**Annex 23: Draft Appraisal Matrix: Criteria for the evaluation of submitted sub-project proposals**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Sub-criteria for analysis** | **Comments** | **Maximum score** | **Minimum score required** | **Score** |
| 1. The sub-project primarily addresses climate-related impacts (climate rationale). | * Relevant climate hazards have been analysed using present climate information and future climate projections regarding different scenarios. * Exposure of people and assets to relevant hazards has been analysed. * Vulnerability of human and natural systems has been analysed (regarding adaptive and coping capacity). * Relevant climate-related risks (potential impacts) have been identified and described. * Evidence / clear indications are provided that the addressed impacts are mainly due to climate change. | All sub-criteria have to be fulfilled. Scoring reflects only degree of fulfilment. | 15 | 08 |  |
| 1. The sub-project contributes significantly to the project´s objective. | * The expected contribution to the project´s objective is described in a comprehensible and plausible way. * The expected outcomes/impact are described in a (semi-) quantitative way using appropriate indicators, and can be considered significant. * The proposal describes in a coherent and plausible way how the planned activities will reduce the identified climate-related risks and contribute to reach the proposed objectives (theory of change). | All sub-criteria have to be fulfilled. Scoring reflects only degree of fulfilment. | 18 | 08 |  |
| 1. The sub-project has a significant potential for a paradigm shift. | * The sub-project has a potential for up-scaling / replication. * It contributes to awareness raising and capacity development of national / regional agencies on the relevance and options of using EbA measures for climate-resilient coastal zone management. * It contributes to an improved regulatory framework regarding the use of EbA options for coastal zone management. * It contributes to a regional exchange of experiences and lessons learnt from the implementation of EbA measures and on how to make EbA an integral part of climate-resilient coastal zone management. | At least one sub-criterion must be addressed. | 10 | 03 |  |
| 1. The sub-project contributes significantly to sustainable development. | * The sub-project has environmental co-benefits, which are described in a plausible way. * It has economic co-benefits, which are described in a (semi-)quantitative manner. * It has social co-benefits (e.g. regarding gender issues). * It has other benefits related to sustainable development. | At least one sub-criterion must be addressed. | 10 | 05 |  |
| 1. The sub-project contributes to climate change mitigation. | * The sub-project has a clear potential for climate change mitigation. * The mitigation potential is described in a plausible and (semi-)quantitative way. | Nice-to-have criterion. | 05 | 00 |  |
| 1. The sub-project responds to the needs of the beneficiaries and the partner country. | * The sub-project addresses relevant climate-related risks, which have been identified in a suitable climate risk analysis. * It addresses mainly poor and highly vulnerable people in coastal areas. * Projects targets a significant size of beneficiaries (minimum of 5,000 people, otherwise not eligible, full score for 20,000) * There are valid reasons, why the project should be financed on a grant-basis. * At present, there are no alternative sources of finance available. | All sub-criteria have to be fulfilled. Scoring reflects only degree of fulfilment. | 10 | 07 |  |
| 1. The beneficiary country has a significant ownership of the sub-project. | * The sub-project is endorsed by relevant national authority * The sub-project is in line with national climate change adaptation plans or strategies (e.g. NDC, NAP). * National, regional, and/or local authorities or academia are involved in sub-project activities. * The local coastal population (particularly women) is involved in sub-project activities. | At least sub-criteria one, two and four have to be fulfilled. Scoring reflects only degree of fulfilment. | 10 | 05 |  |
| 1. The proposed intervention is economically/financially sound and reasonable. | * There is evidence that the proposed sub-project is a cost-efficient alternative for addressing the identified climate-related risks * Adequate bill of quantities and market-appropriate unit costs for different measures / investments * Grantees provide at least 25% match funding; * Blue Action Contribution to indirect costs <10% * The proposed measures are financially viable in the long run. | All sub-criteria have to be fulfilled. Scoring reflects only degree of fulfilment. | 10 | 07 |  |
| 1. Organisational capacity to implement the sub-project. | * Lead organisation is a well-established organisation with experience in the region (NGO has implemented at least 3 projects with a similar approach and Ratio annual budget at country level to project budget sufficiently high) * Ability to manage contractors and large-scale projects * Organisation has documented financial management rules and is internally audited on a regular basis * Office within reasonable distance to the project area * Sufficient numbers of qualified expert staff * Partner organisation have clear roles and responsibilities and bring added value to each other. | All sub-criteria have to be fulfilled. Scoring reflects only degree of fulfilment. Only applications scoring at least 9 points under this criterion will be eligible for funding. | 12 |  |  |
|  |  | **Total** | **100** |  |  |