

QSG CHECKLIST STANDALONE PROJECT FORMULATION

Project title:	Amount:	Task Manager:
	Country/ region:	
CRIS Number:	Country / region:	Coordination Officer (HQ):
		Checklist prepared by: (name+Unit):
		Date:
		Support Mission(s):

		Comments and constructive proposals for improvement
1. RELEVANCE & INTERVENTION LOGIC		
1.1	What is the relevance of the project:	
	1.1.1 a) If the partner government has a sound policy/strategy in this sector, is the project consistent with these strategies and relevant sector policies [1]?	
	1.1.1 b) If the partner government has no sound policy/strategy in this sector, does the project contribute to developing a sector policy/strategy or is it a stand alone project for which a sectoral frame is less important [1]?	
	1.1.2 Is it consistent with the relevant EC programming documents? Please highlight relevant inconsistencies. For thematic operations, are they complementary to the geographic actions?	
	1.1.3 Is the project coherent with EC development policies/guidelines in the concerned field?	
1.2	Does the intervention logic hold true:	

	1.2.1 Have the problems to be addressed been appropriately described and analysed?	
	1.2.2 Are the proposed objectives [overall objective, purpose (specific objective), results] clear and logical and are activities well defined and in support of the objectives ; do they address clearly identified needs and problems?	
	1.2.3 Do the objectives, results and activities match with the proposed budget and are they realistic within the proposed timeframe i.e. are they not over ambitious?	
	1.2.4 Are the objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) identified SMART (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic and Timely) and result-oriented? And have their source of verification been identified? Are baselines set? Have expected target values been defined?	
	1.2.5 Have assumptions/risks (including external factors) been identified and assessed, and are appropriate risk management arrangements proposed?	
	1.2.6 Have lessons learned from ROMs (Monitoring reports and Background Conclusion Sheets), evaluations etc. been taken into account in the formulation of this project?	
	1.2.7 Have complementarity with other ongoing/planned projects or programmes including of other donors been assessed and reflected in the project/programme concept?	
	1.2.8 Where technical cooperation activities are proposed, are they fully in line with the Backbone strategy and related guidelines ? -see TC quality grid	
1.3	Is the current design sufficiently supported by all stakeholders:	

	1.3.1 Were key stakeholders, including target groups, involved in the design process?	
	1.3.2 Have the Partner and other stakeholders been involved in the formulation process and have they demonstrated effective commitment (ownership)?	
	1.3.3 (for regional and multi-country projects only) Is the 'institutional and organisational capacity assessment of the prospective implementing body available?	
	1.3.4. (for regional and multi-country projects only) Should the QSG recommend to elaborate a 'Description of the Management and Control Systems' of the project?	
1.4	Is the current design sufficiently taking cross cutting issues into account?	
	1.4.1 Have EC cross-cutting issues been taken into account in the project design? Are the relevant impact assessments annexed to the AF and have their results been taken into consideration?	
2. EFFICIENCY (PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT)		
	2.1 What is the status of sector coordination in the project domain?	
	2.2 Are the proposed methods of implementation clearly described (including those related to the contribution of the Beneficiary) and justified in line with project objectives?	
	2.3 Is the internal project monitoring system clearly described?	
	2.4 Is the steering structure clearly designed?	

	2.5 Are the proposed contractual procedures likely to facilitate the implementation of the project? Do they support EU commitments on aid effectiveness?	
	2.6 If an implementing partner is proposed, is the choice appropriately justified?	
3. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY (PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT)		
	3.1 Have the institutional setting and context, and the capacity of the country implementing bodies been analysed? Are the proposed capacity building measures appropriate to ensure future ownership?	
	3.2 Does the project set the bases for future sustainability (including social and environmental aspects as well as institutional capacity)? Have the elements supporting future sustainability been properly analysed and taken into account?	
	3.3 What is foreseen to prepare a realistic exit strategy?	
OTHER ISSUES		
A. VISIBILITY (PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT)		
	Have the communication and visibility actions been addressed in an appropriate manner in line with the applicable provisions, and are the related resources clear?	
B. VERIFICATION OF IDENTIFICATION FOLLOW-UP		
	Have the QSG recommendations at the end of the identification been taken into account in the formulation phase?	
	Has the formulation phase been completed?	
	Is there a LOGFRAME and draft TAPs or project description in the case of joint management?	

	Where necessary, have the tender documents been provided?	
	Where necessary, have feasibility studies/ecofin analysis/full gender analysis/Environmental Impact Assessment/TC/PIU quality grid been provided?	
C. INFORMATION SUPPORT		
	Has the project been properly entered in CRIS?[2]	
CONCLUSIONS		
	Overall opinion: Highlight in particular if the project proposal is relevant, realistic and feasible on the basis of the elements provided. Provide an appreciation of whether the project is ready to go forward to financing: <input type="checkbox"/> well designed, no issues or minor issues to be addressed <input type="checkbox"/> project with issues that need to be addressed <input type="checkbox"/> Project with fundamental issues that need to be resolved	
	Additional comments/areas where further clarification is required (for each comment, please specify section to which it applies):	
	Comments of Finance and Contract Unit:	
	Comments of Cooperation officer: comments on Directorate E and adds any relevant information:	
	Good TC quality potential? (see Backbone Strategy principles) [3] Yes/No	

	Comments of Programming or Line DG:
	Chairman's decision: Instructions given to Cooperation Officer (operational) by Chair during meeting
	<p>Option 1: Go forward with inter-service consultation. Action Fiche approved without changes or with minor changes to be introduced under the responsibility of the cooperation officer.</p> <p>Option 2: Resubmit Action Fiche and TAPs/Project Description/Guidelines for Calls for Proposals either: 2-A - Back to QSG as a A point (the agreement of the concerned services needs to be confirmed when re-submitting to QSG) - document partially accepted with recommendation for an improved version of the Fiche to be presented at QSG; 2-B - Back to QSG as a B point: - Document not accepted with recommendations for a substantial revision and a new Fiche to be discussed in QSG as point B. - Additional information/documents are requested.</p> <p>Option 3: Action Fiche (+TAPs/Project Description/Guidelines for Calls for Proposals) to be abandoned or substantially reviewed. If Resubmission to the oQSG is envisaged it will be necessary to submit the necessary documents addressing recommendations in the checklist and the actions below.</p>
	<p>Actions to be taken consequent to the Chairperson's decision:</p> <p>First draft provided by Cooperation Officer based on discussion and conclusions summarised by the chairman.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. [...] 2. [...] 3. [...] 4. [...]

[1] Questions 1a) and 1b) are mutually exclusive so insert N/A where no response is to be given. If under question 1b) the answer is positive for a stand alone project that does not require a sector policy, indicate and justify this clearly in the comments and provide a rating expressing its relevance within the general context.

[2] Creation of a CRIS project number, link with the focal sector of NIP/CSP, introduction of the relevant DAC codes, upload of the formulation documents in CRIS and the other CRIS fields to encode as specified in the Note D(2007) 718 of 26th January 2007

[3] Answer yes when one or more of the following aspects is prominent:

- Strong participation and involvement of partners in TC design and in future implementation set up
- Clear formulation of TC results
- Intervention of non commercial TC providers (non profit organisations, public bodies)

The aim is to identify TC programmes deserving close follow up and feeding a tracking/learning systems