



**The
Pandemic
Fund**
FOR A RESILIENT WORLD



Annex 3: TAP Evaluation Scoring and Weighting Methodology

The Scoring Card will be used by the TAP to evaluate the proposals. Each Proposal will be reviewed for both qualitative and quantitative strengths, based on:

Section	Total Score	% of Total*
A. Context rational, objectives & demonstrated need	25	20%
B. Scope, Priority areas/Core Capacities/Alignment with and contribution to the PF Results Framework/Monitoring and Evaluation	20	15%
C. Ownership, Commitment and Co-investment	20	15%
D. Co-financing and overall available funding	20	15%
E. Coordination, collaboration, and co-creation	20	15%
F. Implementation	25	20%
TOTAL	130	100%

*Percentages have been rounded

A. Context, rationale, objectives and demonstrated need: (Total Score of 25)

1. Does the project focus on a country/region which is exposed to epidemic risks and vulnerabilities, according to internationally recognized epidemic indices?

- Yes
- No

2. Has the country (-ies) conducted a JEE and/or prepared a NAPHS, implementation roadmaps, National Bridging Workshop (NBW) Roadmaps, SPAR or other relevant national and/or regional plans, or equivalent? If no assessments have been conducted yet, were critical pandemic PPR capacity gaps identified in the country and is there a good plan being proposed to assess the gaps identified later by applying a valid methodology?

- **Yes**, a JEE and/or prepared a NAPHS, implementation roadmaps, National Bridging Workshop (NBW) Roadmaps, SPAR or other relevant national and/or regional plans was conducted
- **No**, a JEE and/or prepared a NAPHS, implementation roadmaps, National Bridging Workshop (NBW) Roadmaps, SPAR or other relevant national and/or regional plans was not conducted but there is a clear plan being proposed to identify gaps and assess the pandemic PPR gaps with a valid methodology
- **No**, a JEE and/or prepared a NAPHS, implementation roadmaps, National Bridging Workshop (NBW) Roadmaps, SPAR or other relevant national and/or regional plans was not conducted and there is no plan to conduct any assessments in the future

3. Does the proposal clearly articulate the objectives and actions in line with the above identified gaps?

- The proposal links 100% of the objectives with the identified gaps
- The proposal links greater than 75% of its objectives with the identified gaps
- The proposal links between 50-75% of the objectives with the identified gaps but there are large gaps identified
- The proposal links less than 50% of the objectives with the identified gaps

4. During the inception phase of the project, does the project clearly outline how the national priorities were aligned and coordinated with local needs, other ministries, beneficiaries, stakeholders, partners civil society, vulnerable groups, populations who are marginalized, Implementing Entities, etc.

- Yes
- No

5. Does the proposal complement the efforts/ongoing activities of existing actors who are engaged in pandemic PPR capacity building at the country or regional level?

- The proposal clearly outlines efforts/ongoing activities of existing actors within the country/region engaged in pandemic PPR capacity building at the country or regional levels and articulates how it is complementary
- The proposal partially outlines efforts/ongoing activities of existing actors within the country/region engaged in pandemic PPR capacity building at the country or regional levels and articulates how it is complementary
- The proposal barely outlines efforts/ongoing activities of existing actors within the country/region engaged in pandemic PPR capacity building at the country or regional levels and articulates how it is complementary

6. Does the proposal clearly demonstrate how the proposed activities strengthen and build upon already existing systems and programs within the country or region's pandemic PPR agenda such as One-Health, Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR), or primary health care (PHC).

- The proposal clearly provides links of how the proposed activities strengthen and build upon already existing systems and programs within the country or region's pandemic PPR agenda and specifically highlights 4 or more areas
- The proposal clearly provides links of how the proposed activities strengthen and build upon already existing systems and programs within the country or region's pandemic PPR agenda and specifically highlights 3 or more areas
- The proposal clearly provides links of how the proposed activities strengthen and build upon already existing systems and programs within the country or region's pandemic PPR agenda and highlights less than 2 areas

7. Does the proposal provide a clear overview of how this project fits within the broader public health landscape of the country or region with specific focus of how funding from the Pandemic Fund will provide catalytic value?

- The proposal clearly provides an overview of how this project fits within the broader public health landscape of the country or region with specific focus of how funding from the PF will provide catalytic value
- The proposal does not clearly provide an overview of how this project fits within the broader public health landscape of the country or region and does not clearly articulate how funding from the PF will provide catalytic value

Key observations and notes for consideration:

B. Scope, Priority areas/Core Capacities/Alignment with and contribution to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework/Monitoring and Evaluation (Total Score of 20)

1. Does the project provide detailed descriptions of activities which are technically strong and feasible that are aligned to country-level/regional plans and prioritizations?

- 100% of the detailed activities are technically strong, feasible and aligned to country-level/subnational/regional plans and prioritizations
- Approximately 75% of the detailed activities are technically strong, feasible and aligned to country-level/subnational/regional plans and prioritizations
- Approximately 50% of the detailed activities are technically strong, feasible and aligned to country-level/subnational/regional plans and prioritizations
- Between 20-50% of detailed activities are technically strong, feasible and aligned to country-level/subnational/regional plans and prioritizations
- Less than 20% of the detailed activities are technically strong, feasible and aligned to country-level/subnational/regional plans and prioritizations

2. Does the project present a clear theory of change for how the resources requested will strengthen pandemic PPR, including a set of intended results that are specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound, aligned with the Pandemic Fund's Results Framework measured by a clear set of indicators that are sex and/or gender disaggregated (where applicable) and are clear areas of impact articulated including highlighting how the activities will impact vulnerable groups and populations who are marginalized?

- There is nearly 100% alignment between the theory of change, the Pandemic Funds Results Framework and clear areas of impact
- There is between 50-75% alignment between the theory of change, the Pandemic Funds Results Framework and clear areas of impact
- There is less than 50% alignment between the theory of change, the Pandemic Funds Results Framework and clear areas of impact

3. Does the proposal provide a clear, costed plan for how and when monitoring and evaluation will be carried out for the project, including the specific activities financed by the grant, as well as how learnings will take place and what processes will be used to monitor whether progress is / is not on track?

- There is a clear plan which fully demonstrates how short-term, medium-term and long-term achievements and results will be monitored and evaluated against clearly defined targets with a feedback mechanism for lessons learned
- There is a clear plan but it only partially demonstrates how short-term, medium-term and long-term achievements and results will be monitored and evaluated, and only partially articulates lessons learned feedback mechanism
- The plan is not clear and it does not adequately demonstrates short-term, medium-term and long-term achievements and results against clearly defined targets nor does it have a clear articulation of how this will be monitored, evaluated, with lessons learned feedback mechanism

4. Does the proposal articulate how country and/or regional investments, including those financed by Pandemic Fund grants, will help strengthen core capacities and achieve one or more of the focus technical areas of the JEE 3rd edition tool outlined in the call for proposals along one or more of the identified priorities?

- The proposal clearly describes how country and/or regional investments will strengthen core capacities along more than one of the identified priorities
- The proposal poorly describes how country and/or regional investments will strengthen core capacities

5. If the country has conducted a JEE and/or PVS:

5.1 How well does the proposal articulate how investments will contribute to progress towards a demonstrated level of capacity (goal of level 4 or 5) in one or more of the focus technical areas of the JEE 3rd edition tool and/or PVS listed below:

- a. Surveillance systems and early warning systems
 - i. JEE D2.1 Early warning surveillance function
 - ii. JEE D2.2 Event verification and investigation
 - iii. JEE D2.3 Analysis and information sharing
 - iv. JEE P4.2 Surveillance of AMR
 - v. JEE P5.1 Surveillance of zoonotic disease
 - vi. JEE PoE1 Core capacity requirements at all times for PoEs (airports, ports and ground crossings)
 - vii. PVS II-3 Quarantine and border security
 - viii. PVS II-4 Surveillance and early detection
 - ix. PVS II-9 Antimicrobial resistance and antimicrobial use
- b. Laboratory Systems
 - i. JEE D1.1 Specimen referral and transport system
 - ii. JEE D1.2 Laboratory quality system
 - iii. JEE D1.3 Laboratory testing capacity modalities
 - iv. JEE D1.4 Effective national diagnostic network
 - v. JEE P7.1 Whole-of-government biosafety and biosecurity system is in place for human, animal and agriculture facilities
 - vi. JEE P7.2 Biosafety and biosecurity training and practices in all relevant sectors (including human, animal and agriculture)
 - vii. PVS II-1 Veterinary laboratory diagnosis
- c. Human Resources/Workforce Strengthening
 - i. JEE D3.1 Multisectoral workforce strategy
 - ii. D3.2 Human resources for implementation of IHR
 - iii. D3.3 Workforce training
 - iv. PVS I-1 Professional and technical staffing of the Veterinary Services
 - v. PVS I-2 Competency and education of veterinarians and veterinary paraprofessionals
 - vi. PVS I-3 Continuing education

5.2. How well does the proposal articulate how investments will contribute to progress towards a demonstrated level of capacity (goal of level 4 or 5) in any additional areas outlined in the Pandemic Fund Results Framework, linked and those outlined below (as applicable). This is not the primary objective but demonstrates the cross-cutting nature of the proposal.

- d. Infection Prevention and Control (IPC)**
 - i. R4.1 - IPC programmes
 - ii. R4.2 - HCAI surveillance
 - iii. R4.3 - Safe environment in health facilities
- e. Risk communication and community engagement (RCCE)**
 - i. R5.1 - RCCE system for emergencies
 - ii. R5.2 - Risk communication
 - iii. R5.3 - Community engagement
- f. Additional capacities related to Zoonotic Diseases**
 - i. P5.2 - Responding to zoonotic diseases
 - ii. P5.3 - Sanitary animal production practices
- g. Health Emergency Management [including Medical Countermeasures]**
 - i. R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4, R1.5 - Emergency Preparedness
 - ii. R3.3 - Continuity of essential health services (EHS)
 - iii. PoE 2 - Public health response at points of entry
- h. Immunization [including capacity for mass vaccination]**
 - i. P8.1- Vaccine's coverage (measles) as part of national programme
 - ii. P8.2 - National vaccine access and delivery
 - iii. P8.3 - Mass vaccination for epidemics of VPDs
- d. Other (please identify)**

6. If a JEE or PVS has not been conducted, were other internationally known assessments such as SPAR used and how well does the proposal articulate how investments, including those financed by Pandemic Fund grants, will help strengthen core capacities along one or more of the identified priorities ?

- a. Policy, Legal and normative Instruments to implement IHR
- b. IHR Coordination, National IHR Focal Point functions and advocacy
- c. Financing
- d. Laboratory
- e. Surveillance
- f. Human Resources
- g. Health emergency management
- h. Health services provision

- i. Infection prevention and control (IPC)
- j. Risk communication and community engagement (RCCE)
- k. Points of entry (PoEs) and border health
- l. Zoonotic diseases
- m. Food safety
- n. Chemical events

7. If there are currently no national assessments conducted, does the proposal clearly articulate its plans to do this as part of the proposal including how they will measure impact?

For questions 5.1-7:

- There is 100% alignment between how the investments will contribute to progress towards a demonstrated level of capacity (goal of level 4 or 5) in one or more of the focus technical areas of the JEE 3rd edition tool and/or PVS, SPAR or other internationally recognized assessment tools with clear justifications describing which assessment is being used, why and how impact will be demonstrated
- There is 80% alignment between how the investments will contribute to progress towards a demonstrated level of capacity (goal of level 4 or 5) in one or more of the focus technical areas of the JEE 3rd edition tool and/or PVS, SPAR or other internationally recognized assessment tools with clear justifications describing which assessment is being used, why and how impact will be demonstrated
- There are no national assessments conducted to date, but the proposal clearly outlines when and how the assessment will be undertaken and clearly articulates a plan to link the key technical areas with the assessments and how impact will be measured
- There is less than 60% alignment between how the investments will contribute to progress towards a demonstrated level of capacity (goal of level 4 or 5) in one or more of the focus technical areas of the JEE 3rd edition tool and/or PVS, SPAR or other internationally recognized assessment tools with clear justifications describing which assessment is being used, why and how impact will be demonstrated
- There are no national assessments conducted to date and the proposal does not clearly outline when and how the assessment will be undertaken nor clearly articulate a plan to link the key technical areas with the assessments and how impact will be measured

Key observations and notes for consideration:

C. Ownership, Commitment and Co-investment: (Total Score of 20)

1. Was the project developed in a way that the country owned and led the process and is it clear that the country will continue to lead the process moving forward through implementation?

- Yes
- No
- Country is considered affected by fragility conflict and violence, with strong international support of IE and international community

2. Does the project incentivize countries / Regional Entities to increase and sustain their own efforts in pandemic PPR and health (e.g., is the applicant country/Entity providing a clear plan for co-investment)?

- a. Clear articulation of planned Co-investment (in-kind and financial) and a clear description of how the country's and/or Regional Entity's contribution will be sustained and/or augmented, and financed, over time, beyond project completion
- b. Some articulation of planned Co-investment (in-kind and financial) and some description of how the country's and/or Regional Entity's contribution will be sustained and/or augmented, and financed, over time, beyond project completion
- c. Unclear articulation of planned Co-investment (in-kind and financial) and unclear description of how the country's and/or Regional Entity's contribution will be sustained and/or augmented, and financed, over time, beyond project completion

3. Are new and legacy policy commitments clearly articulated in the proposal with a view of ensuring sustainability of impact (through continued financial and/or policy commitments)?

- Policy commitments both new and legacy are clearly articulated in proposal with a clear view of ensuring sustainability of the project
- Policy commitments both new and legacy are not clearly articulated but implied throughout the proposal with a clear view of ensuring sustainability of the project
- Policy commitments both new and legacy are not clearly articulated

4. *Financial and policy/in-kind contributions:* If a country is not in debt distress or at risk of being in debt distress, are there clear plans for financial co-investment and in-kind co-investment to support the activities over the project period? If the country is in debt distress or at risk of being in debt distress, are there clear plans for policy/in-kind co-investment to support the activities over the project period?

- There is full confidence that there are planned co-investments to support the required activities
- There is strong confidence that there are planned co-investments to support the required activities
- There is average confidence that there are planned co-investments to support the required activities
- There is low confidence that there are planned co-investments to support the required activities
- There is no confidence that there are planned co-investments to support the required activities

5. Is the co-investment amount (s) clearly indicated in the cost tables and if available, clearly linked to JEE, PVS, SPAR, 7-1-7 and other assessments and metrics?

- Co-investment amounts are clearly detailed in the proposal in cost tables and linked to assessments
- Co-investment amounts are not clearly detailed in the proposal in cost tables and not linked to assessments

Key observations and notes for consideration:

D. Co-financing and overall available funding (Total Score of 20)

1. Does the project demonstrate how Pandemic Fund grants will be leveraged to mobilize new, additional resources through co-financing? (i.e. What is the leverage ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant amount to MDB loans/credits mobilized?)

- Total value (in-kind and financial) of Co-financing available is 3x or more than the value of funding requested from the Pandemic Fund , with some monetary contributions]
- Total value (in-kind and financial) of Co-financing available is 2x or more than the value of funding requested from the Pandemic Fund [with some monetary contributions]
- Total value (in-kind and financial) of Co-financing available is 1x or more than the value of funding requested from the Pandemic Fund [some monetary contributions]
- Total value (in-kind and financial) of Co-financing available is less than the value of funding requested from the Pandemic Fund [with some monetary contributions]
- Total value (in-kind and financial) of Co-financing available is less than 50% of the value of funding requested from the Pandemic Fund [with some monetary contributions]
- Only in-kind contributions are available
- There is no co-financing

*The multipliers may be adjusted downward at the discretion of the TAP based on its assessment and other considerations such as: off-cycle budget planning of IEs, size of grant requested.

2. Are co-financing commitments clearly described by entity, components, and activities across the project life cycle?

- All co-financing commitments are clearly described by entity, components and activities across the entire project life-cycle
- 75% of the co-financing commitments are clearly described by entity, components and activities across the entire project life-cycle
- 50% of the co-financing commitments are clearly described by entity, components and activities across the entire project life-cycle
- 25% of the co-financing commitments are clearly described by entity, components and activities across the entire project life-cycle
- Co-financing commitments are not clearly described by entity, components and activities across the entire project life-cycle

3. Does the proposal clearly articulate how co-financing for the project will be mobilized from various sources (in addition to the Pandemic Fund grant), including new financing, reprogramming of financing, and/or a combination of both?

- The proposal clearly describes how new financing will be mobilized in addition to the Pandemic Fund grant.
- The proposal does not describe how new financing will be mobilized in addition to the Pandemic Fund grant.

4. Is there adequate financing to fulfill all short-term and long-term objectives of the project to ensure financial sustainability (this includes all sources of funding including co-financing, co-investment and financing from the Pandemic Fund)?

- The project fully demonstrates that financing will fulfill all short-term and long-term objectives of the project to ensure financial sustainability based on the proposal
- The project strongly demonstrates that financing will fulfill all short-term and long-term objectives of the project to ensure financial sustainability based on the proposal
- The project moderately demonstrates is average confidence that financing will fulfill all short-term and long-term objectives of the project to ensure financial sustainability based on the proposal
- There is low confidence that financing will fulfill all short-term and long-term objectives of the project to ensure financial sustainability based on the proposal
- There is no confidence that financing will fulfill all short-term and long-term objectives of the project to ensure financial sustainability based on the proposal

Key observations and notes for consideration:

E. Coordination, collaboration, and co-creation: (Total Score of 20)

1. Does the proposal bring together key institutions and actors, including Implementing Entities, civil society and non-state actors engaged in pandemic PPR (including human, animal and environmental health) to ensure a co-created, coordinated and coherent approach between and among the applicant(s) and partners (e.g., by aligning support of different partners around a government strategy or plan, leveraging innovation and/or triggering new government commitments and actions), with a strong explanation of how this coordination was done and how it will be carried through to implementation?

- The proposal clearly articulates how it was co-created and coordinated to ensure a coherent approach between and among the applicant and partners by specifically outlining and elaborating at least 5 ways in which innovation was used, how partners worked together to support the government strategy, how new government actions and commitments were triggered, etc. The proposal also clearly outlines at least 5 ways how coordination will be carried through to implementation
- The proposal clearly articulates how it was co-created and coordinated to ensure a coherent approach between and among the applicant and partners by specifically outlining and elaborating at least 4 ways in which innovation was used, how partners worked together to support the government strategy, how new government actions and commitments were triggered, etc. The proposal also clearly outlines at least 4 ways how coordination will be carried through to implementation
- The proposal clearly articulates how it was co-created and coordinated to ensure a coherent approach between and among the applicant and partners by specifically outlining and elaborating at least 3 ways in which innovation was used, how partners worked together to support the government strategy, how new government actions and commitments were triggered, etc. The proposal also clearly outlines at least 3 ways how coordination will be carried through to implementation
- The proposal partially articulates how it was co-created and coordinated to ensure a coherent approach between and among the applicant and partners and outlines and elaborates less than 3 ways in which innovation was used, how partners worked together to support the government strategy, how new government actions and commitments were triggered, etc. The proposal also clearly outlines at least 2 ways how coordination will be carried through to implementation
- The proposal does not clearly articulate how it was co-created and coordinated to ensure a coherent approach between and among the applicant and partners, nor does it demonstrate how coordination will be carried through to implementation

2. Does the proposal involve collaboration between one or more Implementing Entities?

- The proposal and subsequent implementation includes two or more Implementing Entities
- The proposal and subsequent implementation includes less than two Implementing Entities

3. Was the project developed in a way that included multiple relevant sectors in the development process and implementation and were these sectors clearly explained?

- The proposal and subsequent implementation includes all relevant sectors
- The proposal and subsequent implementation includes some relevant sectors
- The proposal and subsequent implementation includes minimal involvement with relevant sectors

4. Was the project developed in an inclusive and participatory manner including the involvement of CSOs, community organizations, vulnerable groups and populations who are marginalized in proposal development, including details of how all actors have been involved in the proposal preparation? There should be a clear description of the following activities, and one point will be allocated for each of these activities carried out credibly:

- An open invitation opportunity was issued for any/all local civil society and vulnerable groups and populations who are marginalized to provide input during proposal development, with a reasonable timeframe for response.
- At least one consultation meeting held with CSO and community representatives and populations who are marginalized to seek their inputs during the proposal development process
- CSO inputs were reflected in final proposal
- Proposal contains endorsement from multiple CSO representatives engaged in the process, attesting to the quality of the engagement
- Proposal contains endorsement from multiple leaders from key populations who are marginalized attesting to the quality of the engagement.

5. Was the project developed in a way that integrates considerations around gender, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, human rights and broader equity challenges?

- Gender equality, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, human rights and broader equity considerations are core fundamental considerations articulated throughout the entire proposal and plan
- Gender equality, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, human rights and broader equity considerations appear to be core fundamental considerations but are clearly articulated in 75% of the proposal and plan
- Gender equality, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, human rights and broader equity considerations appear to be core fundamental considerations but are only clearly articulated in 50% of the proposal and plan
- Gender equality, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, human rights and broader equity considerations appear to be core fundamental considerations but are only clearly articulated in 25% of the proposal and plan
- Gender equality, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, human rights and broader equity considerations are not included or clearly articulated in the proposal and plan

Key observations and notes for consideration:

E. Implementation (Total Score of 25)

1. Does the project detail a plan with intended results that are operationally feasible, linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and Co-investment/Co-financing Principles (Annex 4) and can be implemented within the timeframe?

- The project plan and associated results are operationally feasible within the timeline and resources with no expected challenges in achieving outcomes
- The project plan and associated results are mostly operationally feasible within the timeline and resources with some minor expected challenges in achieving outcomes
- The project plan and associated results are operationally feasible within the timeline and resources with some major challenges expected in achieving outcomes
- It is expected that the project plan and associated results will have major challenges within the timeline and resources but it is achievable if modifications are made
- It is expected that the project plan and associated results will have significantly challenges within the timeline and resources

2. Does the project clearly articulate how during the project implementation process, there will be a division of labor for activities and costs including accountability within and across countries (as necessary), IEs, stakeholders, sectors, civil society, etc. Including describing the roles, such as delivery partner?

- All activities, costs and accountabilities are clearly outlined in the proposal
- Many of the activities, costs and accountabilities are clearly outlined in the proposal
- Few activities, costs and accountabilities are outlined in the proposal

3. Does the project ensure and prioritize the use of resources in an efficient manner, adhering to principles of “value for money”, e.g., are administrative costs related to preparation, implementation, and supervision by involved Implementing Entities kept to a minimal level?¹

- A focus on ensuring the use of efficient resources and “value for money” is clearly articulated throughout the entire proposal
- There is minimal focus on ensuring the efficient use of resources and “value for money” throughout the proposal

4. Does the project clearly identify opportunities it plans to maximize / leverage within the project?

- Opportunities have been identified and plans to maximize / leverage them in the project have been clearly articulated in the proposal
- Few or no opportunities have been identified and there are no plans to maximize / leverage them articulated in the project

1. “Value for money” is the “effective, efficient, and economic use of resources, which requires the evaluation of relevant costs and benefits, along with an assessment of risks, and non-price attributes and/or life cycle costs, as appropriate.” – From World Bank Guidance on Value for Money: Achieving ViM in Investment Projects Financed by the World Bank <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/274711479159288956-0290022017/original/GuidanceNoteonValueforMoney.pdf>

5. Does the project clearly identify key risks related to implementation including presenting how they will be managed and mitigated? (i.e., financial risks such as misuse and wasteful use of funding, fraud, corruption, terrorist financing; operational risks, political and governance risks)

- All foreseeable risks are clearly articulated in the proposal
- Some foreseeable risks are clearly articulated in the proposal
- Risks are not adequately articulated in the proposal

6. Does the project clearly outline how it will ensure safeguards including environmental, social, gender-related, populations who are vulnerable and marginalized, data-sharing, governance and other relevant safeguards?

- All safeguards are clearly articulated in the proposal
- Most safeguards are clearly articulated in the proposal
- Some safeguards are clearly articulated in the proposal
- Few of the safeguards are articulated in the proposal
- Safeguards are not adequately articulated in the proposal

7. Does the proposal clearly indicate how CSOs, community organizations and vulnerable groups and populations who are marginalized will be involved in implementation?

- Inclusivity among and between local CSOs and community organizations are core to the plan. CSOs and community organizations have a clearly articulated and substantial role in plan implementation, including accountability monitoring
- Inclusivity among and between local CSOs and community organizations is given fundamental consideration in the plan. CSOs and community organizations have a clearly articulated and substantial role in plan implementation, but are not included in mechanisms for ensuring accountability
- Inclusivity among and between local CSOs and community organizations is incorporated into the plan, but the role for CSOs and community organizations is minor or not clearly articulated
- Inclusivity among and between local CSOs and community organizations are not included or clearly articulated in the proposal and plan

8. Does the proposal adequately describe how it will build capacity, structures, and processes, that will lead to institutionalization and long-term change within the country and/or region?

- The proposal clearly details specific examples of how it will build capacity, structures, and processes, that will lead to long-term change
- The proposal moderately describes examples of how it will build capacity, structures, and processes that will lead to long-term change
- The proposal does not describe how it will build capacity, structures, and processes that will lead to long-term change

Key observations and notes for consideration: