

Rating	Criteria	Score
Very Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a very strong alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Project offers very good value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are very good, with an exit strategy that demonstrates sustainability post-grant funding • Complete confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes. • Very good prospects for project success 	5
Good	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a good alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Project offers good value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are good, with an exit strategy that outlines the potential to sustain the project post-grant funding • High level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes. • Good prospects for project success 	4
Acceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates an acceptable alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Project offers reasonable value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are acceptable, with an exit strategy that outlines some potential options for sustaining delivery post-grant funding. • Some acceptable weaknesses or deficiencies in deliverability • Reasonable level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes. • Reasonable probability of project success 	3
Marginal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a basic but limited alignment to local and national priorities, evidence of need and local engagement. • Possibly capable of delivering and achieving proposed outputs and outcomes. • Project unlikely to offer value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are high, with an exit strategy that fails to provide confidence in continuity post-grant funding • Some weaknesses or deficiencies • Limited level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes. • Possibility of project success 	2
Poor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates a very limited understanding of local need, engagement, or very limited ability to meet alignment to local and national priorities • Major weaknesses or deficiencies • Project fails to offer value for money, unit costs per output/outcome are very high. Exit strategy is poor. • Very limited level of confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes. • Low probability of project success 	1
Unacceptable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to meet the criterion in all respects • Indicates a complete misunderstanding of, or non-compliance with, stated requirements • No Confidence in deliverability and the achievement of proposed outputs and outcomes. • No prospect of project success 	0