ma business plan EVALUATION CRITERIA

- instructions and guide -

Objective

The Technical Review Team will evaluate MA business plans using a standard rubric, which will help efficiently and fairly determine whether an MA should receive its full Indicative Planning Figure (IPF). **As a reminder, the Technical Review Team is expected to approve 80% of plans without any modifications, and to approve additional plans after modifications are made. Reductions to IPFs are only used when an MA cannot or will not make the changes the TRT recommends.**

Criteria

The rubric is modeled off the OECD DAC evaluation criteria, which include the following items:

* Relevance: The extent to which the intervention objectives and design respond to beneficiaries’ global, country, and partner/institution needs, policies, and priorities, and continue to do so if circumstances change
* Coherence: The compatibility of the intervention with other interventions in a country, sector, or institution
* Effectiveness: The extent to which the intervention achieved, or is expected to achieve, its objectives, and its results, including any differential results across groups
* Efficiency: The extent to which the intervention delivers, or is likely to deliver, results in an economic and timely way
* Impact: The extent to which the intervention has generated or is expected to generate significant positive or negative, intended or unintended, higher-level effects
* Sustainability: The extent to which the net benefits of the intervention continue, or are likely to continue

Business plan scoring

The TRT will score each business plan across the criteria in the rubric, and give each criteria a score of “3 - satisfactory”, “2 - some gaps”, or “1 - significant gaps.” The TRT’s role is to identify significant issues that show potential inefficient use of funds, but otherwise not to ask MAs for minor changes. The final rubric and comments on individual criteria will be shared with MAs for transparency.

**Thus, business plans that receive one or more score of “significant gaps”, or four or more scores of “some gaps”, will receive comments from the TRT and be invited to submit edits to their plan. If issues remain after plans are edited, the TRT may recommend to reduce funding.** We expect no more than 20% of business plans to get flagged, and for many of those to then get full funding after making the requested changes.

MA and Regional Staff consultation of this form

This form is primarily intended to be used by the Technical Review Team; it is being shared with MAs and regional Secretariat staff in the spirit of transparency, so all parties are aware of the criteria used to evaluate the business plans. However, we do not expect MAs or Secretariat staff to fill it out.

In the few cases where regional Secretariat staff have significant concerns about a business plan or MA, they can let the Technical Review Team know which criteria they have concerns about and what the concern is (e.g., a concern on Financial Sustainability, since the MA is not actively working to find other donors). These comments, like the TRT’s comments, will be documented in the rubric and shared with the MA for the sake of transparency to explain any funding decisions. While these criteria are intended to cover overall organizational strategy, we recognize that they can also be useful as a way to think about the effectiveness of major projects (e.g., the criteria on project logic, cost efficiency, expense logic, and project results can all evaluate an individual project).

As with all parts of the new Stream 1 allocation process, 2022 will represent a pilot year to try out and adjust to the new system. We welcome your input on how the process goes this year so we can take any lessons learned and modify the process for the following cycle.