

## **“Dialogue and Dissent, Strategic Partnerships for Lobbying and Advocacy”: The report on the analysis of proposal assessments by Vliegende Keep Team**

### **1. Scope of the analysis**

In order to conduct a comprehensive analysis of all the proposal evaluations, all 5-pagers, the assessment formats of the Theory of Changes and Track Records of 56 organisations were carefully read. In a few cases, for those which received an evaluation of D actual proposals submitted by the organisations were also consulted. In some cases, we also asked gender specialists to check “inclusivity” within the proposals, since we have observed inconsistencies in how different teams rated this aspect. In some other cases, we checked specific sections within the proposals, when the team’s evaluation of the section or their remarks were unclear or contradictory.

### **2. Procedure**

We have first read the assessment formats of the ToC and TR and checked if various responses given to the questions listed in those documents, as well as additional remarks provided by teams justify the scores given to various sub-sections. If there are inconsistencies, these were identified and noted. Then we checked if the final score given to ToC or TR is defensible, whether or not we would propose a different score, and on what basis. Afterwards, we read through the five-pagers and observed how the main arguments are presented in the five-pagers; identified possible inconsistencies or contradictory remarks, and how a final evaluation of the proposal is conducted by the teams. We have read references and the remarks on the pitch, and tried to see if those would contribute to the final score or would undermine the final assessment.

The vliegende keep team has first individually assessed the proposals, and then we met on weekly basis to discuss and exchange ideas. We shared our impressions and raised the questions we had on each case. After such exchanges we decided to confirm or propose changes in the ToC, TR or final scores. Although the teams were asked to rate the proposals with a score of A to E; we introduced + and - as well in order to differentiate between proposals with the same rating, say C, but which still differs in terms of their quality. This is intended to help with the final selection. The discussions are reported in minutes of meetings after each meeting. In these documents, we explained the rationale of the changes we suggested.

A table was created to present the ratings of different organisations. The table included the main aspects of ToC and TR, as well as some other sub-issues we considered highly important in assessment: these included, within TR, the importance of capacity building with regard to L&A; and within ToC, process and impact indicators, risk analysis, legitimacy of southern partners, capacity building of southern partners, enabling environment, sustainability, and the partnership with MINBUZA. Such a table has been rather useful to have an overall picture of the ratings given to an organisation, and to compare it to other proposals.

Members of the team participated in several pitches and in some of the interviews held by the evaluation commission in order to have a broader view.

In our opinion, an analysis of all evaluations by a separate team has been rather useful since there are observable differences in terms of how different teams appraised the proposals and gave scores. Indeed some were highly generous with their scores and some were rather critical. Hence, the exercise of the “vliegende keep team”, contributed to the consistency of assessments and looked after a more balanced way of scoring.

On the basis of the recommendations and the observations of the vliegende keep team and in coordination with the assessment teams the different assessment formats have been adapted in order to guarantee the consistency in the evaluations and eliminate the differences between the appraisals. In those cases where the assessment team did not agree with the comments and changes suggested by the vliegende keep team, it is decided that the assessment of the team did not change, while the vliegende keep team mentioned in their assessment their argumentation for the inconsistencies found.

### **Documentation**

There are two different documents which reports on our evaluation: 1) Minutes of meetings detailing our review of the proposals and the rationale for change when we suggested a different rating; 2) Table reviewing the ratings of all proposals (detailing all important aspects of ToC and TR). In the table, those which are highlighted as blue are the ones we confirmed, and the red includes those for which we proposed a change in the rating. The proposed final score is the one in the last column with a question mark.