

## **Annex 5: Evaluation methodology and criteria for the review of the proposals and award**

Only proposals received within the stipulated time period will be accepted. To select the proposal, a “Competitive Screening Evaluation Team” (CSET) has been established. After the **eligibility** (please refer to the Applicant’s Self-Certification form) of the applicant is confirmed, CSET examines all proposals against the following criteria:

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Weight</b>
<p><b><u>Technical</u></b></p> <p><u>General description</u> Technical content and consistency with Project Concept Note, Terms of Reference and IFAD’s grant policy. The content should demonstrate a clear understanding of small scale fisheries value chains, and in particular, small fish species, presenting a clear and coherent approach and activities to deliver project results</p> <p><u>Specific evaluation component</u> 1.1 Quality and coherence of the overall approach proposed and alignment with the Concept Note 1.2 The proposal is properly focussed on activities to be undertaken (for each component) to reach the intended objectives and expected results 1.3 Relevance/ linkages to IFAD projects and/or fisheries development programmes in the selected countries 1.4 The proposal is properly set-up to reach women and youth in small fish species value chain 1.5 Feasibility within the timeframe available 1.6 Quality of plan of activities and products of Knowledge Management (KM) proposed 2 Innovations to be tested and developed</p>	35%
<p><b><u>Financial – Value for money</u></b></p> <p><u>General description</u> Value for money which does not necessarily mean going for the cheapest option, but making sure that IFAD gets the desired technical quality at the best price. This requires a judgment on whether the expected development benefits justify the costs.</p> <p><u>Specific evaluation component</u> 2.1 The budget is appropriately related to the objectives and it does reflect an efficient cost structure (cost-benefit ratio) 2.2 The proportion of total project costs and administrative overhead is adequate</p>	15%
<p><b><u>Financial – Co-financing ratio</u></b></p> <p><u>Specific evaluation component</u> 3.1 Level of own co-financing (own and mobilized, if properly demonstrated in the proposal)</p>	15%
<p><b><u>Institutional – Implementation Capacity</u></b></p>	25%

<p><u>General description</u> Capacity of the proposing organization (and of any associated implementation partner) to carry out the proposed activities and to account for funds should be demonstrated in the proposal documents. Capacity also means being able to implement across different countries and regions.</p> <p><u>Specific evaluation component</u> 4.1 Experience and technical capacity in fisheries development and generating results 4.2 Experience in the targeted countries either by physical presence or through partners within a consortium 4.3 Experience with fisheries programmes involving both state actors and fishing communities 4.4. Experience in brokering knowledge across several geographical contexts and foster south-south partnerships 4.5 Track record in financial management of grant resources and timely reporting on past project progresses and results 4.6 Capacity to ensure coordination of activities in targeted countries and working with national partners/networks 4.7 Capacity of in-house staff and adequacy of the team proposed (based on CVs of team members and staff proposed); Project Coordinator and key personnel have at least a relevant university degree and 2 years working experience 4.8 The partnership base of the proposing institution(s) with national, regional and international organizations/initiatives (based on letters of proposed partners confirming their participation)</p>	
<p><b><u>Institutional – Scaling-up/Sustainability</u></b></p> <p><u>Specific evaluation component</u> 5.1 Scaling-up proposed pathways (methods) 5.2 Partners identified for sustainability and scaling-up 5.3 How is sustainability pursued/ensured 5.4 Approach to develop Concept Note for future investment programme</p>	10%

The eligible proposals will be reviewed individually by at least three evaluators members of CSET. Each evaluator will review the submitted Design Document against the set evaluation criteria, and provide ratings and comments to justify the ratings. For each criterion, a score will be assigned. The application receiving the highest total score will be selected. No discussion will take place with the applicant on the substance of the proposals as long as the award has not been decided and internally approved.

Evaluators are expected to adhere to the following key principles:

- Impartiality - recipients are rated with same criteria.
- Sufficient time provided to grant applicants (minimum 3 weeks after Call for Proposals)
- Transparency - relevant documents are disclosed equally to all recipients. Evaluation criteria specified in the solicitation document. Feedback is provided.
- Good balance of skills in the reviewer committee. Ensure that appropriate records and data are maintained. Criteria ranking clearly articulated.

Applicants should note that, once selected, IFAD may require further refinements of the proposal throughout the internal review process, that the selected proposal will be subjected to prior review before submission for final approval.

In the event that only one applicant is considered eligible, a Direct Selection mechanism applies. In this case, the IFAD sponsor mobilizes the support of the Competitive Screening Evaluation Team to conduct a Review as per the evaluation criteria (specified above) to reach a conclusion on the value, merit and cost of the bid. The minutes of the meeting are prepared, submitted to the Division Director for agreement, and then made available to management for decision.