|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **SCORING MATRIX** | | |
| **Rating** | **Criteria** | **Score** |
| **Very Good** | • Demonstrates a very strong alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Project offers very good value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are very good, with an exit strategy that demonstrates sustainability post-grant funding • Complete confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes.  • Very good prospects for project success | **5** |
| **Good** | • Demonstrates a good alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Project offers good value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are good, with an exit strategy that outlines the potential to sustain the project post-grant funding • High level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes.  • Good prospects for project success | **4** |
| **Acceptable** | • Demonstrates an acceptable alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Project offers reasonable value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are acceptable, with an exit strategy that outlines some potential options for sustaining delivery post-grant funding. • Some acceptable weaknesses or deficiencies in deliverability • Reasonable level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes.  • Reasonable probability of project success | **3** |
| **Marginal** | • Demonstrates a basic but limited alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Possibly capable of delivering and achieving proposed outputs and outcomes.  • Project unlikely to offer value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are high, with an exit strategy that fails to provide confidence in continuity post-grant funding • Some weaknesses or deficiencies • Limited level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes.  • Possibility of project success | **2** |
| **Poor** | • Demonstrates a very limited understanding of local need, engagement, or very limited ability to meet alignment to local and national priorities • Major weaknesses or deficiencies • Project fails to offer value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are very high. Exit strategy is poor. • Very limited level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes.  • Low probability of project success | **1** |
| **Unacceptable** | • Fails to meet the criterion in all respects • Indicates a complete misunderstanding of, or non-compliance with, stated requirements • No Confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes.  • No prospect of project success | **0** |