UDENRIGSMINISTERIET

Spørgsmål og svar til Q&A møde 26. februar 2021 kl. 10-12 vedr. prækvalifikation til SPA 2022-2025

Der er modtaget spørgsmål fra 16 organisationer. I nedenstående matrix er alle spørgsmål indsat som modtaget (og på det sprog, de er skrevet), dog opdelt efter tema/område og anonymiseret. Alle svar er angivet på engelsk.

Tematik/område	Spørgsmål	Svar
Information note		
Update of Information Note	Will the Information Note as it stands also be applicable to the full application or will the current version be updated?	The Information Note for the full application will be updated
Financial reporting	Will there be a meeting around the separate financial reporting for humanitarian and longer-term development /CS strengthening activities?	There will be a separate meeting on reporting (incl. systems for humanitarian and civil society reporting) for interested partners.
Rio Climate Markers	Can the MFA please refer to background materials, which the applicants can utilise to get more information about the expectations from the MFA in relation to reporting on the Rio Climate Markers before guidelines and other documents linked to the full SPA application round are ready?	These background materials are not available yet. As part of preparation for the full application, interested partners will be invited for a workshop on climate reporting.
PRI	The information note seems to consider "programme related information activities *in* Denmark" and "engaging a wider segment of the Danish public around thematic priorities for the organisation and MFA" as identical. Several organisations got additional funding for engagement of wider segments of the public around development issues last year, and the MFA seemed to recognize that it is not identical with the programme related information work. Would the MFA consider specifying the activities that are supposed to be covered by the 2 percent in the information note on the application for strategic partnership agreements or the administrative guidelines?	This will be clarified in the material for the full application.

Multi-stakeholder approach	It is stated that "Strategic partners are encouraged to work with a multi-stakeholder approach covering a wide range of actors". What is the significance of this related to the scoring and eligibility?	Working with a multi stakeholder approach is generally encouraged in the Information Note. In the capacity assessment, it is required to describe the partnership approach for each organization. The assessment asks for a demonstration of a satisfactory approach to working with local partner organisations in the Global South.
Assessment of partnership approach	The Information Note states that '*Strategic partners are encouraged to work with a multi-stakeholder approach covering a wide range of actors. Emphasis will be put on non-state actors with civil society as a corner stone.*' The Assessment Criteria states that assessment will cover 'Approach to and relevant track record of working with partner organisations at various levels, authorities and other drivers of change, including non-formalized actors, such as community-based networks, local committees, social movements, women and youth groups' Can Danida confirm whether it is relevant to highlight partnerships with civil-society actors within Denmark in the EoI application (eg: partnerships between Danish NGOs, partnerships with the private sector in Denmark)?	This is not relevant at the EoI application stage as the assessment focuses on partners in countries of implementation.
Cost effectiveness	This section focuses on "cost effective sustainable results". Will the MFA provide a definition of what is meant by cost efficiency in their terminology?	Cost effectiveness is a comparative analysis of the relative costs of different approaches with similar results.
Humanitarian principles	Proposing that the following sentence: "*Interventions in areas affected by armed conflict must be guided by the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence*" Be changed to: "*All interventions with a humanitarian component, whether in armed conflict, natural disaster, and/or other crisis, must be guided by the principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence.*"	This proposal will be implemented in the material for full application.
IATI	How is the further promotion of transparency through the use of the IATI standard envisioned - and what role will reporting play in the use of the IATI standard?	This is currently being developed and will be clarified in the administrative guidelines for the SPA 2022-2025.
Learning	We have tried to access the relevant evaluations without success, and would therefore like to ask; which are the key learning points prioritized for this call? Can MFA kindly provide links to relevant lessons learned, evaluations etc.?	Learning centers overall on SPA-2018-2021 reporting from strategic partners, reviews and consultations as well as strategic dialogue between the MFA and

		partners. Learning from the previous period has not been summarized into specific corporate level evaluations. A review of the use of innovation funds has been carried out and can be obtained upon request to the MFA.
Method for assessment	The capacity assessment at the EoI stage will determine if applicants have the necessary capacity. The score will be used again and weighted in the full application round. What does this mean in practice and how does it affect the final score of the full application?	The method for scoring and assessing the full application will be developed and clarified in the full application material.
DDD	"MFA strategy on Doing Development differently and adaptive management" (Information note, p. 2 bottom). We assume it refers to the Guidance Note for Adaptive Management. Are there other relevant documents or strategies we should know of?	Guidance Note for Adaptive Management is the key background document to the adaptive approach. There is not a similar document on Doing development Differently.
Definition of Global South	The term "global South" is repeatedly mentioned in the information note. Does Danida work with a specific definition of the term?	Global South in the Information Note refers to the DAC List of ODA Recipients (DAC-List-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2021-flows.pdf (oecd.org)
Funds raised in DK	Re 5% of the entire partnership budget should be raised in Denmark – is it correctly understood that this is measured on the basis of the entire grant period? (Information note p. 3).	This will be clarified further in the administrative guidelines for the SPA 2022-2025.
Annex 1 – Application form		
Part B		
Membership	Is a reference to the relevant section of §8A sufficient documentation to demonstrate excess of 300 members?	Yes
	How is "Individual regular sponsors (number of individuals)" defined?	An individual regular sponsor is a person or a company that contributes financially to the applicant at least annually.
Programme management and country presence	Der efterspørges vedlagt dokumentation (programdokumenter, årsrapporter eller lignende) for de to lande, som illustrerer organisationens erfaring med at håndtere programmer på minimum 1 mio. kr. Kan årsrapporter være fra et enkelt år fx den seneste årsrapportering?	Yes, i.e. for year 2018 and 2019. Documents must demonstrate engagement in the relevant two countries with minimum DKK 1 million per year per country.

	Kindly clarify whether a whole country programme (all programmes and projects in the two selected countries) should be presented or one programme in each of the two selected countries with a minimum annual budget of 1 million DKK?	Country/regional programmes or specific programmes/projects are acceptable - as long as there is evidence of minimum DKK 1 million annual budget in each country for at least two preceding years.
	When the Annex B mentions: "managing humanitarian and/or development programmes totalling a budget of minimum 1 million DKK in at least two low-income countries in Africa" – what is meant by "programme"? Could it be one regional programme with a budget of more than one million in each of two low-income countries in Africa? What would be the max. time span of a programme?	Same answer as above. The programme(s) can have been running for more than two years.
	The applicant declares having a minimum of experience managing programmes totalling a budget of minimum 1 million DKK in at least two low income countries in Africa and/or prioritised crises (see Annex D for the updated list). The presence must be current and have been on-going for at least the two preceding years. Spørgsmål: 1. Skal 'presence' forstås som generelt samarbejde med lokal partner (finansieret fra forskellige midler) eller det specifikke projekt/program vi henviser til som eksempel? 2. Skal 'current' forstås som en ikke-afsluttet indsats/projekt? Dvs. når vi henviser til 2018-19, så er det understået at det fortsætter i 2020 og 2021?	'Presence' can be both. The MFA will look at the full engagement in the relevant countries. Yes, 'current' means ongoing engagement with a minimum of two preceding years.
	Må ansøgeren skrive flere end to lande? Herudover, kan UM forklare hvor snæver forståelse er lagt til grund for low income countries? Kan low income countries også omfatte middel low income countries?	It is not permitted to describe more than two countries in the eligibility section. 'Low income countries' refers to the ODA list of DAC countries and covers both least developed and lower middle income countries.
	When applying as a consortium, are we only allowed to submit two countries, or can each member of the consortium submit an example of a programme? If only two country programmes are allowed, should all members of the consortium be part of at least one programme or is it sufficient that at least one member of the consortium demonstrates the capacity?	The criteria should be covered by the consortia as a whole. There should only be given two examples from two countries. These can be from one or two partners.
Audit reports	Could the Ministry please clarify the difference between Audit Reports and Audited Accounts cf. Application form part B - section on capacity?	There is no difference.
CHS	Er der defineret, hvor langt en organisation skal være i sin CHS-proces for at blive erklæret egnet ifm. SPA prækvalifikation?	No. The process is expected to have been initiated.

	The CHS certification requirements are very comprehensive and includes many of the documentation requirements outlined in this EoI. Could you kindly share the reason behind the extensive need for documentation through Part C (ref. policies, assessments, evaluations etc.) at this pre-application stage?	To ensure equal terms for all, applicants should submit the same amount of documentation.
	It is clear from the Information Note that Danida wishes to support work across the hum-dev-peace nexus and supports a twin track approach. However, there are mixed messages between the documents released regarding the requirement for CHS, specifically for partners engaging in and undertaking non-humantiarian work in fragile contexts. From the responses to the hearing on prequalification materials it is stated: ' *I materialet tydeliggøres at krav om CHS verificering eller certificering gælder for organisationer med humanitære indsatser og/eller som arbejder i skrøbelige kontekster*'; and in the Information Note it states that ' *Applicants intending to carry out humanitarian interventions or engagements in areas affected by armed conflict, must be Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) certified or verified.* ' Can Danida confirm that CHS certification/verification is not a requirement for partners who are undertaking non-humanitarian work in fragile or conflict-affected contexts?	Humanitarian interventions or any other engagements in areas affected by armed conflict/fragile contexts require (action towards) CHS certification or verification. As stated in the Information Note: For partners in the process of being CHS certified/verified, an individual agreement will be made between the MFA and the partner on the scope of their engagements until the finalization of the certification/verification.
	Can you confirm that this is only a requirement for 'humanitarian interventions'?	No. Same answer as above.
SHEA and Code of Conduct	Just for clarification - which elements does the MFA see included in a Code of Conduct Policy other than SHEA, Anticorruption and Whistle blower mechanism?	There is no definition on this from the MFA. Organisations are expected to have relevant Code of Conduct policies in place (may have a different name).
	What is meant by a Code of conduct? What are minimum requirements for a Code of Conduct? Should the code of conduct be for development cooperation in DAC countries specifically also if the organization is mainly working with other activities?	Code of Conduct refers to a written policy on organisational and staff conduct. It is not a requirement that the Code of Conduct is put in place specifically for development cooperation, but it must cover MFA funded the part of the organisations' work.
	A number of documents, policies, strategies, procedures, methodologies etc. (e.g. SHEA, whistleblower, context analysis, stakeholder analysis) are requested with the EoI or will be used for assessment and scoring. Do you require separate documents titled as mentioned, or are you more concerned with the content being covered?	As long as the content is covered and clear references made, that is acceptable. Organisations are expected to clarify which areas are covered in which documents, e.g. through clear references.

	Meaning that several issues/approaches may in some cases be covered by one document and/or description of practices.	Documents may cover several areas and have various titles.
Complaints handling	Do the complaints handling and whistleblower mechanisms need to be general ones and for the complete organisation - or can they be part of the policies (anti-SEAH and other) mentioned in the application format, and specifically adopted for the development cooperation part of the organisations' activities?	Complaints handling and whistle blower mechanisms should be available to all employers, partners and communities related to the organisation.
Value for money	Could you please provide a definition of value for money?	Value for Money is normally assessed through against a criteria looking at economy, efficiency and effectiveness. The term is used to ensure a focus on learning with an emphasis on getting the greatest possible impact with the funds available. It is also a way of documenting that an activity or project has given results for the budget available.
Part C		
Capacity for analysis, learning and innovation	**Attachment of policies, guidelines, strategies:** The assessment criteria for the section on Capacity for Analysis, Learning & Innovation involves assessment of 'Policies, guidelines and methodologies in place' and similarly assessment of Delivering and Documenting results states that part of the assessment will be 'Policies/strategies in place for a rights-based approach. It is not clear whether organisations should provide relevant policies/strategies as attachments or not. Can Danida confirm whether these policies/strategies mentioned as assessment criteria should be attached to the application?	Organisations should only attach the documents in the capacity assessment that are referred to under documentation in Part C. In the application form organisations are expected to describe the relevant 'policies, guidelines, strategies' (as referred to in Annex B). E.g.: Policies and strategies for rights based approach should be described (and possibly referred to) but not attached.
Delivery and documenting results	Under 'Dokumentation' står der "*Attach an example of an existing results framework as well as recent reviews and evaluation reports documenting evidence of outcome level changes that the organisation has contributed to in a cost-effective manner during recent years.*" Er det rigtigt forstået, at dette materiale skal fremgå af en liste, som UM senere kan få tilsendt hvis ønsket, og IKKE vedlægges Expression of Interest? Og kan UM give en melding om hvor mange reviews og rapporter, der betragtes som fyldestgørende?	Both are allowed. It is possible to include links instead of attachments, but organisations are strongly encouraged to ONLY submit recent and relevant documents. There is no specific number of attachments if not specified.
	The criteria seem to focus very much on compliance and having policies and strategies in place and focus less on demonstrated (or demonstrating) results.	Focus is on the organisations' capacity for documenting results
Organisation and human resources	Application Form states to '*Describe the organisation's/consortium's systems for quality assurance, accountability and transparency.*' Does this requirement relate to quality	The scope should as a minimum cover the part of the organisation responsible for

	assurance, accountability and transparency in the organisation's international programs, or to the organisation more broadly, as a whole? Can Danida clarify the scope to be covered in presenting systems for quality assurance, accountability and transparency?	international activities, but may also cover the entire organisation.
	How do we strike the balance between Part B and Part C regarding "compliance, quality assurance, accountability and transparency". In Part B we are asked to document that we have a SHEA policy, a Code of Conduct and a complaints handling mechanism in place and that we are CHS certified. In Part C we have to describe our systems for quality assurance, accountability and transparency. We see a bit of overlap here.	Part B determines eligibility and Part C capacity. In Part B the assessment team will determine if standards are in place (yes or no) for SHEA, Code of Conduct and complaints handling mechanism and therefore if the organisation is eligible to apply. In Part C the assessment team will look at the quality of the described systems for quality assurance, accountability and transparency and score accordingly.
Financial management	In the 'Application Form' (Annex 1), part C, applicants are requested to "*Attach most recent inspections (financial monitoring visit reports), review reports and audit reports*" [ref. section on 'Financial management']. How much documentation do you need here? Is the most recent *official* financial monitoring report ("tilsynsrapport") as well as organisational capacity review commissioned by MFA sufficient, or should we also submit country programme level audit reports and/or internal financial monitoring visit reports at country programme level? Are there other types of documentation you are particularly interested in?	This is a systems check. Expected documentation: most recent official financial monitoring report, organisational review report (if available) and latest audit report.
	In the 'Application Form' (Annex 1), part C, applicants are requested to 1. "*Attach most recent inspections (financial monitoring visit reports), review reports and audit reports*" [ref. section on 'Financial management'], 2. "*Attach […] recent reviews and evaluation reports…*" [ref. section on 'Delivering and documenting results']. Is it okay to enclose a complete *list* of relevant reports (similar to the requirements for last SPa application), instead of having to enclose all the relevant reports to the application.	A link is possible but organisations are strongly encouraged to ONLY submit or link to recent and relevant documents.
	PART C, section "Financial management", bullet point "*1. Describe the applicant's (lead applicant in case of consortium) procedures for internal financial management control systems at all levels including how financial management is anchored in the day-to-day management and the board (flow of financial information, relevant competences at all levels, clear roles and responsibilities)*". An organisation would like to raise the attention to the agreement made with the MFA (based on the SPA review 2019) that "audit report" (revisionserklæring) should be per organization and not for the Consortium as a whole. Hence, the organisation expects that the current agreement also applies for this new application round and	The requested description in this section is for the lead organisation in case of a consortium – to illustrate financial capacity. This does not indicate future set-ups regarding financial management and division of roles within a consortium.

	that the information requested and assessment of financial capacity is based on this division of financial responsibility.	
Partnership approach	In the 'Application Form' (Annex 1), part C, applicants are requested to "*Attach the organisation's definition of local partner(s) (Refer to Annex C)*", with the specification that "As described in Annex C, 'Transfers to local partners' must also be filled out in the Annex C, but this is for baseline purpose only and not for assessment at the EoI stage". It is not completely clear to us what should be enclosed here. Does this imply that in practice *only* a filled in 'annex C' is enclosed to the EOI application, and that the applicant then – in the application form's 'Partnership approach' section – makes explicit *reference* to the first part of annex C: '*definition of local partner(s)*'?	The partnership approach must be clearly described in the application Part C. Referral should be made to the definition in Annex C. For consortia each organization must fill out Annex C and then jointly fill out the partnership approach for the joint consortium in Annex 1, Part C.
	PART C, section "Partnership approach" bullet point 2 it states: Describe how the organisation/consortium works to reinforce the diversity of local partners - including non-formalized actors, such as community-based networks, local committees, social movements, women and youth groups. In the case of this consortium, we only work with labour market and business organisations as a part of our peer-to-peer approach. These organisations might have contact to some of the groups above but cannot say to fall under these categories themselves. Will it be sufficient for the Danish organisation's local partner to work with these groups in some instances or should the criteria be understood so that the types of partners described carries a higher value than other partners?	The criterion is focusing on how to reinforce the diversity of local partners, *including* non-formalized actors etc. The individual organisation/consortium should describe, how they approach this and why. There is no set level on how many/what type or to what extent.
	In terms of partnership with local businesses/private sector is this type of partnership prioritised in the EoI and where would it fit in the EoI?	Description of partnerships with private sector would fit in to the partnership approach section. In the full proposal, it will be possible to elaborate the choice and relevance of local partners.
General	In general, under Annex 1, part C: As documentation requirements are broad, kindly clarify if there is a maximum number of annexes (reviews, evaluations etc.) the applicant should attach (given some documents may be lengthy).	Only attach recent and relevant documents. No maximum number.
	Are the documentation requirements indicative and could they be presented in other forms – internal review rather than evaluation etc.?	It can be both but should include external sources.
Annex A		
Number of cases	How many cases must be submitted for respectively a) Capacity for analysis, learning and innovation, b) Delivering and documenting results and c) Partnership approach? In Annex A is it written that we have to present minimum three cases, and in Annex B it reads 3 cases for Capacity for analysis, learning and innovation and 2 cases each for Delivering and documenting results and Partnership approach?	Number of cases are between 3 and 7. Under the following sections: Capacity for analysis, learning and innovation, Delivering and documenting results and Partnership approach it is required to refer

		to respectively 3, 2 and 2 cases – however these can be overlapping.
	It is described in the right-hand column of annex B, how many cases one is expected to refer to under the specific criteria. In the case of "capacity for analysis, learning and innovation", the applicant should refer to 3 cases, but only 2 in "delivering and documenting results". Could you kindly explain why this is and whether the applicant can exceed the indicated number of cases referring to a specific criterion?	The applicant cannot exceed the number of cases stated in the material. The extra case under "capacity for analysis, learning and innovation" gives room for a case on innovation (response to the input from the public hearing).
Type of cases	The Annex 1 (Annex A red.) on Preparation of Cases require that cases are from a DAC-country and part of the organisation's own portfolio. Could you clarify, if cases covering global processes, e.g. approaches to learning, that the organization has been engaged in developing and/or implementing at global scale are also acceptable?"	If the implementation at global scale is aiming at DAC countries, then the case can be included.
	Der står i Anneks A, at ansøger kan frit vælge relevant udtræk fra hvilke som helst tematisk, lande og/eller regional programme eller kampagne (…). Cases skal dokumenter og danne grundlaget for ansøgers "track record" i forhold til de nævnte kriterier. Kan en case også være på et organisatorisk niveau? F.eks. kan en case også handle om udvikling af organisationens program strategi som illustrerer hvordan organisationen forholder sig bl.a. til de nævnte kriterier?	It is up to the applicant to decide what is relevant to include. It may be from organisational level. As long as it lives up to the criteria stated in Annex A and aims at DAC country/countries.
Definition of DAC country	The annex providing guidance on preparation of cases states that cases should be 'only in a DAC-country'. This is not clear. Can Danida clarify the meaning of 'DAC-country'? Does this include Denmark as a DAC country, or does this mean the DAC list of ODA recipients?	A DAC country refers to the DAC list of ODA recipients (least developed and lower middle income countries).
References to cases	Is it correctly understood that documentation to the selected cases should only be referred to and not attached as annexes to the cases?	Yes
	I materialet står der: '*For possible later validation, references should be provided to evaluations, impact studies or other evidence in support of the cases*'. Er det rigtigt forstået, at dette materiale skal fremgå af en liste, som UM senere kan få tilsendt hvis ønsket, og IKKE vedlægges Expression of Interest?	References on cases should be stated but not attached. They may be requested by the MFA at a later stage.
Annex B		
Assessments from other MFA departments, representation or other donors	I Annex B står der ud for alle sektionerne, at "Assessments (or equivalent) from relevant departments and representations in the MFA, and (where relevant) from other donors with a recent, substantial funding engagement with the applicant" vil udgøre en basis for vurderingen. Kan UM uddybe metoden bag denne tilgang? Refererer 'assessments' til skrevne vurderinger såsom evalueringer eller respons til rapporter?	Assessments refer to e.g. reviews or monitoring visits etc. It will appear from the assessment note, which sources forms part of the assessment (beyond what the applicant has submitted itself). This may be relevant additional input from embassies or other MFA departments or other donors that the applying organisation has

		cooperated with. Assessments will only be based on written sources.
	Der er usikkerhed omkring formuleringen:" The assessment will be based on recent, independent capacity assessments, inspections, reviews and evaluations of the applicant including follow-up on action plans based on the conclusions of such assessments." Den er i den tredje blok fra oven på side 4 i ansøgningen. Er det muligt at uddybe hvordan UM påregner at bruge f.eks. de respektive reviews i forbindelse med vurderingen?	Same answer as above.
Assessment team	The assessment criteria document states *'Assessments (or equivalent) from relevant departments and representations in the MFA, and (where relevant) from other donors with a recent, substantial funding engagement with the applicant.'* What exactly will be the process for this? Will representations and departments review all EOIs received? Can Danida clarify the process for seeking input in the assessment of partners?	There will be one assessment team consisting of MFA staff and external consultants. They may seek additional input from relevant departments and representations of the MFA or from other donors. (See also answer above.)
	Will one assessment team from MFA be assessing the whole EoI application, or will there be different assessment teams responsible for the various sections? This will have an influence to what extent applicants can cross reference between different sections in the application. Can Danida clarify the procedure for the assessment of the EoI?	Same answer as above.
Scoring	I høringssvaret til prækvalifikationsmaterialet fremgår det, at "metoden for vægtningen af scores vil blive beskrevet i prækvalifikationsmaterialet. Der vil blive udarbejdet en assessment note til den samlede score" (jf. side 8). Vi skal bemærke, at dette ikke specificerer, hvornår de enkelte scores tildeles og hvilke kilder der lægges vægt på. Der kan derfor være risiko for, at der lægges vægt på forskellige aspekter på tværs af de enkelte organisationer. Vi vil anbefale, at dette defineres på forhånd gennem fx threshold-kriterier.	The method for scoring the EoI is described in Annex B. This will be maintained.
Fragile contexts	Can you clarify further regarding "fragile" contexts - when is a context considered fragile, how often do they fx. need to have natural disasters to be fragile?	This will be clarified in the full application.
Annex C		
Type of transfer	In the new guidelines we have to show partner transfers or cost. The question is if it is only direct transfers to the partners or if we have to include costs also paid for on behalf of the partner organsiations?	The total number should include both

Definition of local partner	*'The organization's definition of local partner(s):'*
	    ▪ Is it names of organizations we work with only?
	    ▪ Is it our description of local civil society organizations?
		The organisation should describe how they define local partner(s) – e.g. description of types of local partners (CSOs, non-formal youth groups,

		networks etc.) that the organisation engages with.
Form to be filled out	I understand that the forms that should be filled in is; Annex 1 and Annex C, besides the document with the 3 cases on max 8 pages and all of the attachments. 　■ Is it correctly understood that 'Part C: Capacity assessment' should be written directly into the document Annex 1?	Annex C should be filled out directly
Full international engagement	Is it possible for the MFA to provide further guidance on the definition of "full international engagement" in Annex C on definition of and transfers to local partners – including guideline on how to calculate transfer to local partners?	Full international engagement refers to the organisation's entire international portfolio (including from other donors) for humanitarian interventions and development cooperation (DAC least developed and lower middle income countries). The methodology for calculation may differ from one organisation to another, with the possibility to describe the chosen methodology in the note section of the Annex C.
Annex D		
Prioritised crises	Hvordan skal listen over prioritetskriser forstås vis-a-vis behovet for nexus programmering i skrøbelige kontekster? Listen over prioritetskriser og behovet for at rapportere selvstændigt på hhv. civ og hum aktiviteter understøtter til dels en fortsat opdeling mellem de to områder.	The Annex D is only for assessing previous experience and assessment of current capacity. It is not an indication of future engagement.
	An organisation would like to ask whether we can expect the list of 'prioritised crises' Annex D in its current version is the one to be used for the Application phase, or whether the list will be updated as part of the launch of the Application phase?	The list will be updated for the full application phase.
	In the current SPA 2018-2021, Burkina Faso and Niger are listed as Priority Fragile Countries in the Information Note. In the EoI for the SPA 2022-2025, Burkina Faso and Niger are not separately mentioned as prioritised crisis countries in Annex D (though Niger is part of the Lake Chad basin). Given the deterioration of the humanitarian situation in Burkina Faso in particular and the Danish role in the Sahel Conference in 2020 with a focus on the Central Sahel, what is the rationale for not including Burkina Faso on the 2021 crises list or Central Sahel as a regional crisis? Will the Information Note expectedly still feature Burkina Faso and Niger as Priority Fragile Countries?"	This is still not decided. It will be part of the full proposal.
	We would like the Ministry to specify how they define "the Mali crisis" with regards to whether humanitarian/one grant actions for vulnerable host populations and IDPs	This is still not decided. It will be part of the full proposal.

	in Niger and Burkina Faso comply with the MFA's prioritised crises – ideally from 2022.	
	In annex D "Prioritised crisis 2021, it states current and new crises, followed by a sentence "All priorities include efforts for refugees and host communities in neighboring countries". Does that mean that for example Myanmar only can be included as a case country IF the programme that you have supported in the previous 2 years includes/priorities refugees and host communities in neighboring countries?	Cases should be from DAC list of ODA recipient countries (no more than five years old). Annex D is a list of prioritized humanitarian crisis. All prioritized crisis *also* includes efforts for refugees and host communities in neighboring countries.
Generelle spørgsmål		
Consortia	Forventes alle organisationer i et konsortium at være i gang med en CHS-proces med henblik på verificering/certifikat? Eller er det tilstrækkeligt, at lead organisationen er i CHS proces?	All organisations (including in consortia) working in areas affected by armed conflict/fragile contexts are expected to be CHS verified/certified or in the process towards it.
	I et konsortium kan kravet om medfinansiering på 20 pct. komme fra partnerne i konsortiet, eller forventes det kun at komme fra lead organisationen?	This will be clarified in the material for the full application.
	A general question is if we could expect to clarify the approach to organisations preparing for applying as a consortium. Perhaps a specific Q&A session for those organisations would be useful. The information note, EOI format and annexes are not very specific when it comes to the assessment and scoring of organisations who have decided to apply with others as a consortium. Criteria – such as partnership approach – is mentioned in singular. There seems to be little consideration regarding the possibility of different but complementary approaches.	If nothing else is specified, all consortium members must fill out the Eligibility criteria. In the Capacity assessment it is stated, that the form should be filled out by the consortium as a whole except from Financial Management (only lead organization). There is not a separate meeting on consortia planned.
	Assessment of consortia: What will the capacity assessment of consortia be based on? Will a consortium get credit for best practice/most developed capacity, or will some kind of weighted average to be used? (Last time a consortium was assessed, a certain confusion about the assessment criteria existed).	In the EoI each criterion will be assessed the same way whether being one organization or a consortium as a whole. How the assessment will be made in the full application will be clarified in the application material.
Funding from other pooled fund	Hvilke konsekvenser får en SPA for andre finansieringsmuligheder af Danida midler fra fx. CISU, DMRU, DH osv. Og mere specifikt hvad bliver man udelukket fra, hvis man får bevilget henholdsvis en HUM, DEV, eller HUM/DEV?	As strategic partners it is not possible to seek funding from other pooled funds under the MFA i.e. DH, CKU, DUF of CISU (except certain specific pools like 'Råderumspuljen').

Localisation and local partners	Betyder en øget vægt på *localization* at samarbejde med internationale organisationer eller dele af egen organisation i Syd også i humanitære situationer vil tælle kraftig ned?	As each organisation has different set-ups it will depend on the assessment of the individual applicant's partnership approach
	Strengthening local partners: The LMC acknowledges the priority of strengthening local partners in the global south which is also the core fundament for the LMC approach. Both the information note and the evaluation criteria put a strong emphasis on increasing financial transfers to partners in south, we would like to hear how this is balanced with delivering the most efficient development assistance which in the LMC approach consists of both financial and advisory support. Will the increase financial support be prioritized over delivering the assistance most efficiently in the new strategic partnerships?	Requirements for levels of financial transfers to local partners as well as other aspects of strengthening local partners will be clarified as part of the full proposal material.
Budget ceilings	Udover budgetgulvet på 15 mio. DKK per partner og at den endelige udregningsmodel ikke ligger fast endnu, har I så mulighed for at give nogen form for indikation på, hvordan budgetrammerne vil blive beregnet? Fx hvordan I vil differentiere mellem finansiering som tidligere vil være kommet gennem hhv. lot civ og hum nu partnere kun modtager én samlet bevilling.	It is not possible to say anything about this at this stage.
Climate footprint	Assessment of climate footprint: How will the MFA assess the climate footprint of consortia and of organisations that are not primarily development CSO's but e.g., Danish labour market organisations? Is the MFA interested in the climate footprint assessment of the organization as a whole or only the development cooperation engaged part of the organization?	As part of preparation for the full application EoI-applying organisations will be invited for a workshop on climate reporting.