

ASOP Pacific Sport Development Grants - SELECTION CRITERIA

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|-------------|--|
| Country | | Date | |
| Project Title | | | |

| A. PROJECT DESIGN CRITERIA (quality of design/likelihood of success) | | | | KEY REF |
|---|---|--|--|----------------|
| 1. General | | | | |
| | a) Achieves one or more of the following benefits: | | | S 8 |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhances participation and/or performance • enhances local capacity (in the sport/physical activity field) • health promotion • enhances communities (cohesion, well-being, health, anti-social behaviour etc) • public diplomacy | | | S 9 |
| | b) Scale/magnitude of impact (level of the impact/number of people benefiting directly- indirectly) | | | S 11 |
| | c) Quality of the activity (will the activity deliver on the objectives in an effective, efficient and sustainable way) | | | S 12 |
| | d) Enhances gender equity or equality | | | |
| 2. Potential impact/sustainability | | | | |
| | a) Need/issue is clearly identified and some evidence of need provided | | | S 9 |
| | b) The need/issue is highly relevant/a key priority | | | |
| | c) Objectives are clear, measurable & realistic in timeframe of the grant | | | S 10 |
| | d) Objectives address the need/problem | | | S 10 |
| | e) Activity builds on existing activities/structures/networks | | | |
| 3. Beneficiaries | | | | |
| | a) Targeted beneficiaries are clearly identified | | | S 11 |
| | b) Appropriateness of target (relative to the identified need/issue) | | | S 11 |
| | c) Supports one/more of the primary target group/s | | | S 11 |
| | d) Target beneficiaries involved in project design | | | |
| B. MANAGEMENT CRITERIA | | | | |
| 1. Implementation | | | | |
| | a) Clear, logical, progressive action plan capable of delivering the objectives/outcomes | | | S 13 |
| | b) Appropriate expertise and resources are available and committed | | | |
| | c) Is locally driven and/or has strong links with local organisation(s)/programs | | | |
| | d) Demonstrates capacity/commitment to evaluate and report appropriately | | | S 13 |
| | e) Key risks identified and mitigation is appropriate and acceptable | | | S 15 |
| 2. Budget | | | | |
| | a) Is complete (no significant oversights), sufficient detail provided and realistic | | | S 16 |
| | b) Project is cost-effective relative to the outcomes/impacts and value of total request is reasonable/relevant to local economy | | | |
| | c) Absence of funding from other sources | | | |
| | d) Co-operative funding project | | | |
| | e) demonstrated capacity to manage funds (local referee sought as required, based on level of assessed risk) | | | |
| | f) Appropriate additional documentation (where relevant). | | | |
| C. PUBLIC DIPLOMACY CRITERIA | | | | |
| 1. Public diplomacy (PD) | | | | |
| | a) Quality PD opportunities are available and there is capacity to maximise them (DFAT) | | | |
| | b) Applicant country is a priority/listed as a 'primary target country' | | | |
| | c) DFAT support/relevance to country/regional development priorities | | | |
| | d) Demonstrated ease of contacting, supporting and monitoring of project by ASC/DFAT | | | |
| TOTAL SCORE | | | | |

Scoring Criteria for Applications

Review the grant application and for each criteria, assign a ranking using the table below as a guide:

| Score | Description | Justification |
|-------|--------------------------------|---|
| 5 | Outstanding. Close to an ideal | A score of 5 will be awarded sparingly and is meant to recognise those elements of a project which can be considered excellent. |
| 4 | Very good | Justified where there is strong evidence of quality. The element may not demonstrate the detail, justification or insight to warrant scoring a 5. |
| 3 | Good | A score that is quite common. The application responds appropriately to the criteria, but doesn't show exceptional quality or insight. |
| 2 | Weak | Applies where some support is provided but it is usually very broad or general, or the element is flawed or inappropriate. There is insufficient evidence to warrant a higher mark. |
| 1 | Poor/absent | Element is absent, very weak or concerning. Any elements earning a 1 should raise alarm and generally indicate an area of high risk. |