

**THE PANDEMIC FUND:**

# **SCORING AND WEIGHTING METHODOLOGY**

**For Applicants of the Third Call for Proposals –  
Phase I: Single and multi-country proposals**

March 26, 2025



**The  
Pandemic  
Fund**

FOR A RESILIENT WORLD

# THE PANDEMIC FUND: SCORING AND WEIGHTING METHODOLOGY

The Scoring and Weighting methodology will be used by the Pandemic Fund Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) to evaluate the Funding Proposals [henceforth referred to as a proposal] received during Phase I (single and multi-country) of the Third Call for Proposals (“3rd CfP”) announced in December 2024<sup>1</sup>. Each proposal will be reviewed based on both qualitative and quantitative considerations on the following sections:

- A.** Scope and objectives of the proposal, targeted Core Capacities, key activities and expected outcomes, and Theory of Change
- B.** Context, demonstrated needs and alignment with national/regional priorities
- C.** Co-financing, Co-investment, and overall available funding
- D.** Ownership, Commitment, Coordination, Collaboration, and Co-creation
- E.** Implementation and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

In order to calculate the total score, sections will be given a certain weight in line with the Pandemic Fund’s principles and objectives (table below). These weights will be used to calculate a final score for proposals assessed by the TAP.

**Table 1: Weight of each section**

Section	% of Total Score
Scope and objectives of the proposal, targeted core capacities, key activities and expected outcomes, and Theory of Change	25
Context, demonstrated needs and alignment with national/regional priorities	25
Co-financing, Co-investment, and overall available funding	15
Ownership, Commitment, Coordination, Collaboration, and Co-creation	15
Implementation and M&E	20
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.thepandemicfund.org/call-for-proposals>

To qualify for funding, proposals must achieve a minimum overall score of 80% and at least 80% in each section. The minimum requirement for qualifying for funding will be subject to change, as decided by the TAP, based on the analysis of individual scores.

The following sections include the questions that will be used to guide the evaluation and scoring of proposals. The numbering of these questions aligns with the numbering in the proposal template. They aim to ensure consistent and transparent assessment of proposals submitted under the Third Call.

**A. Scope and objectives of the proposal, targeted core capacities, key activities, and expected outcomes and Theory of Change**

**25%**  
**of Total**

1. Does the proposal provide descriptions of the scope, objectives and activities which are relevant to the three programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan?<sup>2</sup>
  - The proposal provides clear, detailed and comprehensive description of the scope, objectives and activities, demonstrating strong alignment with the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan; or
  - The proposal includes relevant description the scope, objectives and activities, showing alignment with the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan; or
  - The proposal provides basic description of the scope, objectives and activities, showing limited alignment with the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan; or
  - The summary of the scope, objectives and activities is not technically coherent nor linked to the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.thepandemicfund.org/sites/default/files/2024-06/Pandemic%20Fund%20Strategic%20Plan.pdf>

**This question is not scored**

2. Select in which areas the investments financed by the Pandemic Fund grant will contribute to progress towards maintained or increased levels of IHR/PVS capacity in one or more of the focus technical areas, in line with the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Policy, Legal and normative Instruments to implement IHR 2005 and World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH) international standards
<input type="checkbox"/>	IHR Coordination, National IHR Focal Point functions and advocacy, One Health coordination mechanism
<input type="checkbox"/>	Financing
<input type="checkbox"/>	Biosafety and biosecurity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Public and animal health emergency management
<input type="checkbox"/>	Workforce surge during a public health event, or events that would require public health intervention (e.g. mass gatherings, natural disasters)
	Health services provision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Animal (domestic, wildlife) health service provision
<input type="checkbox"/>	Infection prevention and control (IPC)
	Animal diseases prevention, control and eradication
<input type="checkbox"/>	Risk communications
<input type="checkbox"/>	Points of Entry (PoEs) and border health
<input type="checkbox"/>	Food safety
<input type="checkbox"/>	Zoonoses
<input type="checkbox"/>	Anti-Microbial Resistance (AMR)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Changes in environmental conditions
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other /specify

3. Does the proposal articulate how the activities financed by the Pandemic Fund project (including grant, co-financing, and co-investment), will help strengthen identified IHR and veterinary capacities in line with the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan?
- The proposal provides a clear summary description of how investments will strengthen capacities, outlining of activities, rationale for prioritization and expected outputs and outcomes; or
  - The proposal provides some summary description of how investments will strengthen capacities, outlining activities, rationale for prioritization and expected outputs and outcomes; or
  - The proposal provides an inadequate summary description of how investments will strengthen capacities, with limited description of activities, rationale for prioritization and expected outputs and outcomes; or
  - The proposal neither provides any description of how investments will strengthen capacities, nor outlines of activities, rationale for prioritization and expected outputs and outcomes.
- 4a. Does the proposal present a clear theory of change<sup>3</sup> (TOC) for how the proposed activities, through the resources requested (Pandemic Fund grant, alongside co-financing and co-investment), will strengthen IHR and PVS capacities, relevant to one or more of the Pandemic Fund's programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes?
- The proposal presents a clear TOC with a logical and evidence-based pathway from activities to impact. It explicitly links proposed activities to IHR and PVS capacity strengthening, aligns with the Pandemic Fund's priorities, and includes a clear model/diagram illustrating the TOC; or
  - The proposal includes a TOC with clear linkages between activities and expected outcomes. It adequately addresses IHR and PVS capacities and aligns with the Pandemic Fund's priorities, though the TOC model lacks some detail or clarity; or
  - The proposal outlines a TOC with some logical connections between activities and impact. However, it is missing key details, lack strong justification for how activities lead to intended outcomes, or present a weak model; or
  - The proposal does not present a TOC, or it is inadequately structured, or does not demonstrate a pathway from activities to impact in relation to IHR, PVS, or the Pandemic Fund's priorities.

---

<sup>3</sup> A theory of change is a method that explains how a given intervention, or set of interventions, are expected to lead to a specific development change, drawing on a causal analysis based on available evidence. A thorough theory of change helps guide the development of sound and evidence-based program, with assumptions and risks clearly analyzed and spelled out.

**4b.** Does the proposal describe the co-creation process of the TOC with all stakeholders involved in the project?

- The proposal clearly describes the co-creation process of the TOC, detailing engagement with all relevant stakeholders and how their input shaped the proposal; or
- The proposal moderately describes the co-creation process of the TOC with some, but not all stakeholders involved; or
- The proposal provides limited description of the co-creation of the TOC but with limited details on how engagement was conducted or how feedback shaped the proposal; or
- The proposal does not describe a co-creation process of the TOC or provide any evidence of stakeholder engagement.

## **B. Context, demonstrated needs, and alignment with national/regional priorities**

**25%  
of Total**

**5a.** Does the proposal comprehensively describe the context in which project activities will take place?

- The proposal comprehensively describes the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the country (or countries); or
- The proposal provides a moderate description of the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the country (or countries); or
- The proposal provides limited description the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the country (or countries); or
- The proposal does not describe the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the country (or countries).

**5b.** Does the proposal provide a clear and comprehensive summary of the findings of the assessments performed in the last six years, clearly describing challenges and gaps in line with the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan?

- The proposal provides a comprehensive and well-structured summary of relevant assessments conducted in the last six years. It clearly outlines key findings, challenges, and gaps, with strong alignment to the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan; or
- The proposal provides a moderate summary of the past assessments, covering key challenges and gaps in relation to the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan; or
- The proposal provides only a brief summary of past assessments, with limited explanation of findings, challenges, or gaps. The connection to the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan is weak or unclear; or

- The proposal does not provide a summary of the past assessment's findings, challenges and gaps and no plan to conduct assessment. There is little to no alignment with the Pandemic Fund's medium-term Strategic Plan.
6. Does the proposal clearly describe alignment between the national plan(s) including the national health security plan, strategic directions and frameworks and the scope, objective and priorities of the project?
- The proposal clearly demonstrates alignment between national priorities in PPR and project's scope, objective and priorities; or
  - The proposal moderately demonstrates alignment between national priorities in PPR and project's scope, objective and priorities; or
  - The proposal provides minimal or limited references to national plans, with little explanation of how the project's scope, objectives and priorities align with national health security priorities, strategic frameworks, relevant policies; or
  - The proposal does not describe alignment with national plans, or the alignment is unclear and lacks supporting details or there are no national plans with no indication for developing a plan.
- 7a. Does the proposal's scope, objectives and priorities demonstrate complementarity with other on-going initiatives relevant to Pandemic PPR and the broader health system strengthening?
- The proposal clearly demonstrates complementarity with on-going initiatives; or
  - The proposal demonstrates moderate complementarity with on-going initiatives; or
  - The proposal shows limited complementarity with on-going initiatives; or
  - The proposal does not demonstrate complementarity with on-going initiatives.
- 7b. Does the proposal clearly identify complementarities and/or contributions to the implementation, while avoiding duplication of activities of previously awarded Pandemic Fund proposal?
- The proposals clearly describe complementarities and/or contributions to previously awarded Pandemic Fund grants; or
  - The proposal demonstrates moderate complementarities and/or contributions, with some duplication of activities; or
  - The proposal shows limited complementarities and/or contributions to previously awarded Pandemic Fund grants with a lot of duplication of activities; or
  - The Proposal does not demonstrate any level of complementarities nor contributions, and there are obvious duplications of activities.
  - Not applicable.

**7c.** Does the proposal clearly describe the complementarities, while avoiding duplication of activities, between two proposals submitted under the 3rd Call for Proposals (a single-country proposal and a multi-country proposal)?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates complementarity between the two submitted proposals; or
- The proposal demonstrates moderate complementarity between the two submitted proposals; or
- The proposal shows limited complementarity between the two submitted proposals; or
- The proposal fails to demonstrate complementarity between the two submitted proposals.
- Not applicable.

## **C. Co-financing, Co-investment, and overall available funding**

**15%**  
**of Total**

**8.** Does the Funding proposal (henceforth referred to as a “proposal”) explain co-financing that will be mobilized from the Implementing Entities or other partners (such as, e.g., bilateral aid agencies, philanthropies) to complement the requested Pandemic Fund grant and support project activities. What is the ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant amount to total co-financing mobilized? (Note: If the co-financing is “in-kind”, the proposal must include imputed values in US \$).

- The proposal secures significant co-financing from multiple sources, either in cash or in-kind contributions, with a high ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-financing (e.g., greater than 1:5); or
- The proposal mobilizes co-financing from Implementing Entities or other partners, which matches the value of funding requested from the Pandemic Fund grant with a ratio of 1:5; or
- The proposal includes some level of co-financing, but the ratio is relatively small (e.g., less than 1:5); or
- The proposal does not bring any co-financing or provides minimal in-kind contributions without clear valuation. It heavily relies on the Pandemic Fund grant with no evident financial commitment from other sources.



9. Is the breakdown of co-financing commitments (both in-cash<sup>4</sup> and in-kind) clearly described in the proposal with a source (IEs and other partners), amount, nature and timeframe and for which proposed activities?
- Co-financing (both in-cash and in-kind) is clearly identified in the proposal, specifying the source, amount, nature, timeframe, and allocation to specific activities; or
  - Co-financing (both in-cash and in-kind) is identified in the proposal with some details missing; or
  - The proposal mentions co-financing but provides limited or unclear breakdown. Key aspects such as the specific source, amount, or timeframe are insufficiently detailed; or
  - The proposal lacks a clear breakdown of co-financing commitments and its related details.
10. Does the proposal explain co-investment that will be committed by the country(s) to complement the requested Pandemic Fund grant and support project activities. What is the ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant amount to total co-investment mobilized? (Note: If the co-investment is “in-kind”, the proposal must include imputed values in US\$ terms and describe policy commitments).
- The proposal clearly details substantial co-investment from the country, specifying in-cash and in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$ terms. It includes strong policy commitments and aligns well with national/regional priorities. The co-investment ratio is high (e.g., greater than 1:0.7 for LICs, greater than 1:4 for LMICs; UMICs and HICs)<sup>5</sup>, demonstrating significant national ownership and sustainability; or
  - The proposal describes meaningful co-investment, including some in-cash or in-kind contributions with imputed values, but with less clarity on policy commitments. The co-investment ratio is moderate (e.g., between 1:0.1 and 1:0.7 for LICs, between 1:2 and 1:4 for LMICs, UMICs and HICs)), showing reasonable national engagement; or
  - The proposal mentions co-investment but provides little detail or justification. Contributions may be mostly in-kind with unclear valuation, and policy commitments are weak. The co-investment ratio is low (e.g., less than 1:0.1 for LICs, less than 1:2 for LMICs, UMICs and HICs), indicating minimal country in-cash commitment; or
  - The proposal does not include co-investment or provides only vague, unverified information. There is no clear in-cash or in-kind contribution from the country, and policy commitments are absent or weak.
  - Co-investor country is in debt distress or at high risk of debt distress, therefore overall co-investment ratio is not evaluated. However, Co-investor country has clearly specified any in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$ terms and/or described policy commitments and plans to incentivize investment in pandemic PPR in the country.

---

4 Applicants are encouraged to allocate cash contributions in addition to in-kind support.

5 LICs: Low-Income Countries, LMICs: Lower Middle-Income countries; UMICs: Upper Middle-Income Countries; HICs: High Income Countries

11. Is the breakdown of co-investment commitments (both in-cash and in-kind) described clearly described in the proposal with a source, amount, nature and timeframe?

- Co-investment (both in-cash and in-kind) is clearly identified with all necessary details planned out; or
- Co-investment (both in-cash and in-kind) is identified in the proposal with some details missing; or
- The proposal mentions co-investment but provides limited or unclear breakdown. Key aspects such as the specific source, amount, or timeframe are insufficiently detailed; or
- The proposal lacks a clear breakdown of co-investment commitments and its related details;
- Co-investor country is in debt distress or at high risk of debt distress, therefore overall co-investment ratio is not evaluated. However, Co-investor country has clearly specified any in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$ terms and/or described policy commitments and plans to incentivize investment in pandemic PPR in the country.

12. Does the proposal describe technical and allocative efficiency, i.e., prioritizing the use of resources in an efficient manner to achieve the stated outcomes<sup>6</sup>, adhering to principles of “value for money”?<sup>7</sup> Does it ensure that most financing goes to Beneficiaries?

- The proposal provides a clear and well-structured explanation of how resources will be efficiently allocated to achieve the stated outcomes. It demonstrates strong adherence to “value for money” principles, with a high proportion of financing directed to beneficiaries. The cost-effectiveness of interventions is well-justified; or
- The proposal describes efforts to ensure efficient resource allocation and value for money, but some areas lack detailed justification. While most financing appears to benefit beneficiaries, there may be minor inefficiencies or unclear cost-effectiveness considerations; or
- The proposal provides only a general mention of resource efficiency, with limited evidence of cost-effectiveness analysis. There is little assurance that financing is prioritized for beneficiaries, and there may be concerns about potential inefficiencies; or
- The proposal lacks a clear discussion of technical and allocative efficiency. There is no evidence that value for money principles are applied, and a significant portion of financing may be directed to implementing entities rather than beneficiaries.

<sup>6</sup> Allocative efficiency refers to how different resource inputs are combined to produce a mix of different outputs. Technical efficiency on the other hand is concerned with achieving maximum outputs with the least cost.

<sup>7</sup> Meaning an effective, efficient, and economic use of resources, based on the evaluation of relevant costs and benefits, along with an assessment of risks, as appropriate. World Bank Guidance on Value for Money: Achieving VfM in Investment Projects Financed by the World Bank <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/274711479159288956-0290022017/original/GuidanceNoteonValueforMoney.pdf>

## **D. Ownership, Commitment, Coordination, Collaboration, and Co-creation**

**15%**  
**of Total**

**13.** Does the proposal demonstrate ownership and leadership in its development, ensuring multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation of all actors in pandemic PPR (including human, animal, and environmental health) and involving relevant Implementing Entities (IEs)? Does it describe structures or mechanisms used to facilitate coordination and discussion?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates strong country leadership and ownership in its development. It describes well-established coordination structures that facilitated multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation of all relevant actors, including IEs; or
- The proposal shows moderate level of country leadership and ownership in its development. Multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation is good but lacks some details; or
- The proposal shows minimal level of country leadership and ownership in its development. Multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation is inadequate or lacks clarity. Coordination mechanisms, if mentioned, are not well-defined; or
- The proposal does not provide clear evidence of country ownership or leadership in developing the proposal. There is little or no mention of multi-sectoral engagement, co-creation or coordination structures.

**14a.** Does the proposal demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [1]?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence thereof.
- The underlying theme is not applicable in the country(ies) context, and clear and convincing justification is provided.

**14b.** Does the proposal demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [2]??

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence thereof.
- The underlying theme is not applicable in the country(ies) context, and clear and convincing justification is provided.

**14c.** Does the proposal demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [3]?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence thereof.
- The underlying theme is not applicable in the country(ies) context, and clear and convincing justification is provided.

**14d.** Does the proposal demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [4]?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence thereof, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence thereof, when relevant.

- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence thereof.
  - The underlying theme is not applicable in the country(ies) context, and clear and convincing justification is provided.
15. Does the proposal clearly outline how the country(ies) will continue to coordinate and collaborate throughout the project lifecycle – implementation, monitoring and evaluation and reporting with all relevant partners? Does it describe whether the existing coordination structure will be maintained or a new mechanism will be established, along with the roles and responsibilities of each sector involved?
- The proposal clearly articulates the coordination and collaboration role of country(ies) through the project lifecycle, describing coordination structures and the roles and responsibilities of each sector; or
  - The proposal outlines the coordination and collaboration role of country(ies) through the project lifecycle, but lacks some details on coordination structures or the roles and responsibilities of each sector; or
  - The proposal insufficiently articulates the coordination and collaboration role of country(ies) through the project lifecycle, providing minimal details on coordination structures and on roles and responsibilities of each sector; or
  - The proposal does not outline the coordination and collaboration role of country(ies) through the project lifecycle, with no details on coordination structures and roles and responsibilities of each sector.
16. Does the proposal demonstrate that the country(ies) will be able to sustain, over the longer term, the project's outcomes in PPR strengthening beyond the completion of the project and how this will be financed and evaluated?
- The proposal clearly outlines a sustainability plan beyond the project's completion, detailing specific financing mechanisms, strong government commitment, and long-term evaluation strategies. It demonstrates full integration into national policies and frameworks, ensuring lasting impact; or
  - The proposal provides a moderate articulation of sustainability beyond the project's completion, including some planned co-investment (in-cash and in-kind) and policy commitments. It offers a partial description of how project outcomes will be maintained and financed, with some alignment to national policies and frameworks; or
  - The proposal provides an inadequate articulation of sustainability beyond the project's completion, including some planned co-investment (in-cash and in-kind) and policy commitments. It offers a partial description of how project outcomes will be maintained and financed, with some alignment to national policies and frameworks; or

- The proposal does not articulate sustainability beyond the project's completion. There is little to no mention of planned co-investment, policy commitments, or alignment with national policies and frameworks. The long-term impact and continuation of project outcomes is uncertain.

## E. Implementation and M&E

**20%**  
**of Total**

17. Does the proposal detail a plan with intended results that are linked to and aligned with the Pandemic Fund Results Framework, including the cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes, and include project level indicators?

- The proposal clearly details a plan with intended results that are linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and project level indicators; or
- The proposal moderately details a plan with some description of intended results that are linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and project level indicators; or
- The proposal includes a summary plan with limited description of intended results and limited linkage to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and project level indicators; or
- The proposal has no detailed plan, with intended results that are inadequately linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework or without project level indicators.

18. Does the proposal provide a clear and costed monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan that outlines who will be responsible, when and how M&E will be conducted, which specific activities will be financed by the grant? How will lesson learning take place and what processes will be used for tracking project's progress?

- The proposal presents a well-structured, costed M&E plan with clearly assigned responsibilities, timelines, and financing sources. It includes robust processes for tracking progress and incorporates a clear strategy for lesson learning; or
- The proposal provides an M&E plan with key elements, including responsible parties and financing details, but lacks clarity on tracking mechanisms or lesson-learning processes. Some aspects of evaluation and adaptation are addressed but not fully developed; or
- The proposal includes a basic M&E plan with minimal cost details and vague descriptions of tracking mechanisms. It does not clearly define how lessons will be learned or how progress will be monitored effectively; or

- The proposal lacks a structured M&E plan or provides insufficient details on financing, responsibilities, tracking processes, and lesson learning. There is no clear approach to ensuring effective project monitoring and evaluation.
19. Does the proposal clearly define how responsibilities for activities, reporting and accountability will be allocated across countries, Implementing Entities, and delivery partners project implementation, ensuring alignment with the Project-Specific Results Framework (PSRF)?
- The proposal provides a clear and detailed allocation of responsibilities across all relevant stakeholders, including countries, IEs, and partners. Reporting and accountability mechanisms are well-structured and aligned with the PSRF; or
  - The proposal outlines key responsibilities but lacks full clarity in how they will be coordinated among stakeholders. Some reporting and accountability mechanisms are described, with good alignment with the PSRF; or
  - The proposal provides only a general description of responsibilities, with gaps in coordination, reporting structures, and accountability mechanisms. Alignment with the PSRF is weak; or
  - The proposal lacks a clear allocation of responsibilities, with little to no detail on reporting and accountability mechanisms. There is no clear alignment with the PSRF.
20. Does the proposal clearly identify key risks related to implementation (e.g., Political and Governance, Technical Design of Project or Program, Sector Strategies and Policies, Institutional Capacity for Implementation and Sustainability, Fiduciary, Lack of expertise and management) including how they will be managed and mitigated?<sup>8</sup>
- The proposal provides a comprehensive and detailed review of foreseeable risks and clear actions to mitigate them. The risk management approach is detailed, feasible, and integrated into the project design; or
  - The proposal identifies key foreseeable risks and outlines mitigation measures, but some risks are not fully addressed, or the mitigation strategies lack detail. The approach is generally feasible; or
  - The proposal mentions some risks but lacks a comprehensive analysis. Mitigation strategies are vague or incomplete, and the overall risk management approach appears insufficient; or
  - The proposal does not adequately identify risks, or risk mitigation strategies are missing or inadequately developed. There is little to no evidence of a structured approach to managing project risks.

---

<sup>8</sup> According to the Operations Manual (Paragraph 20), each Implementing Entity is responsible for the management of risks associated with the respective projects implemented by them, and reporting on such risks and mitigation measures, as appropriate in accordance with their policies and procedures, as part of their annual progress and results reporting.

21. Does the proposal clearly outline how it will manage environmental and social safeguards, including preventing sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment, child protection, and mitigate harm based on ethnicity, vulnerability or marginalization of groups, data-sharing, governance and other relevant aspects, complying with each IE's policies and procedures?

- The proposal demonstrates comprehensive consideration of safeguards, and they are clearly articulated; or
- The proposal moderately demonstrates consideration of safeguards with some lack of detail; or
- The proposal shows limited consideration of safeguards with lack of detail; or
- The proposal does not demonstrate consideration of safeguards.