

### IRC's Evaluation Criteria for Partner Applications

Criteria	% of Score
<p><b>1. Intervention Logic</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Project Justification</u>: humanitarian needs presented in the proposal are clearly defined and based on recent geographic-specific needs assessments;</li> <li>- <u>Relevance</u>: The problem statement is aligned to the objectives of IRC's project and the objectives and priorities of the RFA</li> </ul>	10%
<p><b>2. Coverage</b></p> <p>Vulnerable groups are targeted in line with the Lebanon Crisis Response Plan, including (but not limited to) hard to reach areas where there is a gap in services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Is the target group clearly defined? (elderly, school children, youth groups, refugees, teachers, NGOs, local authorities)</i></li> <li>- <i>Is the number of direct beneficiaries correctly calculated and segregated by gender, age and/or nationality?</i></li> <li>- <i>Are project locations defined?</i></li> </ul>	10%
<p><b>3. Program Design</b></p> <p>The proposed project is aligned to project objectives and outlines illustrative activities; the programmatic approaches are clearly defined and technically sound as well as reflect and incorporate best practices into proposed interventions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>Is the proposal clear and easy to understand?</i></li> <li>- <i>How coherent is the overall design of the project? Is it feasible and consistent in relation to the objectives and expected results?</i></li> <li>- <i>Are the objectives and outcomes SMART? Does the project provide a sound plan to monitor the progress?</i></li> <li>- <i>Does the design take into account inclusion criteria for vulnerable groups and persons with special needs (including elderly and/or people with disabilities)?</i></li> </ul>	30%
<p><b>4. Technical and institutional implementation capacity</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrated ability to deliver project objectives (past experience delivering similar projects in targeted sectors and geographic areas);</li> <li>- Clear set of indicators with reasonable targets and sources of verifications;</li> <li>- Adherence to humanitarian principles and child safeguarding policy aligned with international standards;</li> <li>- Strong field-based operational support structures in proposed implementation areas.</li> </ul>	20%
<p><b>5. Cost-effectiveness of budgets and value for money</b></p> <p>The intervention demonstrates optimal use of resources to achieve the intended objectives and the expected results justify the costs; The proposed intervention follows the principles of economy, efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <i>How detailed is the budget? Budget for each activity must include details of costs for the activity.</i></li> <li>- <i>Are costs <u>reasonable</u> and <u>necessary</u> for the type of proposed activities? Are they calculated correctly?</i></li> <li>- <i>Do the costs conform to the limitations set under the donor's cost principles?</i></li> </ul>	20%
<p><b>6. Local experience and presence</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrated ability to effectively build upon past experience in implementation area for the implementation of the proposed project.</li> <li>- Strong coordination with local leadership, authorities, and other humanitarian actors in area of operation.</li> </ul>	10%

