SRHR Grants Framework 2012-2015

EXPLANATION OF THE ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE AND DISTRIBUTION OF AVAILABLE RESOURCES

Introduction – Explanation of the assessment procedure

This document explains how SRHR grant applications were assessed and selected for a grant from the SRHR Fund, as laid down in the Order of the Minister for European Affairs and International Cooperation of 6 August 2012, no. DSO/GA-236/12, laying down administrative rules and a ceiling for grants awarded under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grant Regulations 2006 (SRHR Fund 2012-2015) ('SRHR Policy Rules'). It also explains how the available resources were distributed.

The total amount available for SRHR Fund grants was €125 million. This document explains the assessment procedure, how it was carried out and by whom. It concludes with a brief summary of the results on which the allocation of funds was based, and a list of grants awarded for each of the three categories.

1. Assessment procedure and parties involved

The period for submitting applications started on 24 August 2012, immediately after the publication of the SRHR Policy Rules, and ended on 12 October 2012, in accordance with the SRHR Policy Rules.

A total of 76 applications were submitted on time and assessed. Three proposals had been submitted by email only and were thus rejected. One proposal was not received until 24 October, well after the deadline, and was therefore not assessed.

The total amount applied for was €680 million. This meant the amount of €125 million available for grants was more than five times oversubscribed.

The SRHR Policy Rules described three categories of funding. The 76 applications were classified as follows:

Categories	Amount available	Applications received
Category A	€90 million	13
Category B	€30 million	32
Category C	€5 million	30
Category not identified		1

The 76 applications received were assessed in accordance with:

- the SRHR Administrative Rules;
- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grant Regulations 2006;
- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree;
- the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (Grants) Framework Act;
- the General Administrative Law Act;
- the Standard Framework for Development Cooperation.

Assessment began as soon as the deadline for submitting applications had passed. The assessment procedure comprised three stages, as described in the SRHR Policy Rules and in section 2, below.

Applications were assessed by the assessment committee, which consisted of two civil servants of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and three external experts. The committee members had knowledge on SRHR and development, and also had the necessary expertise for a sound financial assessment of grant applications. Throughout the assessment process the assessment committee was assisted by a project team.

After the preliminary assessment (the threshold check) applications went on to the assessment committee, which reviewed and confirmed the results. The committee then assessed applications that had passed the threshold check according to the programme criteria (policy check) laid down in the SRHR Policy Rules. During this stage the committee was assisted by teams of employees of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and external consultants. Following an organisational check, the committee ranked the applications on the basis of the score achieved after the programme check and made a proposal to the Minister on the allocation of funding.

The assessment committee took the following measures to guarantee an accurate, transparent, objective and impartial assessment procedure:

- a standard (model) assessment form was used to assess the applications. It contained indicators per criterion defined by the assessment committee to determine, in a consistent manner, the extent that applications satisfied the programme criteria;
- the composition of the teams of civil servants and external consultants involved in the assessment of applications was varied in order to prevent bias;

- to avoid conflicts of interest, anyone with a present or past connection with any of the applicant organisations – as adviser, board member or employee – was excluded from the assessment and ranking of applications involving these particular organisations.

2. Assessment stages

The assessment of applications for SRHR Fund grants took place in three stages. The first stage consisted of a threshold criteria check. The second stage assessed the quality of the programme proposals, but only of those applications that met the threshold criteria. Parallel to the second stage, some applicants underwent an organisational check in the third stage.

Checks in stage 1

The threshold criteria are criteria that applications for SRHR Fund grants must meet. No points were awarded; applications that failed to meet <u>all</u> of the threshold criteria were rejected and not assessed further (sections 3.3.1 and 4.1 of the SRHR Policy Rules).

Checks in stage 2

Stage 2 involved an assessment of the quality of the programme proposal. Here, a distinction was made between criteria related to the policy relevance of the proposal and its technical/methodological quality. In order to qualify for an SRHR Fund grant, applications had to have satisfactory scores on both components (sections 3.3.2 and 4.2 of the SRHR Policy Rules).

Checks in stage 3

Stage 3 consisted of an organisational check, which is an assessment of the quality of the applicant. Organisations which had passed a relevant organisational check or Checklist for Organisational Capacity Assessment (COCA) in the context of assessment of a grant application under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grant Regulations 2006 within the last four years before the SRHR Policy Rules came into effect, were, for the purpose of these rules, considered to have successfully completed the organisational check. An exception was made if facts and circumstances had changed to such an extent since the organisational check or COCA was carried out that its results were entirely or partially out of date. Applicants were obliged to report this.

Applicants that had met all threshold criteria but did not have a recent and relevant organisational check or COCA, with a positive result, were given the opportunity to submit

additional information required for the organisational check in accordance with section 4.5 of the General Administrative Law Act.

Applicants had to score satisfactorily on the organisational check in order to be able to qualify for a grant, but this score played no further part in the allocation of funding.

The final results of the assessment procedure were announced on 29 and 30 November 2012.

3. Results of the assessment procedure

The quality of all applications that satisfied the requirements set out in the SRHR Policy Rules was assessed in accordance with the Order of the Minister for European Affairs and International Cooperation no. DSO/GA-236/12 of 6 August 2012 (SRHR Policy Rules) and the applicable legislative framework.

3.1 Threshold criteria – first stage of assessment

The first stage of the assessment procedure consisted of the threshold criteria check. Out of the 76 applications submitted, 31 failed to meet one or more of the threshold criteria and were not considered further. The 45 applications that passed the threshold check went on to the programme check.

Categories	Failed threshold criteria check	Passed – on to programme check
Category A	8	5
Category B	11	21
Category C	11	19
Category not identified	1	

The most common stumbling blocks on the threshold criteria check were D.10 and D.3. Other criteria that applications failed to meet were D.1, D.2, D.4, D.8 and D.9.

3.2 Programme check – second stage of assessment

The quality of the remaining 45 applications was assessed in the programme check on the basis of policy-related and technical criteria, as described in section 4.2 of the SRHR Policy Rules. Proposals had to have satisfactory scores on both policy and technical components

(section 3.3.2 of the SRHR Policy Rules). If the quality of either component was judged to be deficient, the application was rejected.

3.3 Organisational check – third stage of assessment

The criteria of the organisational check were scored on an assessment form. Scores were awarded based on an appraisal of each criterion or sub-criterion. Applications with an overall score of less than 65% on the organisational check were turned down (in accordance with section 3.3.3 of the SRHR Policy Rules, according to which the organisational check must be completed satisfactorily). The threshold of 65% was set in consideration of the substantial amount of resources to be managed by the grantees. Two applications failed to meet this threshold level. Neither would in any case have been eligible for funding, as their ranking following the programme check was too low.

4. Ranking of applications and allocation of available funds

Only applications that scored satisfactorily on both the policy component and the technical/methodological component of the programme check, together indicative for the quality of the proposal, were eligible for a grant (sections 3.3.2 and 4.2 of the SRHR Policy Rules). The total requested funding of all these proposals together exceeded the €125 million grant ceiling (€90 million for Category A, €30 million for Category B and €5 million for Category C). An anonymised list of the amounts requested by each proposal is given below. Pursuant to sections 3.2 and 3.3.4 of the SRHR Policy Rules, proposals were selected for a grant according to the quality of the programme proposal and with a view to ensuring that resources were sufficiently evenly distributed among the various subthemes and regions.

Those applications that best fulfilled the criteria of the programme check were ranked highest, as they were expected to contribute most to the achievement of the objectives of the Fund.

In order to preserve the integrity of the proposals, the assessment committee decided beforehand not to divide the available resources over all applications with a satisfactory score, as this would be likely to result in most proposals receiving a far lower grant than applicants had applied for. Instead, the Committee decided that it would aim to award grants that would cover the submitted amounts for grants as much as possible. In Category A, all proposals that passed the programme check were awarded a grant that covered part of the programme costs. In Category B, one proposal was selected for each of the four sub-themes. These were also the best-scoring four proposals. In Category C, the four best-

scoring proposals were selected. The grant amounts requested by the four highest ranking proposals in Categories B and C already exceeded the total funding available for these categories. Therefore no other proposals were selected as this would have meant that the size of the programmes of the awarded applications would be reduced too severely.

After the proposals were selected, a uniform allocation mechanism was applied to the three categories. This mechanism involved the following steps:

1. The starting point is the score awarded to each of the individual proposals.
2. The score of the highest ranking proposal is equal to 100%; the scores of the other proposals are converted into a percentage of the highest score. The percentages of all proposals are added up.
3. Then, for each selected proposal, the percentage of the total score (=pro rata scores) is determined.
4. The amounts requested by the selected proposals are added up; this total is equal to 100%. The amount requested per proposal is then converted into a percentage of the total amount requested.
5. The percentages obtained at steps 3 and 4 are multiplied, resulting in a certain number of credits.
6. These credits, divided by the total number of credits, are indicative of the percentage (share) of total available funding that should be awarded to this proposal.
7. This leads to the grant amounts awarded to each proposal.
8. The final column shows the grant award as a percentage of the requested amount.

The table below refers to the proposals selected for Category A and serves to illustrate the allocation mechanism.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		Pro rata scores	Share of amount requested	Credits	Share of total funds	Weighted shared of available funds	% of requested amount
77	100%	35.7%	31.55%	11.25	0.338083	€30,427,433.67	83.9%
70	90.9%	32.4%	33.97%	11.01	0.330868	€29,778,137.84	76.2%
69	89.6%	31.9%	34.48%	11.01	0.331049	€29,794,428.49	75.1%
	281%	100%	100%	33.27		€90,000,000.00	

The tables below show the ranking of proposals in Categories A, B and C and the grants awarded. An overview of the organisations that were awarded a grant is attached (Annexe 1).

Category A	Requested amount in euros	Amount, if proposal used other currency	Satisfactory (+) / unsatisfactory (-) scores on both sets of policy check criteria	Score (max: 94)	Amount awarded in euros
1	**€36,297,300**	**$51,853,285**	**+**	**78**	**€30,694,876**
2	**€39,061,456**	**n/a**	**+**	**70**	**€29,644,452**
3	**€39,649,243**	**n/a**	**+**	**69**	**€29,660,670**
4	€28,484,755	$40,692,507	-	62	
5	€22,749,657	£20,132,440	-	52	

Category B	Requested amount in euros	Amount, if proposal used other currency	Satisfactory (+) / unsatisfactory (-) scores on both sets of policy check criteria	Score (max: 92)	Amount awarded in euros
1	€8,843,309	n/a	+	86	€8,677,554
2	€7,325,000	n/a	+	79	€6,602,658
3	€9,434,890	n/a	+	77	€8,289,181
4	€7,415,736	n/a	+	76	€6,430,606
5	€9,508,072	£8,414,223	+	70	
6	€10,000,000	n/a	+	69	
7	€5,242,719	n/a	-	68	
8	€5,991,646	n/a	+	64	
9	€7,080,220	n/a	+	63	
10	€9,395,066	n/a	+	63	
11	€6,100,639	n/a	+	63	
12	€8,529,546	n/a	+	61	
13	€7,149,106	n/a	+	61	
14	€9,997,633	n/a	-	59	
15	€5,036,538	n/a	-	59	
16	€9,998,380	n/a	-	56	
17	€9,999,716	n/a	-	56	
18	€9,857,713	n/a	-	55	
19	€6,279,000	n/a	-	52	
20	€7,635,961	$10,908,515	-	48	
21	€5,909,648	n/a	-	36	

Category C	Requested amount in euros	Amount, if proposal used other currency	Satisfactory (+) / unsatisfactory (-) scores on both sets of policy check criteria	Score (max: 82.5)	Amount awarded in euros
1	€1,500,000	n/a	+	72	€1,297,752
2	€1,498,590	n/a	+	69.2	€1,246,111
3	€1,479,552	$2,113,645	+	69	€1,241,856
4	€1,497,801	n/a	+	68.3	€1,214,279
5	€1,483,784	n/a	+	64.3	
6	€1,288,419	n/a	+	64	
7	€1,500,000	n/a	+	61	
8	€1,433,888	n/a	-	60.5	
9	€1,351,692	$1,930,988	-	58.8	
10	€1,500,000	n/a	-	57.5	
11	€1,019,968	n/a	-	57	
12	€1,027,280	n/a	-	53.7	
13	€1,075,672	n/a	-	48.3	
14	€739,165	n/a	-	48	
15	€1,308,754	n/a	-	47	
16	€1,498,744	n/a	-	46	
17	€1,370,000	n/a	-	41	
18	€1,202,200	n/a	-	36	
19	€911,202	n/a	-	35.5	

29 November 2012

Annexe 1

Overview of organisations receiving an SRHR Fund grant

CATEGORY A Name of programme	Lead applicant	Amount allocated
Link Up	International HIV/AIDS alliance (IHAA)	€30,694,876.54 ($43,849,823.64)
Making sexual and reproductive health work for the next generation	CORDAID	€29,644,452.97
ASK (Access, Services and Knowledge) what young people want, what young people need	Rutgers WPF	€29,660,670.48

€90,000,000.00

CATEGORY B Name of programme	Lead applicant	Amount allocated
MenCare: Engaging Men as Caregiving Partners in SRHR and MCH	Rutgers WPF	€8,677,554.13
Staying Alive! Making maternal health work in Kenya, Uganda and Malawi	AMREF Flying Doctors	€6,602,657.96
SHARP: South Sudan Health Action and Research Project	Royal Tropical Institute (KIT)	€8,289,181.45
Keep it Real: Youth-centered Comprehensive Sexual Education (CSE) in Ethiopia and Uganda	Save the Children Nederland	€6,430,606.46

€30,000,000.00

CATEGORY C Name of programme	Lead applicant	Amount allocated
Global dialogues: Connecting Voices for Youth	HIVOS	€1,297,752.28
Exploring new ways of improving sexual health and well-being of young males in Bangladesh and Kenya through a motivational intervention approach	Royal Tropical Institute (KIT)	€1,246,111.69
Netherlands HERproject	Business for Social Responsibility	€1,241,856.04 ($1,774,080.05)
Faith to Action Project	Deutsche Stiftung Weltbevolke-rung	€1,214,279.99

€5,000,000.00