



Issued by the the VTF Selection Committee
28 May 2018

GUIDANCE FOR THE SELECTION PROCESS

The selection of project proposals for funding by the Voluntary Trust Fund (VTF) involves a two-step process: the ATT Secretariat shall conduct a pre-screening of all project proposals against “The General Principles for Implementation Assistance Projects under the ATT Voluntary Trust Fund” as decided by the Conference of States Parties to the ATT (as attached to the VTF ToR) and taking into account the Guidance for the Selection Process developed by the VTF Selection Committee; the VTF Selection Committee then assesses the merits of shortlisted applications.

The Guidance for the Selection Process has been elaborated by the VTF Selection Committee to assess the merits and quality of a project proposal, helping to ensure that projects are selected by it in an objective and consistent manner.

Annex A includes a table setting out considerations to be applied by the VTF Selection Committee to assess the following elements of a project proposal:

1. **Political commitment** – in the event the applicant is not a State Party to the ATT, has it ‘shown clear and unambiguous political commitment to accede to the ATT’ as required by the VTF Terms of Reference?
2. **Financial considerations** – has the applicant paid its financial contributions to the ATT in full (if applicable)?
3. **Strategic vision** – does the applicant have a clear vision or strategy to implement the ATT?
4. **Project design** – are the project deliverables consistent with the strategy?
5. **Project controls** – are the cost estimates, time estimates, and risk mitigation measures identified realistic and appropriate?

Annex B to this document includes some considerations for establishing a methodology for **prioritizing proposals** in the case of insufficient funds to cover all the proposed projects that have met the quality requirements.

VTF SELECTION COMMITTEE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Annex A. Guidance for the Selection Process¹

<p>1. POLITICAL COMMITMENT *only relevant if Applicant is <u>not</u> a State Party*</p>	<p>1. If the applicant is <u>not</u> a State Party has it provided an official letter or note verbale outlining the steps taken that show a ‘clear and unambiguous political commitment to accede to the ATT’? (Yes/No)</p> <p>2. Does the official letter or note verbale submitted by the applicant State outline the steps taken that show a ‘clear and unambiguous political commitment to accede to the ATT’?</p> <p>2.1 Has the State provided roadmap towards ratification or accession, such as the domestic process in written form?</p> <p>2.2 Has the State demonstrated how the project will help to meet envisaged milestones and ultimately lead to speeding up (or enabling) the process of ratification or accession?</p> <p>2.3 Is there a draft Bill before parliament concerning ATT ratification/accession?</p> <p>3. Are there other external factors or circumstances that demonstrate the applicant State’s commitment to the ATT?</p> <p>3.1.Has the applicant State participated in ATT meetings?</p> <p>3.2.Has the applicant consistently voted in favour of or recently changed its voting on ATT resolutions in the First Committee of the General Assembly or the United Nations General Assembly?</p> <p>3.3.Has the applicant State’s leadership made public statements of intent to join the ATT?</p>
<p>2. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS</p>	<p>4. Has the applicant State paid its financial contributions to the ATT in full (if applicable)?² (Yes/No)</p>
<p>3. STRATEGIC VISION</p>	<p>5. Does the applicant State have a strategy to implement the ATT? (Yes/No)</p> <p>5.1.Does this include a plan or roadmap to implement the Treaty?</p> <p>6. Does the project being proposed fit into the applicant State’s strategic vision for ATT implementation?</p> <p>6.1.Is the proposed project a ‘one-off’ project that does not appear to fit within a broader strategy?</p> <p>6.2.If the applicant has submitted multiple proposals, is it clear how they fit together and that there is no duplication of project</p>

¹ Through the application of the considerations outlined in Annex A, the VTF Selection Committee will agree on a relative ranking of the project proposals for the purposes of applying Annex B.

² This consideration is only applicable from the 2019 VTF cycle onwards.

	activities?
4. PROJECT DESIGN	7. Does the project description clearly identify a need/gap the project will address or is it designed to identify such need/gap? 7.1. Does the project constitute a concrete or substantial contribution to implementation of the treaty or is it limited to peripheral activities?
	8. Has the applicant State provided sufficient/concrete information on planned phases and activities? 8.1. Has the applicant State specified the activities to be carried out? 8.2. Has the applicant State described the activities in detail and divided broad activities into sub-tasks? 8.3. Has the applicant State indicated the sequencing and/or timing of planned activities? 8.4. Has the applicant State included a clear division and allocation of responsibilities?
	9. Is it likely that the project is going to succeed in achieving its objectives? 9.1. Has the applicant State included concrete information on <i>what</i> the project will achieve? 9.2. Are the outputs and deliverables appropriate and likely to achieve the project objectives? 9.3. Can the expected impact of the project be measured?
	10. Does the project have a clear monitoring mechanism to ensure it is on track in terms of objectives, timescales and costs?
5. PROJECT CONTROLS	11. Has the applicant State identified all or any key risks associated with the project?
	12. Has the applicant State identified appropriate and realistic measures to manage or mitigate the risks identified?
	13. Has the applicant State included cost estimates in the budget that are accurate, reasonable and sufficiently detailed? 13.1. Are the calculations in the Detailed Budget Form correct? 13.2. Has the applicant State fully costed-out the project? 13.3. Are the costs of each budget item reasonable and appropriate e.g. are per diems sought consistent with the UN Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) rates promulgated by the International Civil Service Commission (ICSC)? 13.4. Is there a risk the applicant has <i>under-</i> or <i>over-</i> budgeted any item?

	<p>14. Has the applicant State included reasonable time estimates for the project activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">14.1. Is the overall project duration reasonable in light of all the project activities and deliverables?14.2. Is the applicant State being too ambitious in terms of what it is seeking to achieve in the timeframe?14.3. Has the applicant provided sufficient time/days for consultants and trainers to prepare and deliver their work?14.4. If an applicant State has submitted multiple proposals, has the applicant State made it clear how it could carry out all the proposed projects?
--	--

VTF SELECTION COMMITTEE - INTERNAL USE ONLY

Annex B. Further Considerations in the case of insufficient funds to cover all the proposed projects that have met the quality requirements

1. STATUS OF APPLICANT	1. Is the applicant a State Party or a non-State Party (see paragraph 2 of the VTF Terms of Reference)?
2. MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS	2. A reasonable balance should be sought by the VTF Selection Committee in the case of multiple applications by a single State. 3. Has the applicant State received VTF funding for one or more projects in a previous VTF cycle or cycles? If so: 3.1. Did the applicant State satisfactorily complete the previous project(s)? 3.2. Does the current project proposal build on the previous project(s)?
3. CONTRIBUTIONS CONTAINING CONDITIONALITIES	4. Have all the conditions placed on the contributions been met?
4. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS	5. Priorities established by the Conference of States Parties, including geographic requirements, shall be taken into account in the allocation of funds to beneficiary States, as appropriate.