Request for Qualifications for Proposal Preparation
Grants: Agricultural Innovation in South Asia and sub-Saharan Africa

Reviewer score sheet TW4

Proposal from (name of proposed grant holding institution)

Proposal number TW4.

Qualifications of proposed staff Weight: 20%

Qualifications include the skills and experience of the proposed team in conducting impact evaluations. Factors to be considered are: (1) experience of the PIs with quantitative and qualitative methods and conducting quality impact evaluations in the agricultural sector; (2) team member experience in managing fieldwork in a developing country; and (3) proven success in communicating and disseminating research/evaluation findings beyond the academic community. Scoring should be done as follows: 0-2 should be given when none of the three conditions are met. 3-5 should be given if one of the criteria is not met and the other three criteria are somewhat met. 6-8 should be given if all the criteria are met to some extent. 9-10 should be given if all three criteria are met very well.

Score:

Involvement of developing country researchers Weight: 15%

This criterion includes the following: (1) substantive involvement of developing country evaluators/researchers in the proposed study (meaning in design, analysis and writing); and (2) efforts designed to build local capacity to produce impact evaluations and contribute to policy influence.
Developing country researchers are defined as developing country nationals resident in their country of origin. Scoring should be done as follows: 0-2: Developing country nationals and organisations are primarily involved in receiving training and logistical or survey activities and not more. 3-5: There is some greater collaboration with developing country institutions and sectoral/local guidance from developing country nationals along with logistical support. 6-8: There is institutional collaboration with developing country institutions and developing country nationals serve as analysts in either the quantitative or the qualitative analyses and, when necessary, receive capacity building in research methodologies. 9-10: These scores reflect significant participation of developing country PIs and applications with a developing country organization as the grant holder (and receiving institutional capacity building as necessary).

Score:

**Quality of technical proposal:**

**Internal validity**

Technical quality concerns whether the proposed impact evaluation addresses the questions of ‘what works, why and for how much?’ using the best available methodology. Reviewers should assess: (1) the identification strategy, treatment of spillovers and contamination, (2) the adequacy of power calculations; (3) the inclusion of heterogeneous effects including treatment of sub-groups (in particular gender), and (4) ethical issues including treatment of possible conflict of interest. Scoring should be done as follows: 0-2: The four conditions are not met or barely/weakly met. Rigor is especially not met. 3-5: The four conditions are somewhat met. Rigor and feasibility are somewhat met. 6-8: The four conditions are met well. 9-10: All four conditions are met very well.

Score:
Quality of technical proposal:  
**External validity**

Reviewers should assess: (1) incorporation of intervention’s theory of change into the evaluation design, (2) the use of mixed-methods, and (3) cost-effectiveness or cost-benefit analysis. Scoring should be done as follows: 0-2 should be given when none of the three conditions are met or inadequately met. 3-5 should be given if one of the criteria is not met and the other two are somewhat met. 6-8 should be given if all the criteria are met to some extent. 9-10 should be given if all three criteria are met very well.

Score:

---

**Potential policy impact**

Potential policy impact is the extent to which the study has the potential to influence national, regional and international policy. The factors assessed for policy impact are: (1) the engagement of key stakeholders in identification of the evaluation questions; (2) proven demand for the study, including clear indication of intended use of evaluation findings by the implementing agency; and (3) the quality of the policy influence strategy for the study. Scoring should be as follows: 0-2 should be given when none of the three conditions are met or inadequately met. 3-5 should be given if one of the criteria is not met and the other two are somewhat met. 6-8 should be given if all the criteria are met to some extent. 9-10 should be given if all three criteria are met very well.

Score:
Cost

This criterion includes two dimensions: (1) total price reasonableness and (2) best value. Total price reasonableness is an assessment of whether the total requested budget for the project is an appropriate price for the scale of the work to be undertaken (e.g. the number of surveys, the amount of analysis, etc.) in the country or region whether the evaluation will take place. Best value is an assessment of whether the evaluation (taking into account quality, relevance, and impact) for the total requested budget is a good value compared to other possible evaluations. For successful application, 3ie and GDN will conduct a line item review of the budgets, so line items do not need to be reviewed here, although reviewers are welcome to make comments on line items should they so choose. 3ie does not pay for implementing agency staff costs and/or implementation costs of the intervention. Scoring should be as follows: 0-2 should be given when none of the two conditions are met or inadequately met. 3-5 should be given if one of the criteria is not met and the other one is somewhat met. 6-8 should be given if the two criteria are met to some extent. 9-10 should be given if both criteria are met very well.

Score: