

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">● Key Objectives● Main Activities● Target Group(s)● Duration |
|---|

(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 |
| I. Achievement of SDF Objectives (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 | | |
| II. Project Quality (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 | | |
| III. Effectiveness of Project (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 | | |
| IV. Financial Viability (10%) | a. Prudence in budgeting | | |
| | b. Financial capability of applicant | | |
| V. Applicant’s Track Record and Capability (10%) | a. Proven track record in operating projects. | | |
| | b. Clear accountability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a registered organization? - has appropriate affiliation? - sponsored by a registered organization? - support with and connection with other community groups? | | |
| VI. Additional Factors | a. Extent of collaboration across sectors/groups. | | |

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|----------|
| (10%) | b. Operational sustainability: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuity beyond funding period - Transfer of skill and knowledge - Support from or engagement with other community groups | | |
| | c. Innovation | | |
| total weighted score | | | 0 |

| | |
|---|--|
| Recommendation of SDF Secretariat: | <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)