



4, Quai Antoine 1er
B.P.445 - MC 98011 MONACO Cedex
PRINCIPALITE DE MONACO

CAPACITY BUILDING SUB-COMMITTEE

PROCEDURE 4

| |
|---|
| <p>EVALUATION PROCEDURE OF SUBMISSIONS REQUESTING SUPPORT TO THE CBSC</p> |
|---|

PROCEDURE 4 of the CBSC aims to establish an objective value for each activity proposed to request support from the SC, based on the weights defined by the CBSC. This will be used as in initial (objective) evaluation for establishing a priority list, that could be changed by the CBSC. This procedure must be followed in conjunction with Procedure 1.

Explanation:

Part 1 of this document contains the **standardized procedure** that must be followed for all proposals requesting support from the CBSC.

Part 2 of this document provides the **evaluation model** to be filled by the CBSC Secretary when receiving the application for support from the CBSC.



PART 1
STANDARDIZED PROCEDURE

All the projects requesting support from CBSC are required to follow this procedure, in conjunction with Procedure 1.

The following aspects must be evaluated in order to fill the model presented in Part 2 of this document:

1. Category of the Project (choose the one that most defines your project):
 - a) Technical Assistance
 - b) Training Education
 - c) Financial Assistance
 - d) Start Up Project
2. Phase of Capacity Building, according to the IHO Capacity Building Strategy:
 - a) Phase 1
 - b) Phase 2
 - c) Phase 3
3. Number of States Benefitted: the number of States involved in the project.
4. External Funding Factor. If there are funding from external agencies or funds, apply the rule:

$$\text{Value} = 5 \times \frac{\text{External funding value (Euros)}}{\text{CBFund value (Euros)}}$$

and consider only the integer part of the above calculation.

5. Neediness Factor, according to the *per capita* Gross Domestic Product (GDP – US\$), published by the United Nations:

<http://unstats.un.org/unsd/demographic/products/socind/inc-eco.htm>

Select the appropriate item, depending of the average value of the States involved, as:

- a) < 2000
- b) 2001 – 5000
- c) 5001 – 10,000
- d) 10,001 – 20,000
- e) 20,001 – 30,000
- f) 30,001 – 40,000
- g) > 40,001

6. Priority within RHC. A value to be established by the RHC, according to the following:
 - a) 1 = top priority
 - b) 2 = very important
 - c) 3 = important
 - d) 4 = lowest priorityEach RHC has to establish a balanced view of the projects, to avoid ranking all the projects as having the same priority.
7. Potential for Success (0 to 5), from the IHB viewpoint, is a measure on how well the project is expected to achieve its goals. From low chance (0) to higher chance (5).
8. Discount for recent similar activities (0 to -3), regarding the following table:
 - a) No similar activity in the past 10 years
 - b) No similar activity in the past 5 years
 - c) One similar activity in the past 5 years
 - d) More than one similar activity in the past 5 years
9. Capacity Building Effect. This is a subjective assessment (1 to 5) to be done by the RHCs, regarding the overall view of the projects, considering all the above factors and the general importance to the development of Hydrography in the region.



PART 2
EVALUATION MODEL

IDENTIFICATION

Project Number: _____

| | |
|---|--|
| Project Name: | |
| Submitting RHC: | |
| Date of Submission: | |
| Institution executing the project: | |
| Name of responsible: | |
| Address: | |
| Telephone: | |
| Fax: | |
| e-mail: | |

EVALUATION

| N. | Description | Maximum | Item value | Assigned value |
|----|--|---------|------------|----------------|
| 1. | Category of the Project | 5 | | |
| | a) Technical Assistance | | 5 | |
| | b) Training Education | | 3 | |
| | c) Start Up Project | | 3 | |
| | d) Financial Assistance | | 2 | |
| 2. | Phase of Capacity Building | 10 | | |
| | a) Phase 1 | | 10 | |
| | b) Phase 2 | | 5 | |
| | c) Phase 3 | | 1 | |
| 3. | Number of States Benefitted | 5 | | |
| | a) 10 or more | | 5 | |
| | b) 5 to 9 | | 3 | |
| | c) less than 5 | | 1 | |
| 4. | External Funding Factor | 5 | | |
| | Other Contributions in cash and kind / CBFund | | 0 to 5 | |
| 5. | Neediness Factor (UN Tables – GDP Per Capita) | 10 | | |
| | h) < 2000 | | 10 | |
| | i) 2001 – 5000 | | 8 | |
| | j) 5001 – 10,000 | | 7 | |
| | k) 10,001 – 20,000 | | 6 | |
| | l) 20,001 – 30,000 | | 4 | |
| | m) 30,001 – 40,000 | | 1 | |
| | n) > 40,001 | | 0 | |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|----|--------|--|
| 6. | Priority within RHC | | | |
| | a) 1 | 5 | 5 | |
| | b) 2 | | 3 | |
| | c) 3 | | 1 | |
| | d) 4 | | 0 | |
| 7. | Potential for Success | | | |
| | a) 5 | 5 | 5 | |
| | b) 4 | | 4 | |
| | c) 3 | | 3 | |
| | d) 2 | | 2 | |
| | e) 1 | | 1 | |
| | f) 0 | | 0 | |
| 8. | Discount for recent similar activities | | | |
| | e) No similar activity in the past 10 years | 0 | 0 | |
| | f) No similar activity in the past 5 years | | -1 | |
| | g) One similar activity in the past 5 years | | -2 | |
| | h) More than one similar activity in the past 5 years | | -3 | |
| 9. | Capacity Building Effect | | | |
| | Subjective Assessment from the CBSC | 5 | 0 to 5 | |
| | Maximum Possible Score | 50 | | |

CBSC Secretary

CBSC Chairman