

Strategic Review Committee (SRC) score card for project prioritization

(15 February 2021)

SRC - Categories weighting

	Categories	Weighting
A	Strategic relevance Aimed at assessing the alignment of the proposed project with the HRP and the allocation strategy	30
B	Programmatic relevance Assesses if the proposed activities are adequate to meet the proposed objective	30
C	Cost effectiveness Assesses if the cost of the proposed projects is commensurate to the intended outputs and outcomes	15
D	Cluster specific criteria Assess if the proposal is technically sound and adheres to cluster standards	20
E	Engagement with coordination Assess partners engagement in humanitarian coordination forums including its level of participation in cluster meetings/activities	5
Total		100

Scorecard for Project Prioritization

Score card				
Category		Question(s)	score	
Strategic Relevance	30	Is the proposal in the HRP and in line with the allocation strategy and its guidelines? Partners with presence in the target locations, has previous experience in the thematic area and with capacity to directly implement should be scored highest. (25 points)	Yes/fully	25
			Substantially	20
			Partially	15
			Minimally	10
			Barely	5
		Is the proposal submitted by a NNGO (5 points)	Yes	5
			No	0
Programmatic Relevance	30	Are the proposed activities in line with those prioritized by the Cluster in their response plan? Does the project clearly define humanitarian needs and needs identification process i.e. needs assessments used. Projects with activities matching those considered by the cluster as most relevant for the targeted response should be scored highest. Projects where targeted beneficiaries are clearly defined, needs of specific and or/vulnerable groups identified and participation of women in the project life-cycle clearly articulated should be scored highest. (15 points)	Yes/fully	15
			Substantially	12
			Partially	9
			Minimally	6
			Barely	3
		Are protection concerns including GBV adequately addressed?	Yes	5
			Partially	3
			No	0
		Does the project target and activities cater for people with disabilities and minority groups?	Yes	5
			Partially	3
			No	0
		Does the project cater for women's participation in all stages of project implementation	Yes	5
Partially	3			
No	0			
Cost Effectiveness	15	Is the cost per beneficiary competitive and within an acceptable range for the cluster? Is the proportion of direct costs versus support/operational costs reasonable? 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? (15 points)	Yes/fully	15
			Substantially	12
			Partially	9
			Minimally	6
			Barely	3
Cluster Specific Criteria	20	Direct implementation, clear linkage in project objective, activities and output, Indicators SMART, Well defined target beneficiaries, project adheres to cluster minimum standards (20 points)	Yes	20
			Substantially	16
			Partially	12
			Minimally	8
Coordination	5	Does the partner participate in the cluster (i.e. attend cluster meetings, provide timely information to the cluster, consistently fulfills cluster reporting requirements, (5 points)	Yes	5
			Partially	3
			No	0
Total	100			

SOMALIA HUMANITARIAN FUND

Project Prioritization - Scoring Sheet - SAMPLE ONLY – The scoring sheet should be completed and submitted directed in the GMS

This scoring sheet is to support Strategic Review Committees in their prioritization of projects for the SHF. In addition to the four generic criteria that apply across clusters (1-3,5), 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 should be inserted in the GMS by the cluster secretariat. The SHF focal points will be available to provide guidance.

(A) Cluster		
(B) Allocation		
(C) Cluster Coordinator (name, title and organization)		Signature Cluster Coordinator
(D) Cluster Co-Chair (name, title and organization)		Signature Cluster Co-Chair
(E) SRC Members (names)		
(F) Date of Submission to SHF		

(G) Summary of issues (if any)	
---------------------------------------	--

No	Project Title	Organization (acronym)	1	2	3	4	5	Total score (automated) (100 points)	Recommend (Yes/No)	Amount Recommended (US\$)	Comments	Locations (regions only, recommended projects only)
			Strategic relevance (30 points)	Programmatic relevance (30 points)	Cost effectiveness (15 points)	Cluster specific (20 points)	Coordination (5 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										0		