# **Annex 4. Template for Grading Sheet for Project Appraisal**

****

**AFoCO Project Appraisal Sheet**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Profile** |
| Project Code | *(to be provided by the Secretariat)* |
| Project Title |  |
| Recipient Country(ies) |  |
| Total Budget |  |
| Date of Review | DD-MM-YYYY |
| **Overall Appraisal** |
| Appraisal Round (*Choose One)* |  Initial Appraisal |  Final Appraisal |
| Name of the Reviewer |  |
| Professional Position |  |
| Institution/Office |  |
| Contact Information |  |
| Appraisal Grading (tick the appropriate box) |
| **A** | Recommended for PAC deliberation | **B** | Recommended for PAC deliberation upon revision | **C** | Not recommended |

|  |
| --- |
| **Official Use Only** |
| Date of Receipt |  |
| Reference No. |  |

**Project Review Criteria and Grading System**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Score****Obtained** | **Comments and Recommendation** |
| 1. **Problem Context**
 |
| * 1. Is the problem identified justifies the need to have a project?
 |
| 1. Clarity of the core problem as it relates to causes and effects (10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. Adequacy of baseline data information about the justification of the problem (10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. **Technical feasibility**
 |
| * 1. ***Logical Framework Matrix***
 |
| * + 1. Are the expected outputs clearly formulated in response to the problems to be addressed?
 |
| 1. Alignment of the objectives with the outputs(10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. Alignment of the activities with the outputs (10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. Formulation of Objectively Verifiable Indicators using SMART criteria and Means of Verification (10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| * 1. ***Relevance to Policy and Programs***
 |
| * + 1. Is the project consistent with the National/Regional Policies and Priority Programs?
 |
| 1. Responsiveness to relevant policies (5 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. Alignment with relevant programs (5 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. **Financial Feasibility**
 |
| * 1. Are the direct and indirect costs justifiable against the workload and actions to be delivered?
 |
| 1. Direct cost (operational expenses) (15 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. Indirect cost (personnel cost, M&E and other support activities) (10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. **Sustainability or relevance of the Project**
 |
| * 1. Will the proposed technology/methodology by the project be appropriate and compatible with the prevailing socio-economic and cultural context?
 |
| 1. Appropriateness of the technology with the prevailing bio-physical, socio-economic and cultural context (5 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| 1. Relevance of the exit strategies with the prevailing national policy/regional trends and future direction (10 points)
 | Score: | *(Specify justification on the score)* |
| **Total Score (Out of 100 points)**(add the score obtained for each criteria)  | Total Score: |  |
| **FINAL GRADE (A, B, or C)****A** for an average score of 85~100 points *(the review criteria is mostly or fully met);***B** for an average score of 60~84 Points (*the review criteria is not adequately met and improvements are required*);**C** for an average score below 60 points or if any of the criteria is score below 60 points (*the review criteria requires substantial improvements*) | **(A, B, or C)** |  |
| While the corresponding Score has been given, identify and describe (why and how) particular sections of the proposal that need further justification and enhancement. |