Annex 2_Selection Committee of the Challenge Facility for Civil Society, 2008

<u>**Issues from Selection**</u>

1. **Call for proposal process** –
- should be circulated to selection committee for comments
- Should include clear advice about what will be funded and what will not. Much clearer guidelines on goal and objectives will reduce inappropriate proposals. This should include a description of what is considered advocacy and examples of fundable and non-fundable activities.
- Need to clarify the areas of the Stop TB Strategy they are working on. This was asked but this was not made clear whether this was the global/national WHO Stop TB Strategy/ Policies. Many proposals quoted strategies but reviewers had no way of ascertaining which policies were being referenced.
- Need to have all the information about an application form, that the team is asked to evaluate. Proposal evaluation form should be structured in line with the application forms For instance, if applications are to be scored based on how long the organizations have been registered, this question should be part of the application form.
- Some of the issues should be categorical, i.e. target group appropriate – evaluate further, target group inappropriate – reject. Does the proposal address the objectives of the CFCS if no reject, no need to score
- If more than 50% of budget for salary and administration then reject

2. **Reporting**
- Need to have copies of reports from first year funding from those who are applying for second year.
- Grantees applying for second round MUST submit their final reports documenting the successful completion of their grant or an explanation as to why this was not the case before they are eligible to apply for another grant
- Include the report from last grant along with the application for the reader to review.

3. **Sustainability**
- Applicants should be asked to say how they plan to ensure the sustainability of the project in the form and then judged on the basis of what is asked.
- Grantees should state clearly how they will ensure sustainability of the project. This can include if they have ways to self-finance/ are looking for support from other funders for this project.

4. **Scoring system**
- Need careful review of weighting in the score system
- Very high proportion of score for the validity of the objectives, activities and outcomes which could score highly even if they are not appropriate for the CFCS
- The scoring form should follow the flow of the application form. This will ensure that all the aspects that the proposals are scored for are included as questions that

need to be responded to in the application. This will also facilitate a more efficient review process so that the reviewer doesn't have to repeatedly flip through the proposal to review all elements that are covered on the scoring form.
- Should members score early and submit their scores on line. These scores should be entered into a data base and shared with the committee members when they arrive in Geneva. The discussions in Geneva should focus on eliminating/ explaining any wide disparities in scoring across the committee members. The in person meeting should focus on eliminating scoring disparities and finalizing decisions

5. Communication
- Committee members need to be kept well in touch of the whole process
- Take into account recommendations of the steering committee for Round 1 and 2 of CFCS.
- Need to translate the proposals into English from French, Portuguese and Spanish.

6. Membership
- Members need to commit to process
- If a committee member has not attended two consecutive meetings and has not sent in their on-line scores, they should be asked to step off.

Lasha Goguadze
On behalf of Selection Committee