

THE PANDEMIC FUND:

SCORING AND WEIGHTING METHODOLOGY

**For Applicants of the Third Call for Proposals –
Phase II: Regional Entity Proposals**

June 16, 2025



**The
Pandemic
Fund**

FOR A RESILIENT WORLD

THE PANDEMIC FUND: SCORING AND WEIGHTING METHODOLOGY PHASE II

The **Phase II Scoring and Weighting methodology** will be used by the Pandemic Fund Technical Advisory Panel (TAP) to evaluate Funding Proposals from Regional Entities (REs) received during Phase II of the Third Call for Proposals (3rd CfP) announced in December 2024.¹ 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 (ToC)
- 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)

To calculate the total score, sections will be given a certain weight in line with the Pandemic Fund's principles and objectives (Table 1). 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 Monitoring and Evaluation	20
TOTAL	100

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

To qualify for funding, proposals must achieve a minimum overall score of 80 percent and at least 80 percent 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 Application for Funding Template (proposal template). They aim to ensure consistent and transparent assessment of proposals submitted under Phase II of the 3rd CfP.

Technical Evaluation of the Regional Entity

The Regional Entity submitting the proposal will be reviewed for the information it provides in the proposal on its public health mandate and its technical and operational capacity to implement the project activities. This is Section i in the proposal template. This section will not be scored but will form the basis of the final recommendations by TAP on the RE itself in addition to the criteria in sections A-D (see Table 1), which will score the content of the proposal.

1. The proposal is submitted from

<input type="checkbox"/>	Long Established Regional Entity
<input type="checkbox"/>	Newly Established Regional Entity

For a Long Established Regional Entity:

2. Does the proposal describe how the Regional Entity supports public health priorities, including One Health initiatives, and efforts to strengthen pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response (PPR)? Does it provide relevant evidence that demonstrates its proven capabilities for a minimum of five years?
 - The proposal clearly describes the public health mandate, including within the One Health framework, of the RE and provides a convincing description, with relevant examples/evidence, of how it has implemented pandemic PPR projects in the region/sub-region; or
 - The proposal provides a moderate description of the public health mandate, including within the One Health framework, of the RE and outlines adequately, providing examples/evidence, of how it has implemented pandemic PPR projects in the region/sub-region; or
 - The proposal provides a limited description of the public health mandate, including within the One Health framework, of the RE. It provides a limited description, without providing examples, of how it is has implemented pandemic PPR projects in the region/sub-region; or

- The proposal provides no description of the public health mandate, including within the One Health framework, of the RE. It provides no description or examples of how it has been involved in pandemic PPR projects in the region/sub-region.
3. Does the proposal describe the technical and operational capacity of the Regional Entity to implement the activities outlined in its proposal? Does it provide relevant examples/evidence that demonstrate its proven ability to successfully execute similar projects for a minimum of five years?
- The proposal provides a clear description of the technical and operational capacity of the RE and illustrates through relevant examples/evidence its proven ability to implement the proposed activities; or
 - The proposal provides a moderate description of the technical and operational capacity of the RE and illustrates through examples/evidence that suggest an ability to implement the proposed activities; or
 - The proposal provides a limited description of the technical and operational capacity of the RE and includes a few examples demonstrating a limited ability to implement the proposed activities; or
 - The proposal provides no description of the technical and operational capacity of the RE and includes a few or no examples, demonstrating a limited ability to implement the proposed activities.

For a Newly Established Regional Entity

1. Does the proposal describe how the Newly Established Regional Entity is addressing an existing capacity gap in the region or sub-region? Has a landscape analysis or similar assessment identified a need for such an entity? If yes, please provide details.
- The proposal provides a clear and compelling rationale for the strengthening of a Newly Established RE. It outlines, by describing assessments the Newly Established RE has undertaken, how the RE is uniquely positioned to undertake the work indicated in the proposal and is filling capacity gaps that no other RE in the region/subregion can fill and provides examples of ongoing activities; or
 - The proposal provides a moderate rationale for the strengthening of a Newly Established RE. It outlines how the Newly Established RE is positioned to undertake the work indicated in the proposal, with some details on ongoing activities but without detail on the capacity gap in the region/sub-region; or
 - The proposal provides a limited rationale for the strengthening of a Newly Established RE. It outlines how the Newly Established RE is positioned to undertake the work indicated in the proposal but provides a limited reason for how the Newly Established RE will fill a capacity gap in the region/sub-region and limited examples of ongoing activities; or

- The proposal provides no rationale for the strengthening of a Newly Established RE. The proposal outlines how the Newly Established RE is positioned to undertake the work indicated in the proposal but does not provide a reason for how the Newly Established RE will fill the capacity gap in the region/sub-region.
2. Does the proposal describe how the Regional Entity plans to build its internal capacity and achieve long-term technical sustainability along with the timeline for becoming fully operational, including staffing and recruitment plans, and for establishing (or developing) administrative and financial systems?
- The proposal provides a clear, well-sequenced strategy with defined roles, sourcing mechanisms, and milestones. It outlines the development of robust administrative and financial systems using best practices and technical support and presents a forward-looking sustainability plan anchored in internal capacity strengthening, governance structures, and diversified financing; or
 - The proposal presents a structured and phased approach to staffing and capacity-building, with a realistic 18–24-month timeline to full operationalization. It describes plans to establish administrative and financial systems, although they may benefit from greater detail on implementation and sustainability mechanisms; or
 - The proposal acknowledges the importance of internal capacity-building and outlines general intentions for recruitment and system development. However, it lacks specificity and clear linkages between the timeline and concrete milestones, and the vision for long-term sustainability requires further elaboration; or
 - The proposal provides limited or vague information on key elements such as staffing plans, recruitment timelines, and the establishment of administrative and financial systems. There is little-to-no indication of how or when the RE will become fully operational, and the approach to sustainability is underdeveloped.

A. Scope and Objectives of the Proposal, Targeted Core Capacities, Key Activities, Expected Outcomes, and Theory of Change

25%
of Total

1. Does the proposal provide descriptions of the scope, objectives, and activities that are relevant to the three programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers, and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan?²
 - The proposal provides a 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 a relevant description of 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 a 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 neither technically coherent nor linked to the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers, and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan.

² <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 toward maintained or increased levels of International Health Regulations (IHR)/ Performance of Veterinary Services (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 could require public health interventions (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 provide a summary of activities, the rationale for prioritization, and expected outputs and outcomes that may be financed by the Pandemic Fund project (including grant, co-finance, and co-investment), in line with Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan?
 - The proposal provides a clear summary description of how investments will strengthen capacities, outlining activities, the rationale for prioritization, and expected outputs and outcomes; or
 - The proposal provides a moderate summary description of how investments will strengthen capacities, outlining activities, the 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, the rationale for prioritization, and expected outputs and outcomes; or
 - The proposal neither provides a description of how investments will strengthen capacities nor outlines activities, the rationale for prioritization, and expected outputs and outcomes.
- 4a. Does the proposal present a clear Theory of Change³ for how the proposed activities, through the resources requested (Pandemic Fund grant, co-financing, co-investment), will translate into outputs, measurable outcomes, and overall impact, aligning with the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and drawing on the Project-Specific Results Framework (PSRF), thereby maximizing existing pandemic PPR efforts in the region/subregion?
 - The proposal presents a clear ToC with a logical and evidence-based pathway from activities to impact. It explicitly links proposed activities in the PSRF to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework, 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 links proposed activities in the PSRF to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework 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, lacks strong justification for how activities lead to intended outcomes, or presents a weak model; or
 - The proposal does not present a ToC, or the ToC is inadequately structured or does not demonstrate a pathway from activities to impact in relation to IHR, PVS, or Pandemic Fund priorities.

3 A Theory of Change is a method that explains how a given intervention, or set of interventions, is expected to lead to a specific development change, drawing on a causal analysis based on available evidence. A thorough ToC helps guide the development of sound and evidence-based programs, with assumptions and risks clearly analyzed and spelled out.

4b. Does the proposal describe the co-creation process of the ToC with relevant 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 the 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 describe the context in the region/sub-region in which project activities of the Regional Entity will take place?

- The proposal clearly describes the context including hazards, vulnerabilities, and the epidemiological situation of the region/sub-region; or
- The proposal provides a moderate description of the context including hazards, vulnerabilities, and the epidemiological situation of the region/sub-region; or
- The proposal provides a limited description of the context including hazards, vulnerabilities, and the epidemiological situation of the region/sub-region; or
- The proposal does not describe the context including hazards, vulnerabilities, and the epidemiological situation of the region/sub-region.

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 clear 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 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 findings, challenges, and gaps from past assessments nor does it indicate any plans to conduct assessments. There is little-to-no alignment with the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan.

5c. Does the proposal describe all the challenges and gaps raised by the assessments, how the funds requested will help close these gaps, and why these areas of need were prioritized in the grant application?

- The proposal provides a clear and well-articulated description of the challenges and gaps identified in past assessments. It convincingly explains how the requested funds will address these specific gaps and offers a strong justification for the prioritization of the selected areas, demonstrating clear alignment with national needs and the Pandemic Fund's objectives; or
- The proposal provides a moderate explanation of challenges and gaps based on previous assessments. It links the requested funds to some of the identified needs and offers partial justification for the areas prioritized, although the rationale could be more comprehensive or better aligned with national and strategic priorities; or
- The proposal includes a limited or general discussion of challenges and gaps from prior assessments. It provides minimal explanation of how the requested funds will address these issues, and the prioritization of needs appears somewhat arbitrary or insufficiently justified; or
- The proposal does not clearly describe the challenges or gaps identified in past assessments. There is little-to-no explanation of how the proposed funding will help close these gaps and no clear rationale is provided for why specific areas were prioritized in the grant application.

6a. Does the proposal clearly describe alignment between regional/sub-regional PPR plans, strategies, and frameworks and the scope, objectives, and activities of the project?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates alignment between regional/sub-regional PPR plans, strategies, and frameworks and the project's scope, objectives, and activities; or
- The proposal moderately demonstrates alignment between regional/sub-regional PPR plans, strategies, and frameworks and the project's scope, objectives, and activities; or
- The proposal provides limited references to regional/sub-regional plans, with little explanation of how the project's scope, objectives, and activities align with regional/sub-regional PPR plans, strategies, and frameworks; or
- The proposal does not describe alignment with regional/sub-regional PPR plans, strategies, and frameworks and the project's scope, objectives, and activities.

6a. Does the proposal identify priorities and how they are aligned with the relevant priorities of regional/sub-regional plans and regional strategic directions and frameworks?

- The proposal clearly identifies well-defined priorities that are strongly aligned with relevant regional and sub-regional plans and strategic frameworks. The alignment is explicitly demonstrated, with references to specific regional strategies, and the proposal builds on or complements ongoing regional initiatives and commitments; or
- The proposal identifies key priorities and provides a general explanation of how they align with regional and sub-regional plans or frameworks. While alignment is evident, it could be strengthened by more concrete references or clearer linkages to specific strategic objectives or regional initiatives; or
- The proposal mentions a few priorities but provides limited explanation of how these are connected to regional or sub-regional strategic plans. The alignment appears weak or superficial and does not clearly demonstrate how the proposal contributes to broader regional goals; or
- The proposal does not clearly identify priority areas or show how they relate to regional or sub-regional strategic directions or frameworks. There is little-to-no reference to regional planning documents or coordination with regional priorities.

7a. Do the proposal's scope, objectives, and activities demonstrate complementarity with other ongoing initiatives relevant to pandemic PPR and broader health and community system strengthening in the region/sub-region?

- 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 regional/subregional proposal clearly identify complementarities and/or contributions to the implementation of Pandemic Fund grants in either the 1st CfP or the 2nd CfP through a single-country proposal or multi-country proposal?

- The proposal clearly describes 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 significant amount of duplication of activities; or
- The proposal does not demonstrate any complementarities or 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 proposal describe the co-financing that will be mobilized from the Implementing Entities (IEs) or other partners (e.g., bilateral aid agencies, philanthropies) to complement the requested Pandemic Fund grant? What is the ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant amount to the total amount of 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 well-justified 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 IEs 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 mainly in-kind with limited details on valuation; 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 and in-kind) clearly described in the proposal with a source (IEs and other partners), amount, nature (cash or in-kind), and timeframe, and allocation for specific 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 information. 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 their related details.
10. Does the proposal explain the co-investment that will be committed by the Regional Entity to complement the requested Pandemic Fund grant to support project activities? What is the ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant amount to the total co-investment mobilized? (Note: If the co-investment is “in-kind,” the proposal must include imputed values in US\$ and describe policy commitments).
 - The proposal details co-investment from the Regional Entity, specifying in-cash and in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$. The grant to co-investment ratio is greater than 1:1, demonstrating significant ownership and sustainability by the RE; or
 - The proposal details co-investment from the RE, specifying in-cash and in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$ and/or described policy commitments and plans to incentivize investment in pandemic PPR with a ratio of 1:1; or
 - The proposal details co-investment from the RE, specifying in-cash and in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$. The grant to co-investment value is less than 1:1, demonstrating a lack of ownership and sustainability by the RE; or
 - The proposal does not detail co-investment from the RE. The project relies heavily on Pandemic Fund grant funds, indicating a lack of ownership and sustainability by the RE.
 - A waiver has been granted to the RE on the co-investment requirement. Therefore, the overall co-investment ratio is not evaluated. However, the RE has clearly specified in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$ and/or described policy commitments and plans to incentivize investment in pandemic PPR in the region/sub-region.
11. Is the breakdown of co-investment commitments (both in-cash and in-kind) described clearly 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 described; 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 information. Key aspects such as the specific source, amount, nature, or timeframe are insufficiently detailed; or
 - The proposal lacks a clear breakdown of co-investment commitments and its related details.
 - A waiver has been granted to the RE on the co-investment requirement. Therefore, the overall co-investment ratio is not evaluated. However, the RE has clearly specified in-kind contributions with imputed values in US\$ and/or described policy commitments and plans to incentivize investment in pandemic PPR in the region/sub-region.
12. Does the proposal describe technical and allocative efficiency, for example, prioritizing the use of resources in an efficient manner to achieve the stated outcomes⁴ and adhering to principles of “value for money?”⁵
- 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 IEs rather than beneficiaries.

4 Allocative efficiency refers to how different resource inputs are combined to produce a mix of different outputs. Technical efficiency refers to achieving maximum outputs with the least cost.

5 Value for money means 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 of the Regional Entity, ensuring engagement and co-creation with all relevant stakeholders in pandemic PPR in the region/sub-region and involving relevant IEs? Does it describe structures or mechanisms used to facilitate coordination and discussion?

- The proposal clearly demonstrates strong leadership and ownership by the RE. It describes well-established coordination structures that facilitated multi-stakeholder engagement and co-creation with all relevant stakeholders in the region/sub-region, including IEs; or
- The proposal demonstrates moderate leadership and ownership by the RE. It describes coordination structures that facilitated multi-stakeholder engagement; however, details are missing. The proposal demonstrates some co-creation with relevant stakeholders in the region/sub-region, including IEs; or
- The proposal demonstrates limited leadership and ownership by the RE. The RE deployed a weak coordination structure that does not demonstrate a sufficient level of stakeholder involvement, including with IEs; or
- The proposal does not demonstrate leadership and ownership by the RE. There is little or no mention of stakeholder involvement, including with IEs.

14a. Does the proposal demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations of, or commitment to, each of the four underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund Medium-term Strategic Plan? Underlying theme[1]:

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence of it.
- The underlying theme is not applicable in the region/sub-region's context, and the proposal provides clear and convincing justification.

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

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence of it.
- The underlying theme is not applicable in the region/sub-region's context, and the proposal provides clear and convincing justification.

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

- The proposal clearly demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates moderate consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides some evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates brief consideration of this underlying theme throughout the project articulation and design and provides little evidence of it, when relevant.
- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence of it.
- The underlying theme is not applicable in the region/sub-region's context, and the proposal provides clear and convincing justification.

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

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

- The proposal demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence of it.
 - The underlying theme is not applicable in the region/sub-region's context, and the proposal provides clear and convincing justification.
15. Does the proposal clearly outline how the Regional Entity will continue to coordinate and collaborate throughout the project lifecycle—including implementation, monitoring and evaluation, and reporting—with all relevant partners? How will coordination be achieved between relevant stakeholders in the region/sub-region? Will existing or new structures/mechanisms be established to ensure successful project outcomes? Does the proposal describe the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders?
- The proposal clearly describes the coordination and collaboration role of the RE throughout the project lifecycle, describing coordination structures and the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder; or
 - The proposal outlines the coordination and collaboration role of the RE throughout the project lifecycle, but lacks some details on coordination structures and/or the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders; or
 - The proposal provides a limited description of the coordination and collaboration role of the RE throughout the project lifecycle, providing minimal details on coordination structures and on the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders; or
 - The proposal does not outline the coordination and collaboration role of RE throughout the project lifecycle, with no details on coordination structures and the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.
16. Does the proposal demonstrate how the Regional Entity will be able to sustain, over the long-term, the project's outcomes in PPR strengthening beyond the completion of the project and how this will be financed and evaluated in the region/sub-region?
- The proposal clearly outlines a sustainability plan beyond the project's completion, detailing specific financing mechanisms, strong policy commitment from the RE and stakeholders, and long-term evaluation strategies. It demonstrates full integration into regional/sub-regional 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 from the RE. It offers a partial description of how project outcomes will be maintained and financed, with some alignment to regional/sub-regional policies and frameworks; or

- The proposal provides limited articulation of sustainability beyond the project's completion, including some planned co-investment (in-cash and in-kind) and policy commitments from the RE. It offers a partial description of how project outcomes will be maintained and financed, with some alignment to regional/sub-regional 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 by the RE, or alignment with regional/sub-regional policies and frameworks. The long-term impact and continuation of project outcomes are uncertain.

E. Implementation and Monitoring and Evaluation

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 costed monitoring and evaluation plan that outlines who will be responsible, when and how M&E will be conducted, and which specific M&E activities will be financed by the grant? How will lesson learning take place and what processes will be used to track the 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 stakeholders 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 to the RE, IEs, other relevant stakeholders, and delivery partners for project implementation, ensuring alignment with the Project-Specific Results Framework?
- 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 on 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 identify key risks related to implementation including how they will be managed and mitigated?⁶
- The proposal provides a clear, 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

6 According to the Operations Manual (Paragraph 20), each IE is responsible for the management of risks associated with the respective projects it implements and reporting on such risks and mitigation measures, as appropriate, in accordance with its policies and procedures, as part of its annual progress and results reporting.

- 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.
21. Does the proposal outline how environmental and social safeguards will be managed in compliance 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.