

**AIC INTERNATIONAL TWINNING PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM
 CRITERIA FOR ASSESSING
 2011-16 PROJECT PROPOSALS**

EXCELLENT = 5 ACCEPTABLE = 3 FOLLOW-UP NEEDED = 0

CATEGORY (Include notes for reference with ratings)	EXCELLENT	ACCEPTABLE	FOLLOW-UP NEEDED
1. COMPLETENESS OF PROPOSAL PACKAGE (OVERVIEW)			
Part I Partner Profiles			
Part II Concept			
Part III Detailed Presentation			
Part IV Investment Risk Register			
Part V Performance Measurement Framework			
Part VI Budget			
Letters of Commitment from Partner Organizations			
2. CAPACITY TO MANAGE PROPOSED PROJECT			
a) Are the roles of the Partner Organizations clear?			
b) Are reporting channels between the Partner Organization and Project Coordinators in place?			
c) Do Coordination Team members hold sufficient project management skills and experience?			
d) Do Coordination Team members hold sufficient technical and scientific skills and experience?			
e) Are financial management systems adequate?			
f) Have both Canadian and Overseas partners demonstrated capacity to meet in-kind requirements?			

CATEGORY (Include notes for reference with ratings)	EXCELLENT	ACCEPTABLE	FOLLOW-UP NEEDED
3. DEVELOPMENTAL VIABILITY OF PROPOSED PROJECT			
a) For on-going projects, is there a demonstrated connection between past successes and this new proposal?			
b) For on-going projects, does this proposal recognize and build on past partnerships?			
c) For new projects, is there a demonstrated connection between the feasibility report and this new proposal?			
d) Does the proposal demonstrate involvement of stakeholders (including beneficiaries) in its planning?			
e) Is the continuity clear from the identified needs of beneficiaries, to the methodology of the descriptive project outline, to the concise statements of immediate outcomes?			
f) Do the project's Immediate Outcomes have a clearly defined current benchmark and express the state of change envisioned as a result of the project?			
g) Do the project's Immediate Outcomes for Organizational change directly respond to the Program-level Intermediate Organizational Outcome?			
h) Has the project included at least one other Program-level Intermediate Outcome in its proposal?			
i) Do the project's other Immediate Outcomes directly respond to the other Program-level Intermediate Outcomes?			
j) Are the project Immediate Outcomes stated in measurable terms?			

CATEGORY (Include notes for reference with ratings)	EXCELLENT	ACCEPTABLE	FOLLOW-UP NEEDED
k) Does the proposal present knowledgeable and logical connections to the country's developmental priorities and focus areas?			
l) Does the proposal demonstrate knowledge of CIDA's developmental strategy for the country and support that strategy?			
m) Does the proposal reflect CIDA's high priority initiatives?			
n) Does the proposal indicate knowledge of and connections to other donors' endeavours within the country?			
o) Is other support (local, regional, national and/or other international donors) to the project defined?			
p) How well described are the project's direct and indirect beneficiaries?			
q) Does the proposal consider how to foster replication of successes, and/or sharing lessons learned with others working in related areas?			
4. GENDER EQUALITY			
a) Is there a viable plan for addressing gender equality in the proposal's coordination, implementation, management and monitoring?			
b) Have the project's Immediate Outcomes sufficiently considered gender equality as a cross-cutting theme?			
c) How does the new proposal build on disaggregated data and baseline data from previous gender analysis or past projects?			

CATEGORY (Include notes for reference with ratings)	EXCELLENT	ACCEPTABLE	FOLLOW-UP NEEDED
5. SUSTAINABILITY			
a) Is there a viable plan for sustainability of benefits at the community level when project funding is discontinued?			
b) Does the project maintain contact with or provide financial and/or other support to, “graduating” communities?			
c) Do on-going projects include a plan for organizational sustainability upon “graduation” from the ITPP?			
6. RISK IDENTIFICATION AND MANAGEMENT			
a) Does the proposal sufficiently identify relevant/realistic risks that may affect implementation and achievement of results?			
b) Does the proposal include a realistic/manageable response to mitigate these risks?			
c) Are the risks identified in the plan included on CIDA’s <i>Investment Risk Register</i> (and vice versa)?			
7. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT			
a) Have the Canadian Coordinators identified public engagement opportunities in Canada and included a plan for public engagement in the proposal?			
8. BUDGET			
a) Does the total proposed budget fall within the annual amount bracket? (nb – the budget may be higher in one year, lower in another – it is the overall amount that is gauged)			
b) Do the budget category allocations accord with the proposal descriptive plan?			

CATEGORY (Include notes for reference with ratings)	EXCELLENT	ACCEPTABLE	FOLLOW-UP NEEDED
c) Do the project holders indicate an ability to make budget adjustments should CIDA not fully fund the Program proposal?			
d) Does the budget include the required level of in-kind commitment?			