

VOLUNTARY CONSERVATION FUND - EVALUATION CRITERIA

	Criteria	Weighting	Score
1	Do the expected outcomes of the project address the identified priority areas in the Conservation Committee's strategic plan?	0 – Not addressed 1 – Poorly addressed 2 – Reasonably addressed 3 – Well addressed 4 – Very well addressed 5 – Excellently addressed	
2	Does the methodology outlined effectively and efficiently address the objectives outlined in the proposal?	0 - Not demonstrated 1 - Poor methodology 2 - Reasonable methodology 3 - Good methodology 4 - Very good methodology 5 - Excellent methodology	
3	Does the project involve good participation and engagement of regional participants?	0 - Not demonstrated 1 - Poor engagement proposed 2 - Reasonable engagement proposed 3 - Good engagement proposed 4 - Very good engagement proposed 5 - Excellent engagement proposed	
4	Is the proposed project feasible, well organised and timeline achievable?	0 - Not demonstrated 1 - Feasibility, organisation and timeline unrealistic 2 - Feasibility, organisation and timeline not properly addressed 3 - Feasibility, organisation and timeline sound 4 - Feasibility, organisation and timeline demonstrated well 5 - Feasibility, organisation and timeline very well demonstrated	
5	Have the project leads demonstrated that they are capable of carrying out the proposed work and disseminating the outcomes accordingly?	0 - Not demonstrated 1 - Poor record 2 - Reasonable record 3 - Good record 4 - Very good record 5 - Project leads have an excellent record relevant to the proposed work	
6	Does the project demonstrate good value for money?	0 – Not demonstrated 1 – Poor value for money 2 – Reasonable value for money 3 – Good value for money 4 – Very good value for money 5 – Excellent value for money	

