

GUIDELINES FOR QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF TC PROJECT DESIGNS

Quality Review Questions	Assessment criteria and sample indicators to guide reviewers for constructive feedback to the project teams.	Ratings: 3 (high); 2 (medium); 1 (low); 0 (no information)
TCR 1. Compliance with TC Central Criterion. Does the project reflect and document its contribution to solving a real problem, as part of an existing national programme supported by the MS on its own? Do the project documents describe MS contributions? (see Problem Statement, linkages with CPF/RPF, past/present country efforts)	RELEVANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear linkages with the Country Programme Framework (CPF), with the national development plans and with SDGs where relevant, or with regional agreements. COHERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing policies or interventions support the programme/project, or <i>vice versa</i>. Efforts made by the country to address the problem in the past are described. OWNERSHIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member State commitment to the programme or project is reflected by provision of an enabling environment (government is engaged in making a change in an area where this technology is relevant). SUSTAINABILITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is linked to the country's medium/long term goals and/or strategic programme. 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear and well documented.
		2: Fairly clear but additional information needed. Implicit references/linkages.
		1: Not clear. Generic descriptions. No reference to CPF. No evidence of MS support.
		Note to reviewers: Do not focus on MS budget contributions in this question, but rather on commitment in the sense of an enabling regulatory environment, past engagement to solving the problem using this technology, support to the institutions involved.
TCR 2. Relevance of nuclear technology and role of IAEA. Does the project reflect the key role of nuclear techniques and/or nuclear technology, or support the development of an adequate national infrastructure for the safe use of nuclear technologies? Is the relevant role that the IAEA TC programme plays clearly described?	RELEVANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nuclear or related technique(s) used in the project are described, with explanation why they are the best choice to address the problem and what comparative advantage they have over non-nuclear techniques. Proposed actions for supporting the development of an adequate national infrastructure for the safe use of nuclear technologies is described, where relevant. COHERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Findings and recommendations of IAEA review and/or advisory service recommendations (e.g. ImPACT review mission reports, Safety Review Mission Reports) mentioned. Specific role expected of the IAEA is described. SUSTAINABILITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to IAEA and TC support provided in the past, and to progress made, showing how this project builds on past IAEA/ TC efforts. 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear and explicit.
		2: Fairly clear but not explicit enough. Needs further explanation.
		1: Not clear. Generic descriptions, unclear contribution of the nuclear technique/technology and/or the role of the IAEA TC programme.

Quality Review Questions	Assessment criteria and sample indicators to guide reviewers for constructive feedback to the project teams.	Ratings: 3 (high); 2 (medium); 1 (low); 0 (no information)
<p>TCR 3. Implementation capacity and strategy</p> <p>Does the project reflect a proper implementation strategy, capacity of the respective Counterpart institutions, roles and responsibilities and commitment/ownership from MS?</p> <p>(see counterpart mandate to address the issue, adequate human and physical infrastructure, institutional priority and support to the project).</p>	<p>RELEVANCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promotes technological self-reliance at national and regional levels through institutional and human capacity development efforts. <p>COHERENCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is linked to other interventions carried out by the Counterpart/government and is consistent with the relevant international norms and standards to which that Counterpart/government adheres. All activities required to achieve project outputs are included, not just activities implemented with IAEA inputs. There is a sequence of project milestones to ensure the correct implementation of the project. <p>EFFICIENCY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate and realistic project work plan to ensure smooth project implementation, timely and within planned resources. Well defined overall management roles and responsibilities, leadership and practical arrangements at the level of the project team and partners. Adequate and realistic project budgets are in place. All the inputs from IAEA, MS and partners, are clear, complete and adequate/consistent with the activities to produce the project outputs. Physical infrastructure and human resources are available to support the project at the counterpart institution(s). The implementation strategy builds on lessons learned or good practices from past projects. <p>OWNERSHIP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Member State commitment to the project is reflected by the allocation of adequate human, technical and financial resources (including in-kind contributions and government cost sharing). 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear, explicit and well documented implementation strategy and institutional capacity analysis.
		2: Fairly clear implementation strategy and institutional analysis but needs additional information.
		1: Not clear. Institutional mandate and priorities missing and implementation strategy unclear.
		<p>Note to reviewers: Focus on roles and responsibilities in the project implementation strategy and workplan.</p> <p>Focus on budget and in-kind contributions from MS. Could be cost-sharing, but also existing laboratories, suitable buildings, number and type of staff that will be directly involved in this project and logistics (i.e. transport for implementation of field studies/trials).</p>

Quality Review Questions	Assessment criteria and sample indicators to guide reviewers for constructive feedback to the project teams.	Ratings: 3 (high); 2 (medium); 1 (low); 0 (no information)
LFA 1. Situation analysis Is the situation, problem, need/gap clearly identified, analysed and documented? (evidence and references).	EFFICIENCY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The main problem to be addressed by the project is described, including data to describe the current situation, with reference to sources. Data should be gender-disaggregated where relevant. RELEVANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is informed by lessons learned, good practices and relevant monitoring findings gathered from assessments, evaluation and monitoring tools. Efforts to assess the different implications for women and men of any planned action, including legislation, policies or programmes are described. Indication that a gender analysis has been conducted for this project or whether it is linked to any national, thematic or institutional gender strategy. Related activities, results and gender-disaggregated outcome indicators. Potential negative social and environmental effects being avoided and other cross cutting issues including climate change risk mitigation/adaptation considered. 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear and explicit.
		2: Fairly clear but not explicit enough. Needs further information.
		1: Not clear. Generic descriptions, unclear description of gap/problem to be addressed. Lack of data.
LFA 2. Stakeholder Analysis Is the stakeholder analysis adequate and clearly presented and documented? (clear identification of end-users, beneficiaries, sponsors, partners, and clearly defined roles and responsibilities).	RELEVANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continued national and/or international partnerships. COHERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The project is consistent with other interventions in the same context – complementarity, harmonisation and co-ordination with others, and avoiding duplication of effort. Connection between the project and the on-going efforts of the IAEA and other programmes to create appropriate synergies. SUSTAINABILITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Downstream mechanisms and modalities are in place to ensure effective linkages between counterparts and end users. Partnerships with UN specialized agencies, development and non-profit organizations are identified and in place whenever required, including public/private partnerships wherever relevant. OWNERSHIP <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A consultative process has taken place and all stakeholders (men and women) have participated in the planning and preparation of project documentation. The roles of the national institutions and stakeholders in the project are well defined. 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear and explicit.
		2: Fairly clear but not explicit enough. Needs further information.
		1: Not clear. Generic descriptions, unclear stakeholder roles and responsibilities.
		Note to reviewers: Verify that stakeholders are not only identified but their respective roles are also described.

Quality Review Questions	Assessment criteria and sample indicators to guide reviewers for constructive feedback to the project teams.	Ratings: 3 (high); 2 (medium); 1 (low); 0 (no information)
LFA 3. Objectives Analysis Is the Objectives Analysis clearly presented, documented and reflected in the LFM? Clarity, consistency and logic of the cause-effect relationship, hierarchy from Activities to Outputs, to Outcome and to Overall Objective.	RELEVANCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High prospects for achieving outcomes and contributing to impact. Different needs and priorities of men and women have been considered. COHERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall long-term objective to which the project will contribute reflects an impact related to a national development priority and to the relevant Thematic Area Outcome of the CPF Results Matrix. EFFECTIVENESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The description of the overall objective clearly reflects the problem and objectives analysis. Clarity, consistency and logic of the cause-effect relationship, hierarchy from Inputs to Activities to Outputs, to Outcome and to Overall Objective. 	0: N/a 3: Yes. Clear and explicit. 2: Fairly clear but not explicit enough. 1: Not clear. Generic descriptions. Note to reviewers: Objective is formulated using the infinite form of the verb, e.g. “to develop”, “to increase”, etc.
LFA 4. Outcome Is the Outcome in the LFM clear, realistic and relevant, and does it address the problem identified? Does it provide a clear description of the benefit or improvement that will be achieved after project completion?	EFFECTIVENESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate identification and clear formulation of the project outcome in terms of change or improvement in conditions, services, and situations, to be obtained due to the completion of the project outputs and their use. Outcome should be realistic and achievable by the project. COHERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the Results Matrix of the CPF, where relevant. 	0: N/a 3: Yes. Clear, realistic and relevant. 2: Fairly clear but not enough to reflect a change/improvement in the situation that the project will address. 1: Not clear. Note to reviewers: Outcome should be formulated as a statement in the past tense, e.g. “Radiotherapy centre built and operational”; “Enhanced monitoring of radiation exposure in health care systems, according to IAEA standards”, etc.
LFA 5. Outputs Are the Outputs in the LFM clearly and adequately described? Are they realistic, measurable and adequate to lead to the achievement of the Outcome?	EFFECTIVENESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All concrete deliverables of the project, that result from the completion of activities within a project and that are necessary in order to achieve the Outcome. Outputs are realistic and achievable during project implementation and sufficient to achieve the change planned in the outcome. 	0: N/a 3: Yes. Clear and lead to the Outcome. 2: Fairly clear but consistency and logic of contribution to outcome needs further development or is unrealistic. 1: Not clear. Note to reviewers: Outputs should be formulated as statements in the past tense, e.g. “Equipment delivered”; “Staff trained”.

Quality Review Questions	Assessment criteria and sample indicators to guide reviewers for constructive feedback to the project teams.	Ratings: 3 (high); 2 (medium); 1 (low); 0 (no information)
LFA 6. Indicators and MoV Are the indicators and means of verification SMART for Outcome and Output levels? Do they include baselines, targets and timeframes?	EFFECTIVENESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SMART performance indicators, including baseline and target, at output and outcome levels, to facilitate monitoring of progress and of results achieved (during and after implementation). Indicators are gender-disaggregated where relevant. EFFICIENCY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular project monitoring and follow-up mechanism are planned and followed. COHERENCE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to the Results Matrix of the CPF, where relevant. 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear. Indicators for Outcome and Outputs are SMART and include baselines and targets.
		2: Fairly clear but not enough. Missing some of the SMART elements.
		1: Not clear. Missing most of the SMART elements.
LFA 7. Risks, assumptions and sustainability Are important external factors identified and are assumptions adequate? Have risks been identified, assessed and have mitigation measures been proposed? Does the project document clearly describe how the project Outputs and Outcome will be sustained and continue to contribute to addressing the problem?	EFFECTIVENESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper identification of risks and assumptions, at least at output and outcome levels, and risk mitigation strategies. Wide range of risks considered, including strategic, political, environmental, financial, operational, organizational, stakeholder and regulatory. E.g. changes in national policies or priorities, institutional restructuring, reallocation of resources and/or budget reduction. Could also include the shift of a significant component of the project budget into footnote-a/. SUSTAINABILITY <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration is given to how will the project outputs and outcome be sustained after the project ends. Measures to be taken to ensure long term sustainability of the results, e.g. self-reliance strategies and operational capability after project closure, ability of recipient institutions to cover maintenance costs of high-value equipment, strategies to promote retention of trained staff and appropriate dissemination of knowledge gained through TC trainings. 	0: N/a
		3: Yes. Clear. Explicit and well documented.
		2: Fairly clear but not explicit enough.
		1: Not clear. Generic descriptions. Factors not identified and assumptions not adequate and/or sustainability not addressed.
		Note to reviewers: Sustainability may be addressed in various sections of the document, including in the Implementation Strategy.