Background

The attached document contains proposals for revising the assessment document used by the Virtual Screening Subcommittee to consider new and revised project proposals. Changes are shown in bold and include wording to reflect comments by the Projects Committee in March and September 2012 about whether the budget was appropriate for the goals of the project (see paragraph 12 of document PJ-32/12), and wording for gender analysis criteria (see report on gender analysis in coffee development projects contained in document PJ-35/12). Suggestions for clearer language on whether a proposal has adequately considered gender (Item 10 on the checklist) were invited from Members of the Projects Committee by 20 December 2012. Three options for wording on gender analysis were received (see Annex I).

Action:

The Committee is requested to consider this document and to submit its recommendation to the Council.
## DRAFT ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICO Criteria¹</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>To be completed by the VSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis: for each criterion explain why it is adequately met, or why it is not relevant. Please do not cut and paste text from the project document.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. **Country eligibility:** Are the intended beneficiaries of the project consistent with the type of beneficiaries described in paragraph 29 of ICC-105-16?

2. **Aims and purposes:** Are they consistent with the 2007 Agreement and ICC-105-16?

3. **Is the project consistent with country or regional priorities?**

4. **Are there critical gaps or problems with the project?**

5. **Is the project likely to have sustainable impacts for project beneficiaries?**

6. **Is the scale and scope, **including budget**, of the project appropriate?**

7. **Is the timeframe of the project appropriate?**

8. **Government commitment:** Is the counterpart contribution committed by the government appropriate?

9. **Will this project develop capacity-building in the local community?**

10. **Have gender aspects been adequately addressed?**

11. **Does this project leverage additional resources through private sector, civil society, government, or academic participation?**

The project is considered **ELIGIBLE/NOT ELIGIBLE** for ICO support (cross out as appropriate).

Name and title of the VSS or PJ Member (**physical signature not required**):

Date:

*If appropriate, evaluate the gender related aspects of the project as suggested in Annex I.

---

10. Have gender aspects been adequately addressed?

**OPTION A**

[10. Has a gender analysis been undertaken and its recommendations taken into account?]

- If the project has a gender dimension, does the proposal:
  - Disaggregate people-level indicators by sex?
  - Promote equal opportunities for men and women (including youth) to participate in and benefit from the project?

**OPTION B**

[10. Should the project address a gender based perspective regardless of their nature and specific aims?]

- If the project should address a gender dimension, does the proposal:
  - Allow for gender disaggregated data?
  - Promote greater gender equality in relation to opportunities and benefits from the project?

**OPTION C**

[10. Are problems analysed from a gender perspective?]

- Separate persons involved: level indicators by sex.
- Does the project have a gender strategy?
- Does the project include activities providing for equitable gender participation?

**Does the project address gender aspects?**

- Does the project provide separate data by gender?
- Who has management responsibility for goods generated through project execution? (gender focus)
- Is there gender differentiation of activities in the project?
  - Does the project have an access and control matrix for resources and benefits by gender?

---