



THE INCUBATOR FOR INTEGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN EAST AFRICA (IIDEA)

“Integration Made Real for Citizens”

IIDEA Scoring System for the Innovative Project Proposals

The IIDEA innovative project proposals will be appraised and scored out of a total of 200 points as follows;

- (a) 100 points will be awarded based on the project proposal’s level of alignment to the overall IIDEA project concept and its contribution to one of IIDEA’s priority topics/themes and specific objectives; and
- (b) 100 points will be awarded on the basis of meeting a generic selection criterion which will assess their efficiency, effectiveness and how appropriately they address the IIDEA’s cross cutting themes.

	CRITERION	MAXIMUM SCORE
1.0	PROGRAMME, PRIORITY AND THEME SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES	
1.1	Programme Specific Objectives	20
1.2	Priority and Theme Specific Objectives	20
2.0	EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS	
2.1	Value for Money / Added Value	20
2.2	Need and potential for project replication in other EAC contexts	20
2.3	Capacities and organizational capabilities	20
3.0	CROSS CUTTING THEMES	
3.1	Gender and marginalized groups	20
3.2	Sustainable Development	20
3.3	Impact on citizens in the region	20
3.4	Partnership	20
3.5	Conflict Sensitivity	20
TOTAL		200
QUALITY THRESHOLD (65% of the total points)		120

Below are tables detailing the questions to be considered by the evaluators while awarding points to each of the proposed innovative projects, and which are based on the set evaluation and scoring criteria. While it is not a guarantee for funding, a quality threshold score of 120 points (60% of the total points) is a required threshold for a project to be considered for support.

1.0 PROGRAMME, PRIORITY & THEME SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

1.1 Programme Specific Objectives (20 points)

Guiding questions
Does the proposed innovative project, demonstrate real life experiences and opportunities of citizens in the implementation of the EAC Common Market?
Are the IIDEA's guiding principles (Vision, Mission, Purpose, Specific Objectives and Expected Impact) ingrained into the objectives of the project proposal?
Is the proposed project innovative (with new product or ideas) and strategic in focus?
Is the proposed project cross border in nature? (Is it set to be implemented in/between at least two EAC Partner States?)
Does the proposed project build on the experiences and lessons from previous/current cross-border initiatives?
Does the proposed project clearly address one of the IIDEA's priority topics/themes? What is the target group?
NOTE: A higher score may be awarded if the proposed project clearly demonstrates the positive outcomes for these people (groups) and places (areas). Therefore, although marks will be awarded for working with the target groups and/or areas, an analysis of the project outputs, outcomes, impacts, long term changes etc. will result in extra marks.

1.2 Priority and Theme Specific Objectives (20 points)

Guiding questions
Does the proposed project communicate tangible outcomes of the EAC Integration process to the citizens of the EAC Partner States?
Does the proposed project have the capacity to influence the perceptions of the citizens on the EAC Integration Process?
Has a bottom-up approach been adopted in the development the project proposal? Has the proposal development process been inclusive between the collaborating organizations and the targeted group?

2.0 RELEVANCY, EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

2.1 Value for Money / Added Value (20 points)

Guiding questions
Has a well costed budget been provided with a clear breakdown of all supporting costs?
Are overhead / management charges apportioned on a justifiable basis-15%?
Does the project demonstrate efficient use of the goods and services purchased for the project?
Does the proposal have the potential to make a difference and have a lasting impact on the target beneficiaries?
Is the project once-off in nature or does it have ongoing operational funding implications?
What is the likelihood of the proposal being sustained beyond period of IIDEA funding? Have any potential sources been identified at this stage?
Does the Lead Partner have a proven track record – i.e. knowledge and proven ability in a field relevant to the proposed project?
Does the project implementation plan provide a level of assurance that the promoter has the capacity to complete the project within the stated timeframe?

Have relevant stakeholders been contacted or informed about the proposed project?
A Communication Plan is a basic eligibility criterion for each proposed project. Has the plan been costed in relation to the overall proposed project? Can it be effectively implemented?
Complementarity with other cross-border initiatives/programmes in the EAC – is the proposed project in receipt of any other funding? Ensure this is complementary and there is no duplication.
Is an evaluation built in to the proposed project as a part of best practice / sustainability strategy?

2.2 Need and potential for project replication in other EAC contexts (20 points)

Guiding questions
Has the applicant provided concrete evidence of need for the proposed project for the target group and for their selected theme? For example, is there evidence that the target group has been consulted with during the design of proposed operation?
Have relevant regional and national policies and/ or research been provided or been cited in support of this need?
Is the plan compatible and complementary with activities being undertaken by Partner States and the EAC Secretariat to promote a people centered and market driven EAC Integration?
Has the proposed project taken consideration of how its proposed activities can be replicated in other contexts or areas within the EAC?
Is relevant and full supplementary information provided: Research reports, project implementation plan with a timeframe, budget etc.?
Does the project proposal provide a clear and defined strategy of implementation? Key components should include: Evidence of Need; Clearly outlined Project Objective(s); Schedule of programme activities; Anticipated Outputs / Results / Impacts; A Monitoring and Evaluation Plan; Timeframe for rolling out the project and a Detailed budget and Associated Costs.
Are the stated proposed project outcomes achievable and realistic?
In the assessment of need, has the applicant identified different options that may meet the need and provided a rationale for the option that they have pursued? Has the applicant identified the main risks associated with the various options and factored these into the final option identified?

2.3 Shared ownership/values and equally committed capacities and organizational capabilities among implementing partners (20 points)

Guiding questions
Is the project proposal collaborative and or/ does it involve stakeholders from at least two EAC Partner States? (they could be drawn from the civil society, private sector or other interest groups)
Has the applicant provided references from their current or previous development partners?
Is there proof of solid financial practices and human resource evidence of the necessary management and staff capacities to implement the project on the side of the applicants?

2.4 Sustainability (20 points)

Guiding questions
Does the project demonstrate financial and operational sustainability beyond IIDEA funding? Have any

potential sources been identified at this stage?

3.0 CROSS-CUTTING THEMES

3.1 Gender (20 points)

Gender:

How will the proposed project promote gender mainstreaming in its project activities?

3.3 Impact on citizens in the region (20 points)

Impact on citizens in the region:

Does the proposed project demonstrate real life East African integration experiences and opportunities and does it have a plan to communicate the tangible outcomes of these opportunities to the citizens?

3.4 Partnership/Collaboration (20 points)

Partnership:

Does the proposed Project demonstrate the involvement of the relevant stakeholder groups in the preparation and implementation of the project?
Does it build on the experiences of previous or ongoing partnerships in similar projects? Are the guiding principles of Partnership embedded in the proposal? –Participation / Openness / Shared Ownership / Representation / Mutual Respect.

3.5 Conflict Sensitivity (20 points)

Conflict Sensitivity:

Does the project proposal provide for the participation and integration of different interest groups and is it in line with the “do-no-harm” approach?

***The scoring bands are as follows**

Score	How Evident?	Link to Criterion	Link at Project Level
0 - 4	Not Evident	The application failed to meet a basic standard under this criterion.	The project proposal does not demonstrate that it has the capacity to deliver basic project outcomes that would be expected in order to be awarded funding.
5 - 8	Less Evident	The application met some of the basic requirements of this criterion.	The project proposal demonstrates some ability to deliver key outputs and outcomes in areas, but overall it is below the standard expected in

			order to be awarded funding.
9 - 12	Evident	The application met the requirements of this criterion.	The project proposal demonstrates an ability to deliver project outcomes to an acceptable standard and it may be considered suitable for funding.
13 - 16	Very Evident	The application fully met the requirements of this criterion.	The project proposal is strong in the manner in which it has described a range of activities that will result in good outputs and the achievement of key goals.
17 - 20	Highly Evident	The application was an excellent fit with the requirements of this criterion	The project proposal demonstrates an excellent ability to deliver and shows a high degree of competency in achieving the outcomes described.