

## WPDC EXTRAORDINARY PROJECT PROPOSAL

### Project application evaluation criteria

#### Title of Proposed Project:

#### Preamble

- Guiding Document: Extraordinary Project Proposal Policy 10.2
- Section 1: Administrative Criteria is to be completed by the WPDC Coordinator. All 6 criteria must have a Yes evaluation to proceed to application ranking as described in Section 2. If any criterion receives a No evaluation then application may be rejected or returned for more information. Prior to an application being rejected completely, the Coordinator may request a second review by the Board or a sub-committee of the Board.
- Section 2: Application Ranking will be completed independently by each WPDC Extraordinary Project Committee member.
- Ranking of Criteria in Section 2 will be averaged from the committee members' score to determine final score.
- At Committee's discretion, WPDC Board of Directors may be asked to rank application
- Applicants must receive a final score of 65% in Section 2 to be considered for funding by the Council Board and referred to the FBCWA for consideration.
- WPDC Board of Directors will undertake a final consideration and vote on every qualifying proposal considered for funding.

### 1. ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA

No.	Criterion	Evaluation (Yes/ No)	Notes	Coordinator Comments (Specific to each evaluation point, may outline areas that need to be strengthened or do not meet WPDC priorities.)
A.	Proponent is a woodlot licensee, a Woodlot Association, WPDC Board of Directors, or FBCWA Board of Directors.			
B.	Project application is submitted on the Extraordinary Project Proposal Official Application Form, the form has been filled in completely and the required supporting documents are limited to 5 pages. (Resume are not considered supporting documents.)			
C.	Project application is signed by the contact person noted on the application form.			
D.	Total amount of WPDC funding requested in project application is greater than \$5,000.00.			
E.	Project information and budget provide sufficient detail to allow Board to determine merit and proceed to vote.			
F.	In the project application, the activities of the project are consistent with the purpose of the WPDC, defined funding priorities and policies.			

## 2. APPLICATION RANKING

No.	Criterion	Assigned Weight	Assessor's Points	Rationale and/or Assessor's Comments
<b>A</b>	<b>RELEVANCE</b> Consider applicability to WPDC purpose, vision and strategy and FBCWA priorities.	<b>35</b>		
1.	Project will benefit the membership and meets the primary purpose of the WPDC which is to benefit and promote the woodlot industry throughout BC.			
2.	Project meets provincial or regional priorities as defined by the FBCWA priorities and member's input from questionnaires.			
3.	Project fits within the WPDC defined ranking priorities. In the event of competing proposals, the Board will assign the highest priority to Provincial projects that benefit the most woodlot licensees, a medium priority for regional and a lower priority for association level projects.			
<b>B</b>	<b>BUDGET</b> Do funding levels appear to be appropriate and fair value?	<b>25</b>		
4.	Planned costs in the project are justified with the anticipated results and proportionate to the actual costs in the sector at the time of submission of the project application.			
5.	Proponent has identified other sources of funding.			
6.	Proponent has identified in-kind contributions.			
<b>C</b>	<b>EXPERIENCE OF PROPONENT</b> Consider applicant's strengths and weaknesses, focus for project	<b>25</b>		
7.	Proponent is competent to complete project as described.			
8.	Objectives and deliverables of the project are well defined.			
9.	In the project application, there is defined a model of cooperation between the project partner, supervisor and team members.			
<b>D</b>	<b>PROBABILITY OF SUCCESS</b>	<b>10</b>		

	Consider complexity of project, timelines and measurable deliverables			
10.	Define anticipated probability of success: High, Medium or Low and why?			
11.	Are timelines reasonable?			
<b>E</b>	<b>QUALITY OF PROPOSAL</b>	<b>5</b>		
12.	Project application quality is acceptable. The project description, the role of the team members, scope of project activities, and project results are clearly defined; the allocated budget is detailed and set according to the project activities and expected outcomes.			
	<b>Score</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>Minimum 65 points</b>

Evaluations will be completed independently by each committee member. In addition, Board members may be asked to rank applications. The final score will be averaged from all scores. Average score must meet 65% to be considered for funding.

<b>Evaluator</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Evaluator #1			
Evaluator #2			
Evaluator #3			
Evaluator #4			
Evaluator #5			
Evaluator #6			
Evaluator #7			
<b>Summary</b>	<b>Average</b>		