Disability Fund Assessment criteria

Applications are assessed on basis of the five criteria of the Danish Disability Fund Guidelines.Sub-criteria are scored on a scale of 1 to 5 after the LEADS approach. LEADS is developed by the World Bank and is also used in a customized version by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **LEADS stands for:** | | **Score** | **The score is given, when there is** |
| L | Little action/evidence | 1 | Weak indication that supports the criteria |
| E | Some Evidence | 2 | Some indication that supports the criteria |
| A | Action taken | 3 | Indication that supports the criteria |
| D | Developed | 4 | Solid indication that supports the criteria |
| S | Sustainable | 5 | Comprehensive indication of implementation and/or indication of an established approach/system in supporting the criteria |

Sub-criteria scored for each application above 500,000 DKK are:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Relevance** |
| * 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) |
| * 1. The project is relevant in view of the context, including disability-specific issues, opportunities and political priorities. |
| * 1. The project is relevant in light of any previous results and experience from cooperation between the Danish organization and the partner organization. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Partnership** |
| * 1. The Danish organization has a track record of offering added value when managing previous and current projects financed by the Disability Fund, and the proposal is consistent with strategic priorities of the Danish organization. |
| * 1. The Danish organization has the capacity to provide professional and organizational inputs to the partner and to issues addressed by the project.   *In case of B3, the assessment also includes if the Danish organization has the required experience in the country of cooperation and with the partner and target group concerned.* |
| * 1. The partner organization possesses strategic priorities and capacity to implement a project on the scale envisaged. |
| * 1. The partner has been actively involved in preparing the project and the proposal offers an appropriate division of labour and responsibilities in relation to project implementation. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Intervention** |
| * 1. Composition and size of target groups reflects project objectives. This includes factors such as rights holders and duty bearers, distribution by age, gender, disability type, social group or other identities, as well as the level of their involvement and influence on project implementation |
| * 1. The strategy of the intervention is coherent, incl. the balance in the Development Triangle+ and the consistency between activities, outputs, indicators and objectives |
| * 1. The proposal contains an adequate assessment of risk factors that may hinder or delay realization of the project’s objectives.   *In case of B3, the assessment also includes the plan to manage any such risks.* |
| * 1. The proposal contains an effective approach to monitoring and evaluation, including documentation of experience and lessons learned, as well as dissemination of results |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Sustainability** |
| * 1. The partner organization has the required capacity – including its financial and human resources – to maintain or deepen the changes achieved upon project completion, and to embed project’s results and experience in its secretariat and among its volunteers   *In case of B3, it is also assessed if it* *is likely that the project leads to a continued strengthening of the partner organization and lasting improvements for persons with disabilities*  (If the intervention is an extension of a previous intervention, it is assessed to what extent the long-term sustainability is strengthened (e.g. relationships with other actors, advocacy etc.) |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Budget** |
| * 1. There is a good match between size of target group, the project’s short- and long-term results and total cost level in view of the context and relevant disability-specific factors |
| * 1. Spending on operational costs, travel and salaries in both the Global South and Denmark is appropriate |