

**FIRST CALL FOR PROPOSALS**

**OF THE PROJECT**

**"PROTECTION OF MARITIME RESOURCES IN CENTRAL**

**AMERICA III"**

**PROJECT PROPOSAL EVALUATION MATRIX**

This document contains the evaluation matrix for project proposals (PP) of the proponents whose concept notes (CN) have been approved.

The maximum score is 145 points for the proposal description. Only proposals that exceed a minimum percentage of 70%, equivalent to 101.5 points, and that have the approval of at least 50% of the evaluation committee members may be selected for funding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project name** |  |
| **Name of evaluator** |  |
| **PP number**  (Include the number provided by the PIU*)* |  |

**Section I. Submitted documentation**

*This section will be completed by the PIU*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Yes** | **No** | **Not applicable** | **Comments** |
| Complete PP |  |  |  |  |
| Documents submitted with the PP |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Grant agreement or matching funds commitment letter |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Endorsement letter from the national authority (CMPA) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Letter of agreement with the project should indigenous and/or Afro-descendant peoples participate |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Research or restoration registrations and/or permits/licenses required by national or local government institutions, or proof that procedures have been initiated |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A video of a maximum of three minutes long, summarizing the project's objective, implementers, activities, expected results, and impacts (optional) |  |  |  |  |

Listed below are the documents that the proponent has updated:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section I Summary:** (completed by the PIU)  The PP (incl. required documentation) is ◻ complete  ◻ incomplete  Comments: |

**Section II. Evaluation of compliance with mandatory requirements**

*This section will be completed by the PIU. In case the answer is No, the PP is rejected.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Aspects to evaluate** | **Yes** | **No** | **Comments** |
| 1 | Matching funds include details of the proponent's contributions, specify other donors, and represent 20% of the estimated project cost |  |  |  |
| 2 | The proposed activities do not include elements from the Exclusion List |  |  |  |
| 3 | The project has an environmental and social risk rating of C, B, or B+ |  |  |  |
| 4 | The detailed budget is within the allowed amounts |  |  |  |
| 5 | The schedule is within the period allowed |  |  |  |
| 6 | Endorsed by the national authority |  |  |  |
| 7 | It has the agreement of the indigenous and/or Afro-descendant peoples (if applicable) |  |  |  |
| 8 | *The project contributes to the required Phase III Logical Framework indicators*  *Projects under funding line 1 ("Conservation") must contribute in a mandatory way to the following Phase III objective indicator: "O1: Area in hectares with better conservation."*  *Projects under funding line 2 ("Sustainable use") must contribute in a mandatory way to the following Phase III objective indicator: "O2: Area of relevant ecosystems with more sustainable use."*  *In addition, the project must contribute to at least two more indicators of the Phase III Logical Framework, which the proponent may select.* |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Section II Summary:**  The PP complies with all the mandatory requirements ◻ It complies  ◻ Does not comply  Comments: |

**Section III. Evaluation of the PP**

*This section is to be completed individually by each member of the evaluation committee. Rate each aspect from 1 to 5, where 1 - does not or unclear, 2 - poorly, 3 - partially, 4 - satisfactorily, and 5 - it does or fully. The maximum score for this section is 145 points.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Aspects to evaluate** | **Score** | **Comments** |
| 1 | Considers the participation of other key stakeholders and shows knowledge about the characteristics of these groups (e.g., number of members, gender distribution, representation of indigenous or Afro-descendant populations, main economic occupation of members of organizations, associations, cooperatives, and/or groups) |  |  |
| 2 | The summary describes the PP in a comprehensive, accurate, coherent, and concise manner |  |  |
| 3 | The context, the problem to be addressed, and how it will be addressed are clearly stated |  |  |
| 4 | The target group is well defined and characterized |  |  |
| 5 | Explains, through the Theory of Change, how the interventions will generate the expected results and how the specific objectives and the project objective will be achieved |  |  |
| 6 | Establishes an objective that can be achieved within the project duration and with the proposed resources (feasibility) |  |  |
| 7 | The objective contributes to the conservation and sustainable use of resources in and/or between the CMPAs of the MAR |  |  |
| 8 | Establishes specific objectives (no more than five) that are measurable, achievable, objective-oriented, and time-bound |  |  |
| 9 | It details the expected results for each specific objective (no more than three per objective) that can be achieved based on the proposed activities, amounts, and time frame |  |  |
| 10 | The proposed activities are suitable to achieve the expected results |  |  |
| 11 | The specific objectives and expected results are encompassed in one or more Phase III results |  |  |
| 12 | The implementation time frame for the activities is realistic and includes times that are suitable for the achievement of the specific objectives |  |  |
| 13 | Includes products that adequately respond to the specific objective that encompasses them |  |  |
| 14 | Establishes indicators that are measurable, appropriate, and consistent with the specific objectives and expected results |  |  |
| 15 | The Project Development Table is complete and duly filled out with all the requested elements |  |  |
| 16 | Aligns with or contributes to national and regional priorities, plans, strategies, and/or policies for sustainable natural resource management |  |  |
| 17 | Considers synergies with other projects |  |  |
| 18 | The monitoring and evaluation methodology and/or protocols are appropriate to evidence progress towards the expected project results |  |  |
| 19 | Indicates how the activities will have continuity after the funding ends |  |  |
| 20 | The way results will be shared/disseminated is appropriate and effective |  |  |
| 21 | It has an effective grievance mechanism with an adequate monitoring protocol and describes the steps it will take to resolve grievances |  |  |
| 22 | Establishes a reasonable, clear, mathematically correct budget and describes each necessary budget item |  |  |
| 23 | The budget reflects the needs of the project and allows the activities described in the Project Development Table to be carried out efficiently |  |  |
| 24 | Quality (in cash/in-kind) and amount of matching funds |  |  |
| 25 | Identifies the project's environmental and social risks |  |  |
| 26 | Proposes the implementation of appropriate and feasible mitigation measures within the project implementation time frame |  |  |
| 27 | The project implementation is feasible within the established time frame and with the requested funding |  |  |
| 28 | Fosters regional cooperation |  |  |
| 29 | It is aligned with the Phase III Logical Framework (number of indicators to which it contributes, similar objectives, etc.) |  |  |
|  | **TOTAL** |  |  |
|  | **Percentage** | **%** |  |

**Comments:**

**Final result**

Recommendation: *(delete the two options that do not apply)*

1. Approve
2. Approve with recommendations *(include recommendations at the end of the document)*
3. Do not approve