

Annex 7: Strategic Review Committee (SRC) Score card for Project Prioritization

SRC - Categories weighting

Categories		Weighting
A	Strategic relevance Aimed at assessing the alignment of the proposed project with the HRP and the allocation strategy	30
B	Programmatic relevance Assesses if the proposed activities are adequate to meet the proposed objective	30
C	Cost effectiveness Assesses if the cost of the proposed projects is commensurate to the intended outputs and outcomes	15
D	Cluster specific criteria Assess if the proposal is technically sound and adheres to cluster standards	20
E	Engagement with coordination Assess partners engagement in humanitarian coordination forums including its level of participation in cluster meetings/activities	5
Total		100

Scorecard for Project Prioritization

Score card				
Category		Question(s)	score	
Strategic Relevance	30	Is the proposal in the HRP and in line with the allocation strategy on sustained response to famine prevention, prioritisation and guideliens. Partners with presence in the target locations with capacity to quickly and directly implement should be scored highest. (25 points)	Yes/fully	25
			Substantially	20
			Partially	15
			Minimally	10
			Barely	5
		Is the proposal submitted by a NNGO (5 points)	Yes	5
		No	0	
Programmatic Relevance	30	Are the proposed activities in line with those prioritized for drought response/famine prevention by the Cluster. To obtain maximum effectiveness and impact from the limited resources available under this allocation, projects with activities matching those considered by the cluster as most relevant for drought response should be scored highest. (15 points)	Yes/fully	15
			Substantially	12
			Partially	9
			Minimally	6
			Barely	3
		Is protection central in response and does the project demonstrate a relationship between humanitarian crisis and the real assistance needs for Men, Women, Boys and Girls? Projects that demonstrate higher quality gender and protection mainstreaming and accountability to affected people should be scored higher. (15 points)		
			Yes fully	15
			Substantially	12
			Partially	9
			Minimally	6
		Barely	3	
Cost Effectiveness	15	Is the cost per beneficiary competitive and within an acceptable range for the cluster? Projects that represent better value for money should be scored higher. Is the total cost of the project per beneficiary competitive when compared to other projects with similar activities, and in line with cluster norms? (15 points)	Yes/fully	15
			Substantially	12
			Partially	9
			Minimally	6
			Barely	3
Cluster Specific Criteria	20	Direct implementation, clear linkage in project objective, activities and output, Indicators SMART, Well defined target beneficiaries, project adheres to cluster minimum standards. (20 points)	Yes	20
			Substantially	16
			Partially	12
			Minimally	8
			Barely	4
Coordination	5	Does the partner participate in the cluster (i.e. attend cluster meetings, provide timely information/report to the cluster (5 points)	Yes	5
			Partially	3
			No	0
Total	100			

SOMALIA HUMANITARIAN FUND

Project Prioritization - Scoring Sheet - **SAMPLE ONLY** - to be submitted via GMS

This scoring sheet is to support Strategic Review Committees in their prioritization of projects for the SHF.
In addition to the four generic criteria that apply across clusters (1-3,5), each cluster can add cluster-spreicific technical criteria (4).
The score card parameters to consider under each standard criteria is shown below the table.
The scores will be reflected in the SHF Granta Management System. Please submit the soft copy of the score sheet to your SHF focal point.

(A) Cluster		<div>Signature Cluster Coordinator</div> <div>Signature Cluster Co-Chair</div>
(B) Allocation		
(C) Cluster Coordinator (name, title and		
(D) Cluster Co-Chair (name, title and organization)		
(E) SRC Members (names)		
(F) Date of Submission to SHF		
(G) Summary of issues (if any)		

No	Project Title	Organization (acronym)	1	2	3	4	5	Total score (automated) (100 points)	Recommen d (Yes/No)	Amount Recommend ed US\$	Comments	Locations (regions only, recommended projects only)
			Strategic relevance (30 points)	Programmati c relevance (25 points)	Cost effectiveness (15 points)	Cluster specific (25 points)	Coordination (5 points)					
1								0				
2								0				
3								0				
4								0				
5								0				
6								0				
7								0				
8								0				
9								0				
10								0				
11								0				
12								0				
13								0				
14								0				
15								0				
16								0				
17								0				
18								0				
19								0				
20								0				
21								0				
22								0				
23								0				
24								0				
25								0				
TOTAL										0		