

**SMALL GRANTS PROGRAMME**

**- project assessment Form -**

This form is for internal use of the CMS Scientific Council and the Secretariat to review projects submitted to the CMS Small Grants Programme (SGP). For those eligible to participate in the SGP review, please use this form to fill sections 1. and 2. only and return the form to the Secretariat (secretariat@cms.int) as a Pdf or MS Word file by **31 January 2014 at the latest**. Submission via email is preferred. Submissions sent via post have to reach the Secretariat by the same date and can be sent to: UNEP/CMS Secretariat, UN Campus, Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1, 53113 Bonn, Germany.

The Revised Guidelines for the Operation of the Small Grants Programme are available in the document [UNEP/CMS/Conf.10.43](http://www.cms.int/bodies/COP/cop10/docs_and_inf_docs/doc_43_sgp_revised_guidelines_e.pdf) , on the CMS website: [www.cms.int](http://www.cms.int).

For any queries please do not hesitate to contact Johannes Stahl (jstahl@cms.int) or Laura Aguado (laguado@cms.int) at the UNEP/CMS Secretariat.

*- Please use the grey fields for answers and comments. -*

**1. Personal details of the reviewer**

Title and name

Position

Organization

Address

E-mail

Telephone

*Please tick as appropriate:*

CMS Scientific Council member [ ]  (country:       )

COP-Appointed Scientific Councillor [ ]  (focus area:       )

Chair of the Scientific Council [ ]  Vice-Chair of the Scientific Council [ ]

UNEP/CMS Secretariat [ ]  (unit:       )

**For any of the projects that you have been requested to review is there a conflict of interest (see explanatory note below)?** If yes, please do not review those particular projects to which the conflict of interest applies and record this in the comments section of the assessment table (section 2. below).

No [ ]  Yes [ ]

**A conflict of interest is understood to include:**

1. The institution which employs you
2. Any other reason that you consider or others might consider may conflict with the requirement for impartiality, to the extent that your objectivity will be impaired, such as
	1. Being a member of a Board of Management or Trustee of an organization;
	2. Being a consultant to the organization;
	3. A close association with an individual involved in a project, such as
		1. through personal connection;
		2. current or recent professional collaboration; or
		3. current or recent teaching at an advanced (post-graduate) level
	4. a close relative being employed by an organization or involved in any of the above ways.

**2. Project assessment**

**Please fill one line per project reviewed and calculate the individual points based on the assessment procedure and categories in Annex I.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project reference** | **1) Exclusion criteria** | **2) Number of priority criteria that apply**  | **3) Points from scoring table** | **4) Comments (e.g. ethics, conflict of interest)** |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |
|       |       |       |       |       |

**Annex I: ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE**

**Please use these categories and instructions to fill in the project assessment table (2.) above. Do not fill in any parts of Annex I.**

**Eligible countries are listed in the document *SGP Country Eligibility* that you can find on the** [**CMS Small Grants Programme website.**](http://www.cms.int/bodies/ScC/small_grants_programme.htm)

***1) Exclusion criteria****, each tick counts as one point in the relevant category in the assessment table:*

**If any of these exclusion criteria apply, please only fill this column in the assessment table for this particular project. No further assessment (assessment stages 2-3 below) is necessary.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

At least one host country has not ratified CMS or is more than three years in arrears.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Project does not address a CMS mandate.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The country is not below 0.200 in the UN Scale of Assessment

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Endorsement form (Annex-A of application form) not signed by all required CMS Focal Point(s) of host country/ies.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

 Total amount requested exceeds € 15,000.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Project duration exceeds two years and no specific explanation/request has been submitted.

***2) Priority criteria****, each tick counts as one point in the relevant category in the assessment table:*

**The following priority criteria will be used to prioritize amongst high-scoring projects.**

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Co-funding, including in-kind contributions, is available.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

The project deals with a conservation emergency or case where there is a need for quick

response.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

At least one Appendix I species, which is also listed for Concerted Action, is being targeted (count

the two boxes below also; see Resolution 10.23 for a list of Concerted Action species.)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

At least one Appendix I species is being targeted (count the box below also).

|  |
| --- |
|  |

At least one CMS-listed species is being targeted.

***3) Scoring table:***

**Please enter scores for each section from 0 (poor) – 10 (excellent)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Question/section** | **Score (0-10)** |
|  |  |
| ***Application quality***: Is it clear how the project is envisaged to work? Are all sections filled in correctly and clearly? |  |
| ***Budget:*** Does the budget appear realistic? Is there a reasonable balance between salaries and activities? |  |
| ***Project team:*** Are the implementing agency and collaborators sufficiently qualified and experienced? Is there a good balance of skills and responsibilities of the team and its members? |  |
| ***Feasibility:*** How realistic is it to implement the project and to achieve the outputs envisaged? Structure, clarity, consistency and suitability of the proposed approach to achieve the expected results. |  |
| ***Conservation impact/CMS application***: Will the project benefit a migratory species and/or assist the implementation of a CMS mandate? |  |
|  |  |
| **TOTAL** | (enter total points into relevant assessment table section; minimum: 0, maximum: 50) |

***4) Comments section:***

Please make use of the comments sections to submit any other specific comments, both positive and negative. The following questions might assist in assessing a number of issues:

* Is the project likely to provide lessons learnt which will be applicable and valuable elsewhere?
* Are there animal welfare concerns?
* Are the skills which are being acquired through the project likely to be valuable after the project? If so, how relevant will this be to CMS implementation?
* If the project fails, could this reflect badly upon the SGP, the Scientific Council or CMS in general?
* Are you aware of poor performance or any misconduct of any of the project partners in the past of which the SGP reviewers should be aware?
* Has the project application already stimulated cooperation with the relevant authority, and/or between the authority and the NGO/IGO/research sector?
* Are you aware of how the implementing or collaborating agencies have delivered on other projects?
* Is the project going to contribute to the conservation of a habitat of importance for migratory species?
* Is the project likely to stimulate international cooperation?
* Will the project contribute to improved awareness raising and/or education concerning migratory species?