

QSG CHECKLIST STANDALONE PROJECT IDENTIFICATION

Project title:	Amount:	Task Manager:
CRIS Number:	Country / region:	Coordination Officer (HQ):
		Checklist prepared by: (name + Unit):
		Date:
		Support Mission(s):
		Comments and constructive proposals for improvement [1]
1. RELEVANCE & INTERVENTION LOGIC		
1.1	What is the relevance of the project:	
	1.1.1a) If the partner government has a sound policy/strategy in this sector, is the project consistent with these strategies and relevant sector policies [2]? (First Key Question)	
	1.1.1b) 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 [2]? (First Key Question)	

	1.1.2 Is it consistent with the relevant EC programming documents? Please highlight relevant inconsistencies.	
	1.1.3 Is the project coherent with EC development policies/guidelines in the concerned field? (Second Key Question)	
1.2	Does the intervention logic hold true:	
	1.2.1 Have the problems to be addressed been appropriately analysed? (Third Key Question)	
	1.2.2 Are the proposed objectives [overall objective, purpose (specific objective), results] clear and logical; do they address clearly identified needs and problems?	
	1.2.3 Are different options for the EC response presented and is the proposed option justified?	
	1.2.4 Do the objectives and results match with the proposed overall financial envelop and are they realistic within the proposed timeframe i.e. are they not over ambitious? If not, propose to the delegation where possible measures to ensure coherence between the objectives and the overall financial envelop as well as the timeframe.	

	1.2.5 Are there any objectively verifiable indicators (OVIs) at this stage? If not, is a process foreseen to develop them? Are baselines available and if not how is it proposed to calculate the initial reference values for indicators?	
	1.2.6 Have assumptions/risks been identified? Are the measures proposed to assess the risks and mitigate them appropriate?	
	1.2.7 Have lessons learned from previous/ongoing experience and ROMs (Monitoring Reports and Background Conclusion Sheets), evaluations etc. been taken into account in the identification of this project?	
	1.2.8 Have linkages with other ongoing/planned projects or programmes including of other donors been assessed and reflected in the project/programme concept?	
	1.2.9 Where appropriate have significant technical cooperation interventions including of other donors been appropriately assessed?	
1.3	Is the current identification process sufficiently supported and owned by all stakeholders:	
	1.3.1 Have key stakeholders, including target groups, been clearly identified? (Fourth Key Question)	

	1.3.2 Have the Partner and other stakeholders been involved in the identification process and have they demonstrated effective commitment (ownership)? (Fifth Key Question)	
	1.3.3 When TC is foreseen, is there evidence of a strong demand for it?	
	1.3.4 (For regional and multi country projects only) Is there a plan to elaborate the 'institutional and organisational capacity assessment of the prospective implementation body'?	
1.4	Is the current identification process sufficiently taking cross cutting issues into account:	
	1.4 Have EC cross-cutting issues been adequately taken into account in the project identification? What measures will be taken to integrate them during formulation (e.g. EIA)? Have the results of the relevant screening questionnaires been taken into consideration?	
2. POTENTIAL SUSTAINABILITY (PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT)		
	2.1 Have the elements supporting future sustainability been properly analysed and taken into account? Does the project set the bases for future sustainability (including social and environmental aspects as well as institutional capacity)?	

2.2 Is there an adequate analysis of the options to ensure appropriate programme implementation arrangements with a view to strengthening ownership and sustainability? (Programme embedded in local/institutional structure, building capacity...)

OTHER ISSUES

A. INFORMATION SUPPORT

Have any identification study, ROM (Monitoring reports and Background Conclusion Sheets) and evaluation reports been prepared and annexed?

Has a draft LOGFRAME been attached?

Are the relevant cross-cutting issues screening questionnaires annexed to the IF?

Has the project been properly entered in CRIS [3]? And all relevant documents attached?

B. NEXT STEPS

Are the activities foreseen for the formulation phase described and appropriate? (Sixth Key Question)

CONCLUSIONS

	<p>Brief 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 formulation or whether the IF should be resubmitted to oQSG1 please provide arguments in particular based on the 6 key questions. <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</p>
	<p>Additional comments/areas where further clarification is required including responding to any questions raised by the Delegation in the Identification Fiche (for each comment, please specify section to which it applies):</p>
	<p>Comments of Finance and Contract Unit:</p>
	<p>Comments of Cooperation officer: comments on Directorate E and adds any relevant information:</p>
	<p>Comments of Programming or Line DG:</p>

Chairman's decision:

Instructions given to Cooperation Officer (operational) by Chair during meeting

Option 1: Go forward with formulation or inter-service consultation. The Identification Fiche approved in the format discussed in oQSG meeting and any oQSG comments to be taken into account during formulation.

Option 2: Resubmit Identification Fiche either:

2-A - Back to QSG as an 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: - Substantial revision necessary and a new Fiche to be discussed in QSG as point B.
- Additional information/documents are requested.

Option 3: Identification Fiche 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.

Actions to be taken consequent to the Chairperson's decision:

First draft provided by Cooperation Officer based on discussion and conclusions summarised by the chairman.

1. [...]
2. [...]
3. [...]
4. [...]

[1] Particular attention should be given to the 6 key questions highlighted in yellow

[2] 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.

[3] 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