**CSO co-financing appraisal**

**PROJECT/PROGRAMME:**

**APPLICANT:**

**COUNTRY/REGION:**

**ASSESSED BY:**

**DATE:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Criteria for assessment:** |
| **Applicant** | Prior positive/negative experiences with the applicant.  Prior experiences in the project country/region, implementation/monitoring capacity. Partner assessment conducted. |
| **Local partner(s)** | Relevant prior experience of local project partner (s); operational and administrative capacities; participation of local partners in planning and implementation; ownership of local partner(s) |
| **Target group(s)** | Are the target group(s) clearly defined?  Is the project/programme clearly relevant to the target group(s)?  Is the suggested intervention appropriate/useful for the target group(s)? |
| **Problem Analysis** | Quality of problem analysis |
| **Intervention logic** | Coherence of overall goal, intended results and activities; quality of indicators |
| **Quality of the Risk Management** | Does the proposal include an adequate (plausible) risk assessment? Are there any risks not mentioned in the application which could undermine programme/project success? Are adequate risk management measures and monitoring foreseen? |
| **Budget** | Quality and plausibility of budget |
| **Coordination with other stakeholders (government, donors and/or other aid organisations)** | Coordination with other donors (harmonisation)? Integration into national development plan, strategies, programmes or structures (alignment)? How does the planned intervention complement initiatives of other national/international organisations active in this field/region? |
| **Sustainability** | How does the applicant intend to ensure economic, social and environmental sustainability of the project /program? Is sufficient attention given towards capacity development of the local stakeholders? |
| **Compliance with ADC principles and standards (EGSIM and Joint Principles respectively)** | Are social, gender and environmental standards adequately integrated/mainstreamed in the project/programme? Is the quality of the respective assessment sufficient? |

**Additional remarks / recommendations:**

**Overall assessment:**

Recommended for funding / recommended for funding under certain conditions / not recommended for funding? Why?