

## Scoring Rubric for MA business plans

International Planned Parenthood Federation

Rate the evaluation using the dropdowns in column I, and add comments and questions in column J. The total score will be calculated in the Summary tab.

If there are one or more "Significant gaps," or three or more "Some gaps" (indicated above in red), the evaluators should ask the MA for revisions in response to comments/questions. If there are still more than one "Significant gaps," or three or more "Some gaps" after the MA makes revisions, the MA should get a R

MA Name:

OECD DAC evaluation category	Criteria	Description	Key business plan questions	1: Significant gaps	2: Some gaps	3: Satisfactory	Rating	Comments/questions from TRT review
Relevance	Country context	Strategy and individual projects respond to country's social, economic, political, and health context	2, 4.1	Strategy and projects fail to address one or more major elements of the country need (e.g., marginalized populations, political context)	Strategy acknowledges elements of country need (e.g., marginalized populations, political circumstances, social change, etc.), but the individual projects do not properly address them	Strategy identifies most relevant factors within the country context (e.g., marginalized populations, political circumstances, social change, etc.) and MA projects respond to these		
	Compelling and ambitious strategy	Strategy presents a bold approach to meeting local needs, and includes improvements from prior approaches	2, 4.1	Strategy is not effectively addressing areas of highest need, and/or relies on outdated approaches	Strategy presents some strengths, but also has gaps in notable areas; might not represent a big step forward from prior approach	Strategy presents a compelling way to meet local needs, and shows improvements from past years' approaches		
Coherence	External coherence	Strategy complements the work of other organizations in the country, and seeks to partner with them effectively	2, 4.1	Strategy does not include any meaningful coordination with other partners	Strategy references external partners and other organizations, but does not show meaningful efforts towards working with them	Strategy shows intentional, deep coordination with other partners		
	Internal coherence: IPPF strategic framework	Strategy connects with IPPF's strategic framework and supports its goals (e.g., Outcomes 1-4)	2, 6	Strategy and projects do not address all four Outcomes	Strategy references Outcomes 1-4, but does not convincingly show how projects address all four Outcomes, nor does it justify why it cannot address a certain Outcome	Strategy convincingly explains how it will make progress on Outcomes 1-4 (or provides a compelling explanation of its limitations in advancing a certain Outcome, despite its commitment to it)		
	Internal coherence: IPPF priorities	Strategy shows commitment to current IPPF priorities (e.g., for 2022, focus on youth-led programs, safe abortion, marginalized populations)	2, 4.1	Strategy and projects do not reference or advance all key priorities (e.g., for 2022, focus on youth-led programs, abortion, marginalized populations)	Strategy and projects include a clear stance on IPPF priorities but do not show clear actions to advance them (e.g., for 2022, focus on youth-led programs, abortion, marginalized populations)	Strategy and projects include a clear stance on IPPF priorities and explain what actions are being taken to advance all of them (e.g., for 2022, focus on youth-led programs, abortion, marginalized populations)		
Effectiveness	Project design	Projects are each well-designed based on best practices and tailored to local needs	4.1	Projects use approaches with significant flaws or major untested assumptions, potentially including elements that will not work in the local context	Projects have some design issues or elements that might make them less effective in the local context	Projects rely on best practices and are tailored to ensure strong impact in their local context		
Efficiency	Cost efficiency	Expenses are reasonable given the MA's activities and targeted results	4.2, 6	Expenses are very unreasonable or not well justified given the country context and MA's plans and expected results	Some expenses are unreasonable or not well justified given the country context and MA's plans and expected results	Expenses are reasonable and justified given country context and MA plans and expected results		
	Expense logic	Spending by expense category (e.g., personnel, commodities) is reasonable and justified according to MA plans and strategy	4.3	Breakdown of expenses by expense type is very concerning and not properly justified	Breakdown of expenses by expense type appears slightly concerning, and is not fully justified	Breakdown of expenses by expense type appears reasonable and justified		
Impact	Project results	Expected results from each project are reasonable, justifiable, and ambitious	4.2, 6	Some expected results appear unreasonable given MA's project plans, and/or the MA has set unreasonably low results given its spending and context	It is not clear how some expected results will be achieved from the MA's projects	Expected results flow clearly and convincingly from each project's plans, and the MA has aimed to achieve significant results		
	Systemic impact	MA's plans are advancing longer-term systemic impact	2, 4.1	MA plan focuses only on near-term outcomes and changes	MA plan considers some longer-term needs, but does not have a compelling approach for building towards them	MA plan develops specific ways to build towards long-term systemic change while continuing near-term impact		
Sustainability	Resource mobilization	Strategy demonstrates ambitious resource-mobilization efforts and multi-year planning	5.2, 5.3, 5.4	Strategy does not describe long-term resource mobilization plans	Strategy describes elements of a long-term resource mobilization plan, but shows little evidence of its full implementation	Strategy describes a detailed plan for multi-year resource mobilization and demonstrates efforts to achieve it		
	Financial sustainability	Income streams are balanced and reasonable across core, non-core, private, and public funding, and show potential for MA to become increasingly sustainable	5.1, 5.2	MA is overly reliant on a small number of income sources and does not have plans to expand its funding sources or increase its sustainability	MA income streams are not sufficiently diversified, and MA is taking some steps, though insufficient, towards increasing its sustainability	MA has diversified income streams and is actively working to increase sustainability		
	Operational sustainability	Internal governance, procedures, staffing, and other capacities support long-term organizational success	3	Fails to identify a major potential internal challenge (e.g., audit/finance systems, governance, leadership change), or identifies a challenge but the approach to addressing it is unlikely to meaningfully help	Identifies at least some, if not all, potential internal challenges (e.g., audit/finance systems, governance, leadership change), but does not have a strong plan for addressing them	Identifies potential internal challenges, and has strong plans for addressing possible challenges		