



Australian Government

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Live Trade Animal Welfare Partnership (LTAWP)

Project Evaluation Worksheet – for Committee Use Only

EVALUATOR: [INSERT NAME OF EVALUATOR]

PROJECT: [INSERT NAME OF PROJECT]

DATE OF EVALUATION: [INSERT]

Criterion 1 – Extent to which the project proposal addresses the LTAWP objectives

Score for Criterion 1	General Comments in relation to Criterion 1

Criterion 2 – Extent to which the project will lead to improvements in Australia’s agricultural and food trade, and market access outcomes

Score for Criterion 2	General Comments in relation to Criterion 2

Criterion 3 – Extent of industry funding and support; and partner country support and/or funding.

Score for Criterion 3	General Comments in relation to Criterion 3



Australian Government

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry

Criterion 4 – Viability and cost effectiveness of the project.

Score for Criterion 4	General Comments in relation to Criterion 4

General comments:



1. SUGGESTED SCORING METHODOLOGY

1.1 The suggested scoring scale outlined below can be used by the committee members for the purposes of scoring project proposals. Scores should be allocated for each evaluation criterion and must be based on the committee member's comments for each criterion. A final score should also be calculated so that project proposals can be ranked (if required).

Score	Definitive Answers	Value Judgement
0 - 1	Unsatisfactory / Non-Compliant	Fails to meet the program objectives. Lack of supporting information or otherwise unacceptable.
2 - 3	Poor	Minimal Compliance. Program objectives inadequately dealt with in most or all areas. Detailed information missing or deficient. Where appropriate, proponent's capability, understanding and experience is unconvincing.
4 - 5	Satisfactory	Adequate, but some reservations. There may be shortcomings in scope or detail in a number of important areas. Where appropriate, proponent's capability, understanding and experience in a number of areas is questionable.
6 - 7	Good	Good quality, mostly meets program objectives. Some shortcomings in at least one important area. Where appropriate, proponent demonstrates some capability, understanding and experience relevant to the program objectives. Detail limited in some areas.
8 - 9	Very Good	Very good quality response satisfies the majority of the program objectives. Any shortcomings relate to minor issues only. Where appropriate, proponent demonstrates capability, understanding and experience relevant to the Program objectives. Good level of detail in most areas.
10	Excellent	Fully satisfies the program objectives. Where appropriate, proponent fully demonstrates capability, understanding and experience relevant to the program objectives. Comprehensive level of detail provided.