## ANNEX 1: DESK APPRAISAL FORM

1. Pro	ject Name: RIVIRIOI EPA ORACE CONSIRUCTION					
2. Pro	ject Location:					
	Name of the area RIVIRIUI EPA					
	TA_NSAMALA					
	Ward RIVIRIVI					
	VDC_LUPANGA					
3. Elig	gibility Criteria					
i.	Is the project derived from DDP? Or VAP? Or DDPF? Yes [✓ No [ ]					
ii.	Is the project in line with DDF guidelines on investment menu?  Yes [ \int ] No [ ]					
iii.	Is the Project cost within the funding ceilings of the development budget of the council? Yes [ No [ ]					
iv.	Does the area/VDC have any history of project management? How many projects has VDC successfully implemented Yes [ ] No [ ] , Number [ ]					
v.	Are there uncompleted projects under the council in the proposed project site?  Yes [ ] No [ ]					
vi.	Is there adequate access to the site, and are transport facilities satisfactory?					
	Yes [ No [ ]					
vii.	Has land been secured for use by the project?					
	Yes [ No [ ] N/A [ ]					
	If Yes, How?					
	<ol> <li>Will use public land [ ]</li> <li>Voluntary Donation [ ]</li> <li>Purchase/compensation [ ]</li> </ol>					

project? TOTAL SO	call Assessment	Decision Guide  • If the answer to all the questions	Tick as	appropriate			
project? TOTAL So  6. Over	all Assessment			16/8			
project?	CORE (0 to 18)			160			
project?	CORE (0 to 19)						
			U	1 2			
		rience does the council have to manage such	0	5			
		t sustainability plan?	0	1 (2)			
one year		readily available in the district?	0	1 6			
(vi) Is the	e project size of the	project simple enough to be implemented in	0	1 (2)			
(v) Does	the project site per	mit easy access for all beneficiaries without  Assess location and land ownership issues if any)	0	1 (2)			
(iv) To w youth? (	0	2					
	to ensure sustainab	0	1 2				
	project drawn from	n DDP? Or VAPs? y/department provide any needed technical	0	1 (2)			
	·	with the national, sector and district priorities?	0	1 (2)			
(On a sc	ale of 0-2, where: "	0" means unsatisfactory and "2" very satisfactor	·				
B. PROJE	ECT APPRAISAL		(Tick ag	ainst the score)			
CRITERIA	raisal Criteria	SCORE					
iv.		endorsed proposed project in the proposed sit	e? yes[	√] No[]			
iii.	Distance to the nearest structure (KM)						
ii.	Sector of the Project. Agriculture  Number of beneficiaries [Male]. 31757 [Female]. 5,634						
i.	Sector of the Project. Agriculture						
4. Tech	mical:						
	Yes [ ] No [ 🗸	ſ					
	Will the project have irreversible and unmanageable negative effects on the environment?						

If the overall score for section 5 (Appraisal Criteria) is ≥12(above

prioritisation

	67%)	
Deferred	<ul> <li>If the answer to any of the questions in section 5 (Eligibility Criteria) is "NO".</li> <li>If the overall score for section 5(Appraisal Criteria) is less than 12 (less than 67%)</li> <li>If the project requires changes in certain areas.</li> </ul>	

## 7. Appraisal Team

Name	Designation	Signature	Date
1. DANIS ZINGENI	CAENRO	Dichagem	23/66/2021
2. PATEL CHIUMBUZO	014	The solf	28/106/12021
3. EDGAR CHIHANA	CPO	The state of the s	23/16/21
4. CHIFUNIED KATENGERA	Buff	V X	23/66/21
5. DAVIS KONDADO	M学EO		23/06/2
6 MACDONALD NYA		munic	23/06/2021
7.1920 CLOUS KAMED	<b>基果家甘油</b>	Str	28/06/2021
8. JOYCE CHINDENS	A-CA	T,	28/06/2021
9. IDAH MKWEZALA	HMBA-EDO	Snob	= 23/06/202
10. LUKRESHA MATEKE	ENYA - DW	0 selev	23 106 1202