

SOMALIA HUMANITARIAN FUND

Project Prioritization - Scoring Sheet

This scoring sheet is to support Cluster Review Committees in their prioritization of projects for the SHF. In addition to the three generic criteria that apply across clusters (1-3), each cluster can add cluster-specific technical criteria (4). The score card parameters to consider under each standard criteria is shown below the table. The scores will be reflected in the SHF Granta Management System. Please submit the soft copy of the score sheet to your SHF focal point, copying afifa@un.org, kovacm@un.org and shfsomalia@un.org

(A) Cluster	XXXX
(B) Allocation	Standard Allocation 1 (SA1) 2017
(C) Cluster Coordinator (name, title and organization)	
(D) Cluster Co-Chair (name, title and organization)	
(E) CRC Members (names)	
(F) Date of Submission to SHF	

Signature Cluster Coordinator
Signature Cluster Co-Chair

(G) Summary of Discussion

No	Project Title	Organization (acronym)	1	2	3	4	Total score (automated)	Recommend (Yes/No)	Amount Recommended (US\$)	Comments	Locations (regions only, recommended projects only)
			Strategic relevance (30 points)	Programmatic relevance (20 points)	Cost effectiveness (15 points)	Cluster specific criteria (35 points)					
1							0				
2							0				
3							0				
4							0				
5							0				
6							0				
7							0				
8							0				
9							0				
10							0				
11							0				
12							0				
13							0				
14							0				
15							0				
16							0				
17							0				
18							0				
19							0				
20							0				
21							0				
22							0				
23							0				
24							0				
25							0				
							TOTAL (US\$)	0			

Scorecard Parameters

1. Strategic relevance (30 points):
Is the proposal in the HRP and in line with the integrated approach strategy on drought response, prioritization and specifications. Partners with presence in the target locations with capacity to quickly implement or scale up response should be scored highest. (Suggested scores: Yes = 30, Partly = 15; No = 0; CRC can assign any other value within the range)

2. Programmatic relevance (20 points):
Are the proposed activities in line with those prioritized for drought response by the Custer. To obtain maximum effectiveness and impact from the limited resources available under this allocation, projects with activities matching those considered by the cluster as most relevant for drought response should be scored highest. (Suggested scores: Fully = 10; Partly = 5; No = 0; CRC can assign any other value within the range.)

Is protection central in response and does the project demonstrate a relationship between humanitarian crisis and the real assistance needs for Men, Women, Boys and Girls? Projects that demonstrate higher quality gender programming and protection mainstreaming should be scored higher. (Suggested scores: Fully =10; Partly = 5 No = 0; CRC can assign any other value within the range)

3. Cost effectiveness (15 Points):
Is the funding used in complementarity and coordinated with other partners or resources (no duplication or overlap with existing or planned activities), Projects which demonstrate complementary with other resources and avoid duplication should be scored higher. Knowledge of funding available to the partner from other funding sources will be taken into account. (Suggested scores: Yes = 5; No = 0; CRC can assign any other value within the range)

Is the cost per beneficiary competitive and within an acceptable range for the cluster? Projects that represent better value for money should be scored higher. Is the total cost of the project per beneficiary competitive when compared to other projects with similar activities, and in line with cluster norms? (Suggested scores: Yes = 10; No = 0; CRC can assign any other value within the range)

4. Cluster specific criteria (35 Points)
Please ensure that the cluster-specific technical criteria is defined before the CRC starts its work. Please include the specified criteria in this section as you are submitting the scoresheet.