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| **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** |