

Application Assessment Explanation

Institutional Collaboration Projects - Orange Knowledge Programme (OKP)

Joint proposal

I. Quality of the partnership

See question 1.4.

Criterion	Score
I.1 Nature of the partnership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there an existing partnership? ▪ What is the quality of the joint activities so far, if applicable? ▪ What is the quality of the plans to build/sustain this partnership? ▪ Does the partnership go further than this project? 	6
I.2 Reciprocity and ownership <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is/Will the partnership (be) on an equal level? ▪ To what degree does the application systematically show how the country A partner(s) will remain in command of its/their part of the proposed project? 	4
Maximum score	10
Minimum score	6

II. Project relevance

See logframe and questions 2.2.1 – 2.2.5 and organisational assessment.

Criterion	Score
II.1 Relation logframe and application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the project logframe have a logical relationship with the grant application? ▪ Did the partners select relevant and realistic indicators? 	6
II.2 Ambitiousness of the project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ How ambitious are the targets set in the application? ▪ Are the ambitions (and their timing) realistic? Will the project be able to realise what it proposes? ▪ Does the application give an indication of the number of final beneficiaries on the medium and long term (see ToCs)? 	6
II.3 Context knowledge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the description of the current state of affairs (in relation to this project) adequate and complete? ▪ Is the applicant familiar with the context and the capacity gaps? 	4
II.4 Relation call and application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Does the proposed project contribute to resolving the capacity needs of the country as described in the CPI? ▪ Are all described challenges/problems addressed? 	8
II.5 Capacity needs of country A partner(s) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Are the capacity needs and ambitions of the country A partner(s) described in a structured way differentiated between individual, organisational, institutional and educational levels of capacity development (see also the annex organisational assessment)? ▪ Are the capacity gaps of the country A partner(s) urgent enough for setting up an Orange Knowledge project? ▪ Do the capacity needs of the country A partner(s) fit the aims and possibilities of the Orange Knowledge Programme? ▪ Does resolving the capacity needs of the Country A partner(s) contribute to resolving the capacity gaps of the country in this thematic area? 	6
II.6 Capacity needs of Dutch partner(s)	4

Criterion	Score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the capacity needs and ambitions of the Dutch partner(s) described in a structured way differentiated between individual, organisational, institutional and educational levels of capacity development? Will the Dutch partner (and consortium) and the Netherlands benefit from the project outcomes? 	
II.7 Donor harmonisation	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the proposed project aligned with the objectives of the relevant Embassy of the Kingdom of the Netherlands? Is the applicant familiar with the donor landscape and seeks as much synergy with other projects in the area? 	
Maximum score	38
Minimum score	23

III. Project approach and design

See questions 2.3.1 – 2.3.9.

Criterion	Score
III.1 Strategy to close capacity gaps on all levels	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the strategy address the individual, organisational, institutional and educational levels of capacity development of the country A partner(s), and relate these levels to each other? Does the application offer a solution to the specific capacity gap and does this relate to the capacity gap of the country as identified in the CPI? Does the strategy address the individual, organisational, institutional and educational levels of capacity development of the Dutch partner(s), and relate these levels to each other? 	
III.2 Competitiveness of the application	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the chosen strategy in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Is the budgeting efficient and are the costs of the separate outputs and cost categories justifiable? Is the approach innovative in terms of solutions, inputs and appropriate technologies? 	

Criterion	Score
<p>III.3 Strategy to close educational capacity gap</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is there a strategy to modernise the didactics of involved educational institutes (CBET/PBL, facilities for practical lessons, apprenticeship programmes, increase the percentage of practical lessons, work experience in the curriculum etc.)? ▪ Does the strategy propose improvements in the educational offer and in educational, research and outreach competencies? 	5
<p>III.4 Equal opportunities between men and women</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree do approach and outputs promote the achievement of gender equality in project implementation as well as in the contents and delivery of education, training, research and services? ▪ Does the application include a strategy to promote gender equality in the implementation of the project (think of the composition of the project team)? ▪ Does the application include a strategy to promote gender equality within the organisation (think of the composition of management, administrative and teaching staff)? ▪ To what degree does the application contribute to the achievement of the indicators for gender from the programme's ToC? ▪ Is gender systematically integrated in all parts of the project (outcomes, outputs and indicators) and in all its stages (design, planning, implementation phases and in the M&E)? 	5
<p>III.5 Equal opportunities for members of marginalised groups</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree do approach and outputs promote positive discrimination of marginalised groups in project implementation as well as in the contents and delivery of education, training, research and services? ▪ Does the application include a strategy to include (members of) marginalised groups in the implementation of the project (think of the composition of the project team)? ▪ To what degree does the application contribute to the achievement of the indicators for inclusion from the programme's ToC? ▪ Is inclusion of marginalised groups systematically integrated in all parts of the project (outcomes, outputs and indicators) and in all its stages (design, planning, implementation phases and in the M&E)? 	5
<p>III.6 Labour market</p>	5

Criterion	Score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree does the proposed project support the country A partner(s) in being responsive to the demands of the national or local labour market? ▪ Does the project have a strategy to make sure that the country A partner(s) is/are better able to equip students with the knowledge and/or hands-on skills they need to find work (through internships, workshops, excursions etc)? ▪ Does the project propose a strategy to help students find work? ▪ Does the application state clearly how the education, training or research programmes will respond to the requirements of the national labour market? ▪ To what degree does the proposed project contribute to the achievement of the indicators for employability from the programme's ToCs? ▪ Are mechanisms proposed to secure the involvement of representatives of the local labour market (public, private or informal sector) and the value chain in the planning, implementation and monitoring of the project? 	
<p>III.7 Entrepreneurship</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree does the proposed project support the country A partner(s) in integrating entrepreneurship in its/their educational programme? ▪ Does the project propose innovative ways to promote entrepreneurship apart from modules in the curricula? ▪ Will the ability of the final beneficiaries to set up a successful business be increased through the proposed project? ▪ Will increased entrepreneurship of the beneficiaries be valuable for the thematic area of the project? ▪ To what degree does the proposed project contribute to the achievement of the indicators for employability from the programme's ToCs? 	5
<p>III.8 Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree does the application specifically addresses the academic, institutional, technical and financial sustainability of the project's achievements? ▪ Will the country A partner(s) be able to maintain and further upgrade the educational offer developed with the help of the project? 	6

Criterion	Score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the country A partner(s) be able to maintain and further upgrade improvements made in its structure, systems and strategic plans after the end of the project? Will financial resources be available to maintain the project achievements beyond the timeframe of the project? Will skills and tools be developed to properly use and maintain hardware and facilities also after the project? Does the application include appropriate training for administrative, financial and technical support staff at the country A partner(s) to ensure the sustainability of project outputs? 	
III.9 Risks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the project risks (both internal and external) in the organisational and institutional context sufficiently defined and identified? Does the application differentiate between risks and other factors within and beyond (project) control? Are the measures to mitigate the risks, which form a threat to the project implementation or to the realisation of the project objectives, sound and realistic? 	5
Maximum score	49
Minimum score	29

IV. Project management

See questions 3.1.1 - 3.1.3 and tables under 3.2 and 3.3 and the annexed CVs and statements of availability and expertise.

Criterion	Score
IV.1 Experience and knowledge in managing comparable projects <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant and consortium members show they have experience with comparable capacity building projects in the subject matter in the country in question or in a comparable context? Do the management teams (project directors and project coordinators) of the country A and the Dutch partner have experience with managing comparable projects? Also take into consideration how much each team member will contribute to the project (table under 3.2). 	6

Criterion	Score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the tasks and the time contribution equally distributed between both management teams? 	
IV.2 Experience and knowledge in the content matter <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do the experts have knowledge and experience with/about the content of the project and the cross cutting themes? Also take into consideration how much each expert will contribute to the project (table under 3.3) and what his/her tasks are. Do the partners have expertise in all fields necessary for the project? Do all enlisted experts and consortium partners have an added value for the project? To what degree is local/regional expertise included in the list of experts? 	6
IV.3 Competitiveness of the Dutch consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the Dutch consortium partners the best possible actors to tackle the described capacity gap? Is the Dutch TVET sector involved in the project? Does its involvement benefit the Dutch TVET sector and its students through the internationalisation of its education? 	4
IV.4 Competitiveness of the country A consortium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are the country A consortium partners the best possible actors to tackle the described capacity gap? Is/Are the country A partner(s) a party (parties) that can sustainably change the situation in its country? Will it be able to inspire change among related organisations? Are there private companies included in the consortium of one or both partners? 	4
Maximum score	20
Minimum score	12

V.a Technical quality of the application

See questions 4.1 – 4.3 and annexed budget.

Criterion	Score
V.a.1 Quality of the project's organisation and management	8

Criterion	Score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the project's organisation and management included in the application, for instance with an organisational chart? ▪ How does the project propose to keep up continuous and fast communication between all partners? ▪ Is the management structure of the project sufficient to implement, coordinate and monitor the project? ▪ Is the consortium (if applicable) adequate to allow a good project management, and is the consortium sufficiently flexible? 	
V.a.2 Quality of the system for internal monitoring and evaluation (M&E) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the proposed system for internal project M&E effective in terms of mandate, ownership, budget and allocated time? ▪ Does the proposed M&E system encourage systematic self-reflection and an active exchange of knowledge and information within the project? ▪ Is risk management explicitly integrated in the M&E system? ▪ Is there a clear procedure to handle possible conflicts between the partners? 	6
V.a.3 Communication on project results <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Next to the mandatory reporting in AkvoRSR (AkvoRSR is the mandatory tool for reporting about the project progress) how will the applicant communicate on project achievements? ▪ Does the programme benefit from the proposed communication about project achievements? ▪ Would other projects be in the position to benefit from the lessons learned of this project? 	5
V.a.4 Presentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Quality of the presentation of the application. 	4
Maximum score V.a.	23
Minimum score V.a	14

V.b Technical quality of the application

See questions 4.1 – 4.3 and annexed budget.

Criterion	Score
<p>V.b.1 Degree of co-funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To what degree is co-funding proposed as % of the total project budget (including the mandatory percentage of co-funding, if applicable)? 1% < 5%, 1 point; 5% < 10%, 2 points; 10% < 15%, 3 points; 15% < 25%, 4 points; 25% < 50%, 5 points. 	5
<p>V.b.2 Background source of co-funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the source of co-funding reliable and credible? ▪ Is the private sector directly involved in the implementation (in the form of funding in kind) or funding of the project (consortium partners, letters of support)? 	5
<p>V.b.3 Guarantee of co-funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the proposed co-funding guaranteed (by contract, guarantee etc.)? ▪ To what degree is the proposed co-funding quantifiable (in absolute terms)? 	6
<p>V.b.4 Sustainability of co-funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the source of co-funding sustainable? 	4
<p>Maximum score V.b</p> <p>Note: In case a minimum of co-funding is not required, the maximum allocated points in section V.b.2-4 will be calculated in relation to the degree of the proposed co-funding as % of the total project budget).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1% < 5%, maximum of 3 points (1 point V.b.2, 1 point V.b.3, 1 point V.b.4); ▪ 5% < 10%, maximum of 6 points (2 points V.b.2, 2 points V.b.3, 2 points V.b.4); ▪ 10% < 15%, maximum of 9 points (3 points V.b.2, 3 points V.b.3, 3 points V.b.4); 	20

Criterion	Score
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 15% < 25%, maximum of 12 points (4 points V.b.2, 4 points V.b.3, 4 points V.b.4); 25% < 50%, maximum of 15 points (5 points V.b.2, 5 points V.b.3, 5 points V.b.4). 	
Minimum score V.b.2 – 4 Note: In case a minimum of co-funding is not required, the minimum score in this section does not apply.	9

Overview of scores

Criterion	Maximum score	Minimum score
I. Quality of the partnership	10	6
II. Project relevance	38	23
III. Project approach and design	49	29
IV. Project management	20	12
V.a Technical quality of the application	23	14
V.b Technical quality of the application (only applicable for V.b.2-4 when a minimum of co-funding is required)	20	9

Total score in case a minimum of co-funding is required

Total maximum	Maximum score	160
Total minimum	Minimum score	93

Total score in case a minimum of co-funding is not required

Total maximum	Maximum score	160
Total minimum	Minimum score	84