1. **Analytical capacity and learning**

*The applicant demonstrates capacity to carry out comprehensive context and stakeholder analysis and risk assessments, and to generate and utilize learning to inform programme strategies and operational approaches across partners/development interventions/contexts.*

1. **Delivering and documenting results**

The criteria presented below are used to assess whether applicants are eligible for applying for a programme in the Disability Fund.

The assessment will be based on the **Expression of Interest** (EoI) by the applicant, the external **capacity assessment** / **financial supervision**, the **Management Response** by the applicant to the capacity assessment, and the **track record** produced by DPOD and the applicant.

The assessment will make use of a set of sub-criteria which will be scored by applying rating scale ‘LEADS’, allocating scores from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 |

Based on an overall assessment, the applicants will be assessed as either **a) eligible for applying for a programme, b) partly eligible,** or **c) not eligible.**

The individual score (allocated at sub-criteria level) is indicative and will be used as part of the overall assessment. The score can also be used as a baseline for the applicant to determine areas for improvement. A percentage weight is attached to each sub-criterion, indicating its relative importance as part of that criterion. The weighted score of the overall criterion indicates its relative importance in relation to the other criteria.

*The Assessment Committee has the option of setting conditions as well as giving recommendations. The conditions are set in case of partly eligibility and refer to aspects of the Expression of Interest and/or the Management Response, which the applicant must improve within maximum two weeks. If the conditions are meet, the applicant will obtain full eligibility. The recommendations are forward looking and relate to areas that need to be enhanced and appear in the programme application.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **STRATEGIC RELEVANCE**  Assessment of the strategic relevance of the overall programme idea, the partnership approach and the suggested programme partners – in terms of working towards a shared goal of positive and sustainable impact for persons with disabilities. | |
| **Criterion 1: Relevance of the overall programme idea** *[weighted score: 15%]*  *The applicant must present a relevant strategic programme objective which contributes to a strengthening the disability movement, thus contributing to lasting positive changes in living conditions, participation, and inclusion of persons with disabilities.*    The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  1.1 Level of coherence between the overall programme objective and the purpose of the Disability Fund. *[weighted score: 50%]*  1.2 Extent to which the proposed programme idea is based on experiences, lessons learned, and results achieved in previous interventions. *If new programme countries or new strategic intervention areas or approaches are introduced, the choice of integrating these into the programme must be justified. If the programme includes fragile contexts, the applicant must demonstrate ability to operate in such context*. *[weighted score: 50%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Guidelines for the Disability Fund |
| **Criterion 2: Relevance of programme partners** *[weighted score: 15%]*  *The applicant must present partnerships that are relevant to the programme and contribute to the development of a strong, independent, vocal, and diverse disability movement in the Global South.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  2.1 Relevance of the proposed partner portfolio, including their mission and mandate, their overall expertise, expected contribution, and added value to the programme and the development of the disability movement in the Global South. *If the programme includes new partners, the choice of integrating these into the programme must be justified. [weighted score: 70%]*  2.2 Extent to which the proposed programme supports the building of synergies and learning among the partner organisations. *[weighted score: 30%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Management Response |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CAPACITY ASSESSMENT**  Assessment of the existing capacity and perceived capacity of the applicant organization to manage a coherent program including ability to provide analysis, learning and delivery of results. | |
| **Criterion 3: Relevance of partnership approach** *[weighted score: 15%]*  *The applicant must demonstrate a partnership approach that accommodates the strengthening of capacity, local ownership and local leadership of partner organisations.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  3.1 Track record of engaging in meaningful, mutually beneficial, and respectful cooperation with partners and working towards a shared goal of positive and sustainable impact for persons with disabilities and their organisations. *[weighted score: 60%]*  3.2 Relevance of approaches used to strengthen organisational capacity, ownership and local leadership for partners in the programme (including strengthening of decision-making power and fundraising to local partners). *[weighted score: 40%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Track Record Document * Management Response |
| **Criterion 4: Organizational and professional capacity of the applicant** *[weighted score: 10%]*  *The applicant must demonstrate presence of human resources and systems/procedures to enhance effectiveness and efficiency, and ability to apply these as part of a coherent programme.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  4.1 Qualified human resources, adequate professional competencies, and effective management guidelines and procedures for programme cycle management. *[weighted score: 75%]*  4.2 Efficient institutional support for and integration of international development cooperation in the applicant organisation. *[weighted score: 25%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Track Record Document * Management Response |
| **Criterion 5: Financial management, and management and prevention of irregularities** *[weighted score: 10%]*  *The applicant must demonstrate administrative capacity and systems/procedures to enhance financial management, and a plan for the implementation of anti-corruption and PSHEA policies at partner level.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  5.1 Existence and effectiveness of financial and administrative control systems and procedures required to manage DPOD grants. *[weighted score: 50%]*  5.2 Efficiency of systems and procedures to monitor financial and administrative management by partner organizations. *[weighted score: 30%]*  5.3 Implementation (current or planned) of anti-corruption and PSHEA policies at partner level, to prevent, disclose and actively follow up on irregularities. *[weighted score: 20%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Report from financial supervision * Track Record Document * Management Response |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion 6: Analytical capacity.** *[weighted score: 10%]*  *The applicant must demonstrate capacity to carry out comprehensive context, stakeholder and risk assessment analysis, and ability to adapt to changing contexts.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  6.1 Existence of and ability to apply guidelines for carrying out comprehensive context, stakeholder and target group analysis as a basis for programme design and planning. *[weighted score: 60%]*  6.2 Existence of and ability to apply guidelines for thorough risk management, covering both risk analysis and strategies for mitigation of contextual and programmatic risks. *[weighted score: 40%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Management Response |
| **Criterion 7: Ability to deliver and document results, and to generate and utilize learning.** *[weighted score: 20%]*  *The applicant must demonstrate capacity to operate results frameworks and deliver and document results at outcome level. Further the applicant must demonstrate ability to generate and utilize learning to inform programme strategies and approaches across partners and intervention contexts.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  7.1 Existence of effective results-based management systems and track record of delivering and documenting results at outcome level – together with partners in the Global South. *[weighted score: 60%]*  7.2 Existence of effective procedures and systems for generating evidence-based learning from implementation, reviews, evaluation etc. (including learning from failures/non-achievements), and track record of applying learning. *[weighted score: 40%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Track Record Document * Management Response |
| **Criterion 8: Engagement and communication in Denmark.** *[weighted score: 5%]*  *The applicant must describe how the programme engages with relevant groups and stakeholders in Denmark to strengthen the understanding of and interest in global development challenges, particularly for the disability movement.*  The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:  8.1 Track record of engaging internal stakeholders (members, board, etc.), and communicating to the Danish population about the international development collaboration and the global disability movement. *[weighted score: 100%]* | **Documentation:**   * EoI * Capacity Assessment Report * Track Record Document * Management Response |