

Scoring and Weighting Methodology

For Applicants of the Fourth Call to Proposals

April 1, 2026



**The
Pandemic
Fund**

FOR A RESILIENT WORLD

Official Use Only

FOR INFORMATION

Scoring and Weighting Methodology

April 1, 2026

The Scoring and Weighting methodology will be used to evaluate the Funding Applications [henceforth referred to as Application] received under the Pandemic Fund’s Fourth Call for Proposals (4th CfP), announced in November 2025¹. Each Application will be reviewed based on both qualitative and quantitative considerations on the following sections:

- A. Scope, objectives, and costed Project activities and indicators**
- B. Context, demonstrated needs and alignment with national priorities**
- C. Co-financing, Co-investment and Value for Money**
- D. Ownership, Commitment, and Coordination**
- E. Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation**

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 1). These weights will be used to calculate a final score for Funding Applications.

TABLE 1

Section	% of Total Score
A. Scope, objectives and costed Project activities and indicators	25
B. Context, demonstrated needs and alignment with national priorities	20
C. Co-financing, Co-investment, and Value for Money	20
D. Ownership, Commitment, and Coordination	15
E. Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation	20
TOTAL	100%

To qualify for funding, Applications must achieve a minimum overall score of 80% and at least 80% in each section. An 80% minimum scoring overall and in each section allows the

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

identification of proposals that are technically and strategically sound. A lower score in any of the Sections may represent an implementation risk.

The following sections include the questions that will be used to guide the evaluation and scoring of Applications. The numbering of these questions aligns with the numbering in the Funding Application Template. They aim to ensure consistent and transparent assessment of Applications submitted under the Fourth Call.

A. Scope, objectives, and costed Project activities and indicators (25% of Total)

1. Does the Application provide a clear description of the objectives of the proposed Project (supported by the Pandemic Fund grant, alongside co-financing and co-investments), scope and costed activities, and how they support the three programmatic priorities and cross-cutting enablers, with consideration to underlying themes as set out in the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan²?
 - A. The Application provides a clear, detailed and comprehensive description of the Project's objectives, scope 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
 - B. The Application provides an adequate description of the Project's objectives, scope and activities, showing alignment with the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan; or
 - C. The Application provides limited description of the Project's objectives, scope 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
 - D. The Application does not provide a technically coherent description of the Project's objectives, scope, and activities, and these are not aligned with the programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers, or underlying themes of the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan.

2. Does the Application present a clear Theory of Change³ (TOC) for how the proposed activities, through the Project (financed by the requested Pandemic Fund grant, alongside co-financing and co-investment), will strengthen IHR and PVS capacities,

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

³ 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.

relevant to one or more of the Pandemic Fund's programmatic priorities, cross-cutting enablers and underlying themes?

- A. The Application 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
 - B. The Application 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
 - C. The Application 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
 - D. The Application 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.
3. Does the Application describe the co-creation process of the TOC with all stakeholders involved in the Project?
- A. The Application clearly describes the co-creation process, demonstrating engagement with all relevant stakeholders and clearly explaining how their input informed and shaped the of the TOC; or
 - B. The Application adequately describes the co-creation process with some, but not all, stakeholders involved providing a general explanation of how stakeholder input informed and shaped the TOC; or
 - C. The Application provides limited description of the co-creation but with limited details on stakeholder engagement and little explanation of how feedback influenced the TOC; or
 - D. The Application does not describe a co-creation process of the TOC and provides no evidence of stakeholder engagement.
4. Do activities included in the Application to be financed by the Project (including the Pandemic Fund grant, co-financing and co-investment), align with the stated scope and objectives and presented TOC? Will they help to strengthen the identified International Health Regulations (IHR) and/or veterinary capacities in line with Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan?
- A. The activities included in the Application are fully aligned with the stated scope, objectives, and TOC. The activities are coherent and well-justified and are clearly expected to strengthen the identified IHR and/or veterinary capacities in line with the Pandemic Fund's Medium-term Strategic Plan.

- B. The activities included in the Application are generally aligned with the stated scope, objectives, and TOC. While some elements could be more clearly articulated, the activities are reasonably expected to contribute to strengthening the identified IHR and/or veterinary capacities in line with the Pandemic Fund’s Medium-term Strategic Plan.
- C. The activities included in the Application show limited or partial alignment with the stated scope, objectives, and TOC. The link between the proposed activities and the strengthening of the identified IHR and/or veterinary capacities is weak, unclear, or insufficiently justified.
- D. The activities included in the Application do not align with the stated scope, objectives, or TOC and are not expected to strengthen the identified IHR and/or veterinary capacities in line with the Pandemic Fund’s Medium-term Strategic Plan.

This question below is not scored:

5. Select in which areas the project investments 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. Please explain briefly how the activity supported by the project is directly contributing to this area.
 - Policy, Legal and normative Instruments to implement IHR 2005 and World Organization for Animal Health (WOAH) international standards
 - IHR Coordination, National IHR Focal Point functions and advocacy, One Health coordination mechanism
 - Financing
 - Biosafety and biosecurity
 - Public and animal health emergency management
 - Workforce surge during a public health event, or events that would require public health intervention (e.g., mass gatherings, natural disasters)
 - Health services provision
 - Animal (domestic, wildlife) health service provision
 - Infection prevention and control (IPC)
 - Animal diseases prevention, control and eradication
 - Risk communications
 - Points of Entry (PoEs) and border health
 - Food safety
 - Zoonoses
 - Anti-Microbial Resistance (AMR)
 - Changes in environmental conditions
 - Other /specify

B. Context, demonstrated needs and alignment with national priorities (20% of Total)

6. Does the Application comprehensively describe, and substantiate with evidence, the context in which Project activities will take place?
 - A. The Application provides a clear and comprehensive description of the context including relevant hazards, vulnerabilities, and epidemiological situation of the **Eligible Beneficiaries (henceforth referred to as “Eligible Co-investors”)**. The application provides strong evidence to support the description; or
 - B. The Application provides an adequate description of the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the Eligible Co-investor, but with limited depth and/or supporting evidence;
 - C. The Application provides limited description of the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the Eligible Co-investor; or
 - D. The Application does not describe the context including hazards, vulnerabilities and epidemiological situation of the Eligible Co-investor.

7. Does the Application provide a clear and comprehensive summary of the findings of the assessments performed in the last 4 years, clearly describing challenges and gaps in line with the Pandemic Fund’s Medium-term Strategic Plan?
 - A. The Application provides a clear, comprehensive, and well-structured summary of relevant assessments conducted in the last four years. It clearly outlines key findings, challenges, and gaps, with strong alignment to the Pandemic Fund’s Medium-term Strategic Plan; or
 - B. The Application provides an adequate summary of the past assessments, covering key challenges and gaps in alignment to the Pandemic Fund’s Medium-term strategic plan; or
 - C. The Application provides a limited summary of past assessments, explanation of findings, challenges, or gaps. The connection to the Pandemic Fund’s Medium-term Strategic Plan is weak or unclear; or
 - D. The Application 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.

8. Does the Application clearly describe alignment between the national plan(s) including the national action plan for health security (NAPHS), strategies and policy frameworks and the scope, objective and priorities of the Project?
 - A. The Application clearly demonstrates alignment between national priorities in PPR and the Project’s scope, objective and priorities with explicit references to relevant national plans, strategies, and policy frameworks; or

- B. The Application adequately demonstrates alignment between national priorities in PPR and Project's scope, objective and priorities with sufficient references to relevant national plans, strategies, and policy frameworks; or
 - C. The Application provides 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
 - D. The Application does not describe alignment with national plans, or the alignment is unclear.
9. Does the Application's scope, objectives and priorities demonstrate complementarity with other on-going initiatives relevant to Pandemic PPR (including Projects supported by previously awarded Pandemic Fund multi-country grants / regional entity grant) and the broader health system strengthening efforts?
- A. The Application clearly demonstrates complementarity with on-going initiatives; or
 - B. The Application demonstrates adequate complementarity with on-going initiatives; or
 - or
 - C. The Application shows limited complementarity with on-going initiatives; or
 - D. The Application does not demonstrate complementarity with on-going initiatives.

C. Co-financing, Co-investment and value for money (20% of Total)

10. Does the Application include co-financing mobilized from the Implementing Entities (IEs) or other partners to complement the requested Pandemic Fund grant and to support Project activities? What is the ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant amount to total co-financing mobilized? All co-financing contributions must be described in signed Co-Financing Letter of Intent from the co-financier which clearly states the co-financier's name; the expected funding amount; the Project activities it will support; the expected dates by which the funds are likely to become available; and the expiry date. If the co-financing is "in-kind", the Application must include imputed values in US\$.
- A. The Application secures significant confirmed co-financing contributions with a **high** leverage ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-financing (e.g., greater than 1:5); or
 - B. The Application secures confirmed co-financing contributions with a **moderate** leverage ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-financing (e.g., between 1:4 and 1:5); or
 - C. The Application secures confirmed co-financing contributions, with a **low** ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-financing (e.g., between 1:2 and 1:4); or
 - D. The Applications low to no confirmed co-financing contributions (e.g., below 1:2).
11. Does the Application demonstrate co-investment that will be provided by the Eligible Co-investor to complement the requested Pandemic Fund grant and support Project activities? What is the ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to total co-investment mobilized? All co-investment contributions must be described in signed Co-investor Letters of Intent from relevant authorities which clearly state the source of co-investment; the expected funding amount; the Project activities it will support; the expected date by which the funds are likely to become available; and the expiry date and aligns how it aligns with national priorities. If the co-investment is "in-kind", the Application must include imputed values in US\$ terms and describe policy commitments.
- A. The Application secures confirmed co-investment from the Eligible Co-investor with a **high** leverage ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-investment (e.g., for LICs greater than 1:0.7, for LMICs 1:4) demonstrating significant national ownership and sustainability.
 - B. The Application secures confirmed co-investment from the Eligible Co-investor with a **Moderate** leverage ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-investment (e.g., between 1:0.1 and 1:0.7 for LICs and between 1:2 and 1:4 for LMICs) showing reasonable national engagement; or
 - C. The Application secures confirmed co-investment from the Eligible Co-investor with a **Low** leverage ratio of the Pandemic Fund grant to co-investment (e.g., less than

- 1:0.1 for LICs and less than 1:2 for LMICs), indicating minimal in-cash commitment;
or
- D. The Application does not secure confirmed co-investment confirmation letter or provides only vague, unverified information. There is no clear co-investment of contribution, and policy commitments are absent or weak.
 - E. The Eligible Co-investor is in debt distress, or at high risk of debt distress and is not required to provide in-cash contribution, however, to demonstrate commitment and ownership, the Eligible Co-investor will provide in-kind co-investment and policy commitments in support of the Project activities.
12. Does the Application describe technical and allocative efficiency, i.e., prioritizing the use of resources in an efficient manner to achieve the stated outcomes⁴, adhering to principles of “value for money”?⁵ Does it demonstrate that most of the grant financing requested will go to the Eligible Co-investor, on-budget (rather than to IEs)? If IEs are being asked to procure goods and services on behalf of the Eligible Co-investor, has a clear justification for this been provided?
- A. The Application 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 the Eligible Co-investor. The cost-effectiveness of interventions is well-justified; or
 - B. The Application describes efforts to ensure efficient resource allocation and value for money, but some areas lack detailed justification. While a substantial proportion of financing (at least 70%) is directed to the Eligible Co-investor and/or Delivery Partners, there may be minor inefficiencies or unclear cost-effectiveness considerations; or
 - C. The Application provides limited reference to resource efficiency and weak cost-effectiveness analysis. Less than 70% of total grant financing is directed to the Eligible Co-investor and/or Delivery Partners, with potential inefficiencies, including, for example, significant overhead costs beyond the IE administrative fee; or
 - D. The Application lacks a clear reference to technical and allocative efficiency. There is no evidence that value for money principles are applied, and a significant portion

⁴ 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.

⁵ 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>

of financing may be directed to IEs for direct implementation rather than the Eligible Co-investor.

D. Ownership, Commitment, and Coordination (15% of Total)

13. Does the Application demonstrate the Eligible Co-investor's ownership and leadership in its development, ensuring multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation by all actors in pandemic PPR (including human, animal, and environmental health) and involving relevant IEs and CSOs? Does it describe structures or mechanisms used to facilitate coordination and discussion?
 - A. The Application clearly demonstrates strong country leadership and ownership in its development. It describes well-established coordination structures that enabled multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation of all relevant actors, including IEs; or
 - B. The Application adequately demonstrates country leadership and ownership in its development. Multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation are evident though some aspects lack details; or
 - C. The Application demonstrates limited country leadership and ownership in its development. Multi-sectoral engagement and co-creation are weak, unclear, or inconsistently described, and coordination mechanisms, if mentioned, are poorly defined.
 - D. The Application does not demonstrate country ownership or leadership in developing the Application. There is little or no evidence of multi-sectoral engagement, co-creation, or coordination structures.

14. Does the Application demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [1]?
 - A. The Application clearly demonstrates consistent consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides evidence, when relevant; or
 - B. The Application adequately demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides some supporting evidence, when relevant, though the treatment could be more consistent or detailed;
 - C. The Application demonstrates limited consideration of this underlying theme, with brief or superficial references in the Project description and design and little supporting evidence where relevant; or
 - D. The Application demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence.

15. Does the Application demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [2]?

- A. The Application clearly demonstrates consistent consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides evidence, when relevant; or
 - B. The Application adequately demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides some supporting evidence, when relevant, though the treatment could be more consistent or detailed;
 - C. The Application demonstrates limited consideration of this underlying theme, with brief or superficial references in the Project description and design and little supporting evidence where relevant; or
 - D. The Application demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence.
16. Does the Application demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [3]?
- A. The Application clearly demonstrates consistent consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides evidence, when relevant; or
 - B. The Application adequately demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides some supporting evidence, when relevant, though the treatment could be more consistent or detailed;
 - C. The Application demonstrates limited consideration of this underlying theme, with brief or superficial references in the Project description and design and little supporting evidence where relevant; or
 - D. The Application demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence.
17. Does the Application demonstrate an effort to integrate considerations around or commitment to the underlying theme [4]?
- A. The Application clearly demonstrates consistent consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides evidence, when relevant; or
 - B. The Application adequately demonstrates consideration of this underlying theme throughout the Project articulation and design and provides some supporting evidence, when relevant, though the treatment could be more consistent or detailed;
 - C. The Application demonstrates limited consideration of this underlying theme, with brief or superficial references in the Project description and design and little supporting evidence where relevant; or

- D. The Application demonstrates no consideration of this underlying theme and provides no evidence.
18. Does the Application clearly outline how the Eligible Co-investor country will continue to coordinate and collaborate throughout the Project lifecycle – implementation, monitoring and evaluation and reporting with all relevant partners? Does it specify whether the existing coordination structure will be maintained or replaced with a new mechanism, and clearly define the roles and responsibilities of each sector involved?
- A. The Application clearly describes the coordination and collaboration role of country through the Project lifecycle, describing coordination structures and the roles and responsibilities of each sector; or
- B. The Application adequately outlines the country’s coordination and collaboration role throughout the Project lifecycle, but lacks some specificity regarding coordination structures and/or the roles and responsibilities of each sector; or
- C. The Application provides a limited description of the coordination and collaboration role of country through the Project lifecycle, providing minimal details on coordination structures and on roles and responsibilities of each sector; or
- D. The Application does not outline the coordination and collaboration role of country through the Project lifecycle and provides no details on coordination structures and roles and responsibilities of each sector.
19. Does the Application demonstrate that the Eligible Co-investor 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?
- A. The Application clearly describes a sustainability & institutionalization 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
- B. The Application provides an adequate description of a sustainability & institutionalization plan 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
- C. The Application provides a limited description of sustainability & institutionalization 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
- D. The Application does not describe sustainability & institutionalization 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, monitoring and evaluation (20% of Total)

20. Does the Application describe how intended results 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 Application provides specific examples.
- A. The Application clearly describes how the intended results are linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and Project level indicators. Illustrative and relevant examples are provided; or
 - B. The Application adequately describes how intended results are linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and Project level indicators. Several examples are provided but they are lacking in detail; or
 - C. The Application includes a limited description of intended results and limited linkage to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework and Project level indicators. Several examples are provided but they are neither specific nor relevant; or
 - D. The Application provides no detail of how the intended results are linked to the Pandemic Fund Results Framework or without Project level indicators.
21. Does the Application 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, and which specific activities will be financed by the Pandemic Fund grant, by co-financing and by co-investment? How will lesson learning take place and what processes will be used for tracking Project's progress?
- A. The Application presents a clearly 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
 - B. The Application provides an adequate 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
 - C. The Application includes a limited M&E plan with minimal cost details and vague descriptions of tracking mechanisms. It does not define how lessons will be learned or how progress will be monitored effectively; or
 - D. The Application provides no 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.

22. Does the Application clearly define how responsibilities for activities and outcomes, reporting, and accountability will be allocated across the Eligible Co-investor, IEs, and Delivery Partners in Project implementation, ensuring alignment with the Guidance Note and the Pandemic Fund Results Framework?
- A. The Application clearly describes the allocation of responsibilities across all relevant stakeholders, including the Eligible Co-investor, IEs, and partners, in line with the Guidance Note. Reporting and accountability mechanisms are well-structured and aligned with the Pandemic Fund Results Framework; or
 - B. The Application adequately describes 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 Pandemic Fund Results Framework; or
 - C. The Application provides a limited description of responsibilities, with gaps in coordination, reporting structures, and accountability mechanisms. Alignment with the Project-Specific Framework is weak; or
 - D. The Application lacks a clear allocation of responsibilities, with little to no detail on reporting and accountability mechanisms. There is no clear alignment with the Pandemic Fund Results Framework.
23. Does the Application 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) and describe how they will be managed and mitigated?⁶
- A. The Application provides a comprehensive and detailed description of foreseeable risks and clear actions to mitigate them. The risk management approach is detailed, feasible, and integrated into the Project design; or
 - B. The Application 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
 - C. The Application provides a limited description of some risks but lacks a comprehensive analysis. Mitigation strategies are vague or incomplete, and the overall risk management approach appears insufficient; or
 - D. The Application does not 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.

⁶ 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.

24. Does the Application clearly outline how environmental and social safeguards have been incorporated into the design and how they will be managed --including preventing sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment, child protection, and mitigating harm based on ethnicity, vulnerability or marginalization of groups, data-sharing, governance and other relevant aspects--in compliance with each IE's policies and procedures?
- A. The Application clearly demonstrates a comprehensive consideration of safeguards;
or
 - B. The Application adequately demonstrates consideration of safeguards with some lack of detail; or
 - C. The Application shows limited consideration of safeguards with; or
 - D. The Application does not demonstrate consideration of safeguards.



**The
Pandemic
Fund**
FOR A RESILIENT WORLD