**B1 – Small-scale development project**

**Appropriation Note**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Basic Data** | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant | | | Insert name of applicant organisation | | | | | | |
| DPOD File no | | | Insert DPOD file no | | | | | | |
| Appropriation consultant | | | Insert name of appropriation consultant | | | | | | |
| Application title | | |  | | | | | | |
| Partner organisation(s) | | |  | | | | | | |
| Country | | |  | | Country classification | | | Low income  Lower middle income  Upper middle income | |
| Amount applied for | | |  | | Of which disability compensation | | |  | |
| Proposed project period | | | Insert proposed project start date | | | to | Insert proposed project end date | | |
| Project summary | | | Insert project summary prepared by applicant organisation (in Danish) | | | | | | |
| 1. **Decision -** Appropriation committee | | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriation committee decision |  | Approved | | | | | | | |
|  | Approved with recommendation(s) | | | | | | | |
|  | Approved with condition(s) | | | | | | | |
|  | Not approved | | | | | | | |
| Amount approved |  | | | Of which disability compensation | | | | |  |
| Appropriation committee assessment and decision, specify any conditions and recommendations |  | | | | | | | | |
| Date of decision | Insert date of committee’s decision | | | | | | | | |

1. **Assessment** - Appropriation Consultant

## **3.1. Summary Assessment & Recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Relevance**:  **Partnership**:  **Intervention**:  **Budget**: |

## **3.2. Fulfilment of Requirements**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | | The objective of the intervention is in alignment with the purpose of small-scale development projects | Fulfilled | Not fulfilled |
| 2. | | Partner organization’s capacity and annual turnover match project’s level of ambition | Fulfilled | Not fulfilled |
| Insert any comments to the above assessment of applicant’s fulfilment of requirements | | | |

## **3.3. Assessment of the application**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Appropriation Consultant’s assessment of compliance with the criteria:** | | | |
| **1. Relevance** | **Achieved** | **Partially achieved** | **Not achieved** |
|  |  |  |
| **Assessment** | | |
| ~~1.1. The project is in alignment with the guidelines for the Danish Disability Fund and relevant to Danida’s Civil Society Policy~~  ~~(If the proposal is an extension of a previous intervention, the assessment includes to what extent there is a progression in either the objectives, the strategic approach or the target group)~~ | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 1.1 is not assessed, as it is assumed that the intervention is still in alignment with the Danish Disability Fund. | | |
| 1.2. The project is relevant in view of the context, including the issues and opportunities that you envisage | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 1.2 is assessed. With point of departure in the ongoing intervention, the applicant is asked to describe developments in the context and what has been achieved so far, incl. what relevant experience and learning underpins this application? | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2. Partnership** | **Achieved** | **Partially achieved** | **Not achieved** |
|  |  |  |
| **Assessment** | | |
| ~~2.1. The Danish organization offers an added value in terms of its professional or organizational contribution to the project~~ | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 2.1 is not assessed, as it is assumed that the Danish organisation continues to offer added value. | | |
| 2.2. The partner organization has experience and capacity to implement the project | In case of a cost-extension proposal, which includes a focus on capacity building of the local partner, criterion 2.2 is assessed, in particular with focus on what relevant experience and learning the local partner has generated so far as part of the on-going intervention. | | |
| ~~2.3. The partner organization demonstrates an active participation, including by volunteers, in preparing and implementing the project~~ | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 2.3 is not assessed, as it is assumed that the local partner organisation continues to take part in the intervention. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3. Intervention** | **Achieved** | **Partially achieved** | **Not achieved** |
|  |  |  |
| **Assessment** | | |
| 3.1. Target groups are relevant and with a considered composition, i.e. age, gender, disability, social group or other identities | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 3.1 is only assessed, if there is a development in the composition of the target groups. | | |
| 3.2. The proposal demonstrates coherence between desired change, tangible outputs, and the project strategy | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 3.2 is assessed.  With point of departure in the ongoing intervention, the applicant is asked to describe how the cost-extension links to the original project. In case of new acitivities and outputs, coherence with the original project’s strategy and desired change is assessed – on the basis of an amended results framework. | | |
| 3.3. The proposal has a clear strategy for gathering and disseminating experience and results | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 3.3 is only assessed, if there is a development in the approach to gathering and dissiminating experience and results. | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4. Budget** | **Achieved** | **Partially achieved** | **Not achieved** |
|  |  |  |
| **Assessment** | | |
| 4.1. There is a good match between the size of the target group, expected results, voluntary labour input, and total spending, including on travel, salaries and other recurrent costs | In case of a cost-extension proposal, criterion 4.1 is assessed – on the basis of an amended budget (column reflecting the spending in the cost-extension period inserted in the original budget). | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Budget allocation**   ***Main budget items*** | Total budget | Total in % | Of which Disability Fund | Other funding |
| 1. **South Partner Activities - total** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| * 1. Objective 1 | 0 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Objective 2 | 0 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Objective 3 | 0 |  |  |  |
| * 1. Cross-cutting activities | 0 |  |  |  |
| 1. **South Partner Investments - total** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **South Partner Project staff employed by partner organisation** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **South Partner administration - total**   *(incl. % supported by project)* | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Evaluation** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Staff in partner country employed by Danish organisation** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Danish contribution to Project activities**   **& Danish monitoring** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Project support (Danish organisation)** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| **Total project expenses** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Budget margin** *(min. 6% and max. 10% of 8)* | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Information work in Denmark** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Disability compensation** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Contribution to auditing in Denmark** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Sub-total** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Administration in Denmark** *(max.7% of 13)* | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |
| 1. **Total amount** | **0** |  | **0** | **0** |