

SDF Reference No. \_\_\_\_\_

**SDF Project Summary, Assessment and Recommendation**

**(A) Summary of the Proposal:**

Name of Applicant(s): \_\_\_\_\_

—

Name of Collaborating Group(s): \_\_\_\_\_

—

Name of Project: \_\_\_\_\_

Total Amount Requested from SDF: \_\_\_\_\_

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>● Key Objectives</li><li>● Main Activities</li><li>● Target Group(s)</li><li>● Duration</li><li>● <del>Proposed Outcome</del> <i><u>(It is proposed that this item be deleted as the relevant information will be provided under the above four items)</u></i></li></ul>
--

**(B) Assessment by SDF Secretariat**

**1. Disqualifying Factors (if any):**

- Ineligible applicant (e.g., Govt. dept. as sole applicant)
- Ineligible project (e.g., not meeting the scope and ambit of SDF, more appropriately funded by other funds, profit making in nature)
- Others:

## 2. Assessment Criteria:

Assessment Criteria (Weighting)	Indicators	Rating (0 – 10)	
		Item	Average
<b>I. Achievement of SDF Objectives</b>  (30%)	a. Shows clear understanding of SD principles		
	b. Would enhance public understanding of SD		
	c. Would encourages public to put the concept of SD into practice		
	d. Degree of integration of the three “pillars” of SD		
<b>II. Project Quality</b>  (20%)	a. A demonstrable need for the project		
	b. Extent of community benefit to be achieved, e.g., wider HK community or district, single organization, consortium of companies or a narrow sector		
	c. The potential to become a project model for wider dissemination		
	d. Well-planned schedule of project implementation		
<b>III. Effectiveness of Project</b>  (20%)	a. Clearly specified performance targets and indicators		
	b. Easily quantifiable performance targets and indicators		
	c. Long-term impact on the community		
	d. No duplication of work with other community projects		
<b>IV. Financial Viability</b>  (10%)	a. Prudence in budgeting		
	b. Financial capability of applicant		
<b>V. Applicant’s Track Record and Capability</b>  (10%)	a. Proven track record in operating projects.		
	b. Clear accountability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a registered organization?</li> <li>- has appropriate affiliation?</li> <li>- sponsored by a registered organization?</li> <li>- support with and connection with other community groups?</li> </ul>		

<b>VI. Additional Factors</b>  <b>(10%)</b>	<del>a. Projects should be non-profit making in nature</del> <del><i>*(It is proposed that this item be deleted as the non-profit making nature of the project is a prerequisite and not an assessment criterion).</i></del>		
	<del>b.a.</del> Extent of collaboration across sectors/groups.		
	<del>e.b.</del> Operational sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continuity beyond funding period</li> <li>- Transfer of skill and knowledge</li> <li>- Support from or engagement with other community groups</li> </ul>		
	<del>d.c.</del> Innovation		

<b>total weighted score</b>	<b>40.5</b>
-----------------------------	-------------

<b>Recommendation of SDF Secretariat:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Recommend to approve <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend to reject <input type="checkbox"/> Marginal - for further consideration by VC
---	--

**(C) Recommendation of VC:**

<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal supported. Suggested amount of grant: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal not supported <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal to be referred back for further clarification or consideration	Comments from VC
--	------------------

Signature of Chair (VC): \_\_\_\_\_

**(D) Recommendation of EPSC**

<input type="checkbox"/> Proposal supported by EPSC. Amount of grant recommended: _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Proposal not supported <input type="checkbox"/> Decision deferred on current proposal, for applicant to consider resubmission after modification	Comments from EPSC
---	--------------------

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

(Chair EPSC )