

The criteria presented below are used to assess the quality of programme applications submitted for funding by the Danish Disability Fund.

The assessment will be based on the Programme Application consisting of a **Programme Document** and **Programme Budget**.

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 Programme Applications will be assessed as either **a) recommended for approval, b) recommended for approval with conditions/recommendations, or c) rejection.**

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 and recommendations. Conditions refer to specific (and limited) aspects of the programme application which the applicant must remedy before the programme is granted, while recommendations are forward looking and relate to issues that must be incorporated as part of the implementation of the programme.

| STRATEGIC RELEVANCE | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Assessment of the relevance of the overall strategic programme approach relative to the purpose of the Danish Disability Fund and pro-poor, human-rights based development.</u></p> | |
| <p>Criterion 1: Relevance of the programme context. <i>[weighted score: 10%]</i> <i>The applicant must present an analysis of relevant external factors and actors in the overall context that are considered important for the programme design and strategy.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>1.1 Relevance of the presented analysis of disability specific issues and challenges in the programme’s context, including local priorities and opportunities of relevance to the programme. <i>[weighted score: 40%]</i></p> <p>1.2 Relevance of the presented analysis of key actors and stakeholders in the context that the programme needs to consider, influence and/or cooperate with. <i>[weighted score: 40%]</i></p> <p>1.3 Relevance of presentation of external risks that could delay or prevent programme implementation – as well as planned mitigation measures. <i>[weighted score: 20%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Programme Document</p> |
| <p>Criterion 2: Relevance of target groups and their involvement. <i>[weighted score: 10%]</i> <i>The applicant must present a clear description of target groups, including their relevance for the programme and how they will be selected to contribute to the fulfilment of equal rights to participation and access to resources by poor, marginalized, and vulnerable population groups (cf. the SDG principle of leaving no-one behind).</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>2.1 Relevance of the proposed target groups in terms of size, inclusion and representation and participation (considering gender, age, level of disability, socio-economic status and other factors that can lead to marginalization). <i>[weighted score: 100%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Programme Document</p> |
| <p>Criterion 3: Relevance of programme partners. <i>[weighted score: 10%]</i> <i>The applicant must present an updated list of programme partner organisations (building on the presentation in the EOI-application) and demonstrate their relevance to the programme, key expected contributions.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>3.1 Relevance of programme partners and their capacity in relation to the programme objectives, and the extent to which the programme supports the building of synergies, collaboration and learning among partner organisations. If relevant: the degree to which the inclusion of new partners is credible and justified. <i>[weighted score: 100%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Programme Document</p> |

| PROGRAMME DOCUMENT AND BUDGET | |
|---|---|
| <p><u>Assessment of the programme logic and how the programme will be implemented (i.e. the intervention areas, and the methods and approaches applied) as well as the proportionality between expected outcomes, the proposed target group(s), and the programme costs.</u></p> | |
| <p>Criterion 4: Strategic Focus and Programme Logic. <i>[weighted score: 25%]</i> <i>The applicant must present a comprehensive and focused programme strategy with clear outcomes building on previous results and learnings, and on the context analysis. The strategy shall include a description of approaches to promote local leadership and advocacy.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>4.1 Programme intervention logic: The extent to which the strategy presents a clear and logical link from previous results, lessons learned and links these to the programme intervention areas and expected outcomes. If relevant: the degree to which interventions in new countries or within new thematic areas (where the applicant has not been present previously) are credible and justified. <i>[weighted score: 40%]</i></p> <p>4.2 Change triangle: Whether the strategy has a coherent and relevant balance between organizational development, engagement and empowerment of rights holders, strategic service delivery and advocacy. <i>[weighted score: 15%]</i></p> <p>4.3 Local leadership: Whether organizational development of partners is based on a recent capacity assessment and addresses identified capacity gaps, and whether the approach to programme development and management allows partners to effectively exercise local leadership and contribute to creating lasting positive changes in living conditions, participation and inclusion of persons with disabilities. <i>[weighted score: 15%]</i></p> <p>4.4 Advocacy: Whether the approach to advocacy empowers partners and target groups to hold duty-bearers to account (based on documented evidence), and taps into relevant national, regional and/or global policy processes. The likeliness that the planned advocacy work will generate results. <i>[weighted score: 15%]</i></p> <p>4.5 Synergy: The extent to which the programme strategy facilitates mutual contributions, collaboration, and learning between partners and across countries (including the extent to which the applicant organization adds value in the form of contributions by members, volunteers and leadership). <i>[weighted score: 15%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Programme Document</p> |
| <p>Criterion 5: Results-based management and learning. <i>[weighted score: 20%]</i> <i>The applicant must present a coherent results framework, and an appropriate approach to and system for managing and documenting results and stimulating learning at programme level.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>5.1 Coherence between the programme objective (impact), outcomes, and indicators, including relevance of outcome formulations, indicators and targets. Clear outline of assumptions in the programme logic. <i>[weighted score: 30%]</i></p> <p>5.2 Suitability of the proposed results-based management system for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of change at outcome level,</p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Programme Document</p> <p>Summary results framework</p> <p>List of assumptions</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>including the plan for preparing and managing sub-results frameworks at partner level. <i>[weighted score: 30%]</i></p> <p>5.3 Approach to creating and sharing knowledge, data and analyses and promoting mutual learning and innovation among partners, as well as with other CSOs and relevant stakeholders. <i>[weighted score: 20%]</i></p> <p>5.4 Clarity and strength of the programme management set-up; expected contributions and sharing of roles and responsibilities between all partners, including for financial management. <i>[weighted score: 20%]</i></p> | |
| <p>Criterion 6: Sustainability and exit. <i>[weighted score: 10%]</i> <i>The applicant must demonstrate how the program will be able to deliver sustainable results for the target groups and partners, without leaving the target groups or partners in an inappropriate relationship of dependency.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>6.1 Relevance of the approach to creating sustainability, including measures for financial and organisational viability of programme results and partner organizations. If relevant, appropriateness of exit-strategies for partners and/or intervention areas which are planned to be handed over/phased out during programme phase. <i>[weighted score: 100%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Programme Document</p> |
| <p>Criterion 7: Financial resources and cost level. <i>[weighted score: 10%]</i> <i>The applicant must present a transparent and proportionate programme budget, clearly identifying and separating costs at country level and costs relating to the Danish applicant.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>7.1 Budget coherence: extent to which the relationship between expected outcomes, proposed target group(s), and programme costs, including Danish costs (administration, travel, salaries in Denmark and in partner countries), are proportionate and justified. If relevant, own contribution: applicability of plans and approaches to expanding access to financial resources, by increasing own and co-funding for the applicant organization as well as partner organizations. <i>[weighted score: 100%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation</p> <p>Budget</p> <p>Plan for additional funding</p> |
| <p>Criterion 8: Engagement and communication in Denmark. <i>[weighted score: 5%]</i> <i>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.</i></p> <p>The assessment is based on the following sub-criteria:</p> <p>8.1 Relevance of plans and methods to: a) engage new members, volunteers and/or supporters (if possible and relevant other disability organisations) in programme related activities in Denmark and b) communicate to the Danish population about the international development collaboration and the global disability movement. <i>[weighted score: 100%]</i></p> | <p>Documentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity Assessment Report • Track Record Document • Management Response • Programme Document |