NTT Proposal Assessment Scoring Sheet

Criteria	Description (Shift-the-Power Lens)	Score Range	Weight %
1. Vulnerability & Relevance to Communities	Prioritizes marginalized, excluded, and vulnerable groups; proposal reflects lived realities and community-defined needs.	1–5	25%
2. Geographical Reach & Equity of Access	Extent to which the organisation works in underserved/remote regions beyond Colombo; commitment to equity of access.	1–5	15%
3. Concept & Vision for Change	Grounded, context-driven, and community-informed ideas with potential for systemic change, not just project outputs.	1–5	15%
4. Organisation's Access to Funding & Equity in Resourcing	Identifies organisations that face barriers to funding; funding would redress structural imbalances and enable sustainability.	1–5	20%
5. Organisational Capacity & Potential to Grow	Looks at willingness to learn, accountability, inclusivity, and adaptability rather than rigid systems; capacity gaps seen as growth opportunities.	1–5	10%
6. Alignment with NTT's Values & Shift-the-Power Principles	Commitment to equity, inclusion, human rights, non-violence, and participatory approaches; solidarity beyond self-interest.	1–5	15%

Scoring Guide

- **5 – Transformative:** Strongly demonstrates the principle in practice; rooted in community realities; high alignment with NTT's ethos.
- **3 – Moderate:** Shows potential and some evidence but could be strengthened with support.
- **1 – Low:** Limited evidence of alignment; proposal appears externally driven or disconnected from NTT's approach.

Total Score Calculation

- **Weighted score** = (Score × Weight) across all six criteria.
- **Maximum possible score:** 5
- **For risk calculation** = maximum score is multiplied by 20 to arrive at the risk score range.

Interpretation of Scores

- **80–100: Strong alignment** – highly recommended for support.
- **60–79: Moderate alignment** – consider support with capacity-strengthening or dialogue.

- **Below 60: Limited alignment** – may not fit NTT's ethos at this time

NTT Finance Risk Assessment Scoring Sheet

Criteria	Description	Score Range	Weight % (equal weight given to all criteria)
1. Bank Account Management	Secure, accurate, and compliant management of bank accounts; regular reconciliations, complete documentation, and strong internal controls that safeguard funds and ensure transparency.	1–6	20%
2. Payment Processing & Record Keeping	Ensures payments are timely, accurate, well-documented, and traceable; processes comply with policies and regulations; controls prevent errors, fraud, and mismanagement.	1–6	20%
3. Financial Reporting & Monitoring	Accuracy, clarity, and timeliness of financial reports; consistency in monitoring; compliance with regulatory requirements; use of financial information for decisions and performance improvement.	1–6	20%
4. Procurement	Transparency, fairness, and efficiency of procurement; competitive processes, value for money, ethical standards, and complete documentation throughout procurement and contract management.	1–6	20%
5. Organisational Governance & Operational	Clarity of roles and responsibilities; transparency and inclusivity in decision making; accountable leadership; effective, ethical, and updated operational processes aligned with organisational goals; staff capacity and qualifications.	1–6	20%

Scoring Guide (1–6 Scale)

Because risk scoring uses a 1–6 range, the guide is calibrated to reflect proportionality, enabling support for smaller or less-resourced organisations while identifying areas needing strengthening.

- **5-6 – Strong/Low Risk**

Demonstrates solid, reliable practices. Systems are functioning, transparent, and well-documented. The organisation shows accountability and responsibility in financial and operational management.

- **3-4 – Moderate/Manageable Risk**

Systems exist but may need strengthening. Some inconsistencies or gaps are present, but they are not structural failures. Risks can be mitigated with support, monitoring or capacity building.

- **1-2 – Weak/High Risk**

Limited evidence of systems or controls. Practices are inconsistent, undocumented or unclear. Significant support would be required to ensure accountability and reduce risk.

Total Score Calculation: Finance Risk

- **Maximum possible score:** 30.
- **For risk calculation** = maximum score is divided by 30 and multiplied by 100 to arrive at the risk score range.

Interpretation of Total Scores

- **80–100: Low Overall Risk** – Suitable for Funding

Strong systems and transparent processes. The organisation demonstrates accountability. Only routine monitoring is required.

- **60–79: Moderate Overall Risk** – Fund with Safeguards/Capacity Strengthening

Risks are manageable and can be reduced through tailored support, coaching or closer monitoring. Suitable for organisations with potential to grow.

- **Below 60: High Overall Risk** – Not Recommended for Funding at this Time

Significant gaps in financial management, governance or processes. High likelihood of accountability issues without substantial foundational support