

ASOP Pacific Sport Development Grants - SELECTION CRITERIA

Country		Organisation	
Project Title		Date	

A. PROJECT DESIGN CRITERIA (quality of design/likelihood of success)			KEY REF
1. General			
	a) Is the application well thought out and has any degree of innovation		
	b) Achieves one or more of the following benefits: <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 8 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 achieve the objectives in an effective, efficient and sustainable way)		S 12
	d) Enhances gender equity or equality		S 9
2. Potential impact/sustainability			
	a) Need/issue is clearly identified and some evidence of need provided		S 10
	b) The need/issue is highly relevant/a key priority		S 10
	c) Objectives are clear, measurable & realistic in timeframe of the grant		
	d) Objectives address the need/problem		
	e) Activity builds on existing activities/structures/networks		S 11
3. Beneficiaries			S 11
	a) Targeted beneficiaries are clearly identified		S 11
	c) Appropriateness of target (relative to the identified need/issue)		
	d) Supports one/more of the primary target group/s		
	d) Target beneficiaries involved in project design		
B. MANAGEMENT CRITERIA			S 13
1. Implementation			
	a) Clear, logical, progressive action plan capable of delivering the objectives/outcomes		
	b) Appropriate expertise and resources are available and committed		S 13
	c) Is locally driven and/or has strong links with local organisation(s)/programs		S 15
	d) Demonstrates capacity/commitment to evaluate and report appropriately		
	e) Key risks identified and mitigation is appropriate and acceptable		S 16
2. Budget			
	a) Is complete (no significant oversights), sufficient detail provided and realistic		
	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.