indicate your rating for each criterion. At the end of each section, total the points for each section as indicated in the Total Score box. In Section 8, include any “red flag” issues that must be addressed by the partner (irrespective of scoring) before contracting can begin. The Grant Manager will use these points to follow-up with the partner.

	Rating	Evidenced by
4	Strongly Support	Responses are clear and easily understood; no or minimal clarification required; Reviewer has full confidence in the partner’s ability to understand these issues and to deliver accordingly.
3	Support	Response requires clarification and some revision. The partner/proposal has not fully addressed the points, or some doubt remains as to whether they have understood the importance of these issues.
2	Low Support	Significant revision required to meet HARP-F standards. Major gaps are present in the partner’s response and/or track record in this area. Proposal (or partner) likely to require too much development to be viable at this time.
1	Not Supported	Proposal does not demonstrate any of the required criteria and standards.

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government’s official policies

PART 3: RELEVANCE AND IMPACT: <i>Please provide brief narrative response to each question demonstrating how well proposal addresses each point. In the RATING section, please complete with a rating of Strongly Support, Support, Low Support or Not Supported as explained above.</i>		Rating
IMPORTANT: Complete Section 8 to indicate any “Red Flag” issues that must be addressed prior to contracting.		
3.1	How well does the project meet one or more of HARP-F's five key objectives? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Better support to protect and provide basic services to vulnerable people living in protracted crises. 2. Stronger capacity of FCDO and partners to meet acute spikes in humanitarian need. 3. Better accountability, coordination, and coherence of the humanitarian system in Myanmar. 4. Improved approaches to address long term drivers of humanitarian need and disaster risk and actions that build resilience. 5. Better focus on generation of evidence and synthesis of learning on what works in humanitarian programming in Myanmar. 	
3.2	How well does the proposal evidence a need and outline target beneficiaries?	
3.3	How well does the proposal outline a clear strategy for addressing these needs and articulate the impact?	
3.4	Is the project cash based? If the project isn't cash based, is there adequate explanation for this?	

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

3.5	Has a thorough stakeholder analysis been completed? To what extent is ownership and participation of key stakeholders evident?		
<p>TOTAL SCORE PART 3:</p> <p><i>Determine the numerical simple average score for the section as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Add up the ratings for each question using the ratings box above (i.e., 4 for strongly support, 3 for support, 2 for low etc.) and indicate the total to the right.</i> <i>Divide by the total number of questions (for Part 3 this is 5)</i> <i>Indicate the numerical average (up to 2 decimal places) in the box to the right</i> <p><i>Example: If all responses are “support”, total = 15; 15/5 = 3</i></p>			
<p>QA COMMENTS PART 3: <i>Please indicate agreement or changes with rating in narrative format and adjust scoring box as applicable</i></p>			
<p>PART 4: REGIONAL CONTEXT: <i>Please provide brief narrative response to each question demonstrating how well proposal addresses each point. In the RATING section, please complete with a rating of Strongly Support, Support, Low Support or Not Supported as explained above.</i></p> <p>IMPORTANT: <i>Complete Section 8 to indicate any “Red Flag” issues that must be addressed prior to contracting.</i></p>			Rating
4.1	How well does the proposal demonstrate the partner’s understanding of current contextual and environmental issues?		
4.2	How well does the proposal demonstrate knowledge of		

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government’s official policies

	other regional humanitarian projects? Does the project fill a gap and avoid duplicating existing work?		
4.3	Does the Partner have a track record of working within the specified location(s) and/or sector(s)?		
4.4	Will the project localize components and is the method for achieving this reasonable?		
4.5	Will the project build the capacity of any partner organizations? If yes, are plans well-articulated, achievable, and measurable?		
4.6	How well does the project build resilience?		
<p>TOTAL SCORE PART 4:</p> <p><i>Determine the numerical simple average score for the section as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Add up the ratings for each question using the ratings box above (i.e., 4 for strongly support, 3 for support, 2 for low etc.) and indicate the total to the right.</i> <i>Divide by the total number of questions (for Part 4 this is 6)</i> <i>Indicate the numerical average (up to 2 decimal places) in the box to the right</i> <p><i>Example: If all responses are “support”, total = 18; 18/6 = 3</i></p>			
<p>QA COMMENTS PART 4: <i>Please indicate agreement or changes with rating in narrative format and adjust scoring box as applicable</i></p>			

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

PART 5: BUDGET & VALUE FOR MONEY: Please provide brief narrative response to each question demonstrating how well the proposal addresses each point. In the RATING section, please complete ONLY with a rating of Strongly Support, Support, Low Support or Not Supported as explained above.		Rating
IMPORTANT: Complete Section 8 to indicate any “Red Flag” issues that must be addressed prior to contracting.		
5.1	Is the budget coherent, complete, and transparent? (Formulas are correct and all expected components are present).	
5.2	Is the budget reasonable, realistic, and sufficient to achieve stated objective?	
5.3	Are costs in line with similar projects funded in the area?	
5.4	Are all the expenses allowable under the FCDO regulations? Are any on the list of “unallowable costs”?	
<p>TOTAL SCORE PART 5:</p> <p>Determine the numerical simple average score for the section as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Add up the ratings for each question using the ratings box above (i.e., 4 for strongly support, 3 for support, 2 for low etc.) and indicate the total to the right. Divide by the total number of questions (for Part 5 this is 4) Indicate the numerical average (up to 2 decimal places) in the box to the right <p>Example: If all responses are “support”, total = 12; 12/4 = 3</p>		

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

	QA COMMENTS PART 5: <i>Please indicate agreement or changes with rating in narrative format and adjust scoring box as applicable</i>		
<p>PART 6: TECHNICAL REVIEW & ABILITY TO DELIVER: <i>Please provide brief narrative response to each question demonstrating how well proposal addresses each point. In the RATING section, please complete ONLY with a rating of Strongly Support, Support, Low Support or Not Supported as explained above.</i></p> <p>IMPORTANT: <i>Complete Section 8 to indicate any “Red Flag” issues that must be addressed prior to contracting.</i></p>			Rating
6.1	Is the project design coherent? How well is the methodology explained?		
6.2	Are there clear milestones and are timeframes realistic?		
6.3	How well are activities and outcomes articulated in the logframe?		
6.4	Does the proposal consider major risks to delivery? Are plans and tools in place to report on and mitigate risks?		
6.5	How will the project address gender and inclusion barriers?		
6.6	How well does the project demonstrate a Conflict Sensitive approach and comply with the principals of Do No Harm?		
TOTAL SCORE PART 6:			

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

<p><i>Determine the numerical simple average score for the section as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Add up the ratings for each question using the ratings box above (i.e., 4 for strongly support, 3 for support, 2 for low etc.) and indicate the total to the right.</i> <i>Divide by the total number of questions (for Part 6 this is 7)</i> <i>Indicate the numerical average (up to 2 decimal places) in the box to the right</i> <p><i>Example: If all responses are “support”, total = 21; 21/7= 3</i></p>		
<p>QA COMMENTS PART 6: <i>Please indicate agreement or changes with rating in narrative format and adjust scoring box as applicable</i></p>		
<p>PART 7: MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING: <i>Please provide brief narrative response to each question demonstrating how well proposal addresses each point. In the RATING section, please complete with a rating of Strongly Support, Support, Low Support or Not Supported as explained above.</i></p> <p>IMPORTANT: <i>Complete Section 8 to indicate any “Red Flag” issues that must be addressed prior to contracting.</i></p>		Rating
7.1	Is a Monitoring & Evaluation framework provided and is it appropriate for the project?	
7.2	Is budget allocated to Monitoring & Evaluation?	
7.3	Does the Monitoring & Evaluation framework support adaptive programming?	
7.4	Do project activities demonstrate sufficient accountability to affected populations?	

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

<p>TOTAL SCORE PART 7:</p> <p><i>Determine the numerical simple average score for the section as follows:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Add up the ratings for each question using the ratings box above (i.e., 4 for strongly support, 3 for support, 2 for low etc.) and indicate the total to the right.</i> <i>Divide by the total number of questions (for Part 7 this is 4)</i> <i>Indicate the numerical average (up to 2 decimal places) in the box to the right</i> <p><i>Example: If all responses are “support”, total = 12; 12/4 = 3</i></p>	
<p>QA COMMENTS PART 7: <i>Please indicate agreement or changes with rating in narrative format and adjust scoring box as applicable</i></p>	
<p>PART 8: SUMMARY AND FOLLOW-UP:</p> <p>“RED FLAG” COMMENTS REVIEWER(S): <i>Note below any critical points from your review of the proposal that must be addressed by the partner before contracting can begin (irrespective of total score).</i></p> <p><i>Examples of “red flags” include (but are not limited to):</i></p> <p><i>These items will be queried with the Partner by the Grants Team to ensure they are sufficiently addressed.</i></p> <p><i>Please try to word your comments as a question requiring a clear response or action from the Partner rather than simply noting your disagreement with a statement made in the proposal. General comments can be included above; this section is for points requiring a specific response.</i></p>	
PART	Comments
Part 3: Relevance and Impact	
Part 4: Regional Context	

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

Part 5: Budget			
Part 6: Technical			
Part 7: Monitoring and Evaluation			
FINAL COMMENTS QA			
<p>FINAL RATINGS:</p> <p><i>To determine final rating:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Insert Average Rating for each Part in appropriate box</i> <i>2. Determine if any Part will be weighted differently. Default is 0.20 (20%) weighting for each section. Any change in weighting of a Part must have a corresponding change in another Part: in other words, total weighting must always = 1 (100%)</i> <i>3. Calculate Final Score for each Part by multiplying the Average Score by the Weighting</i> <i>4. Add Final Scores for a Total Numerical Score</i> <i>5. Convert numerical score to Rating (Strongly Support, Support, etc)</i> 			
PART	Average Score	Weighting	Final Score
Part 3: Relevance & Impact		.20	
Part 4: Regional Context		.20	
Part 5: Budget		.20	
Part 6: Technical		.20	
Part 7: M&E		.20	

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies

FINAL RATING		
PART 9: PROPOSAL REVIEW MEETING		
GENERAL COMMENTS note any general comments from the review meeting		
KEY PROJECT RISKS		
PROPOSAL DECISION: Recommend or not recommend for funding		
Decision signed off by:		Date:

Supported by



This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK government; however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies