



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF DENMARK**

Q&A

**QUESTIONS RECEIVED BY 8TH OF OCTOBER -
PRESENTED ON Q&A MEETING 10TH OF OCTOBER**

HUMCIV – 10.10 2025

INFORMATION NOTE

0. Own-financing: Please clarify what is the correct answer:

"The requirement is now rephrased. The headline "Own-financing" is now rephrased to "Annual turnover" and the description is rephrased from "The organisation declares having at least 25% of annual ODA-turnover sourced from other channels than the MFA" to "The organisation declares having at least 25% of annual turnover sourced from other channels than its MFA-sourced main grant (e.g., SPA main grant, CISU main grant etc.)".

For consortia the requirement will only apply for the lead-organisation.

Furthermore, the expected own-financing requirement for applicants who will receive funding as part of SPA3 is now included in the Information Note"

0. Having "at least 25% of annual turnover sourced from other channels than its MFA-sourced main grant" is an entry-level requirement in the prequalification process. For consortia, the requirement applies only to the lead applicant.

Own-financing has furthermore been included in the Information Note after the hearing process. It relates to successful applicants' own contribution to the SPA programme (2027-2031) when entering into a SPA3 partnership. This requirement will apply to consortia as a whole.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

1. Membership: Can applicants include members' members, when these organisations are in strategic partnership with the applicant?

2. Programme management and country presence: It is stated we have to submit 'annual results reports' as supporting documentation for the two country engagements. Does this mean one annual report for each country or annual reports for more than one year for the two countries?

1. It is possible to meet the requirement of having 300 contributing members by also counting members' members. See also Annex 1 section B: Membership. This means for umbrella organisations that they can count their members' members. Members of partners cannot be included.

2. Reports should (in total) cover two countries. For each country, both years should be covered.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

3. Budgetary volume of development and/or humanitarian action: Does it refer to the total budget of the organization, or the total budget for specific projects? Does it include all projects, or only those involving local partners

3. Budgetary volume of development and/or humanitarian action includes funds originating from MFA/CISU grants and other sources as well. The amount stated should be a sum of all relevant activities within development and/or humanitarian action managed by the applicant, also including programmes without direct local partners. It also includes programme support costs at HQ level.*

* Last sentence is added after the Q&A session, due to elaboration on the questions during the Q&A session.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

4. Annual budgetary volume: Please specify what is meant with “similar reporting requirements as MFA and CISU”? Does this relate to e.g. IATI?

5. Annual budgetary volume: Do you request budget or actuals as described in the annual accounts?

6. Annual budgetary volume: What is the difference between annual budgetary volume and annual turnover?

4. Reporting requirements should be somewhat similar in terms of narrative and financial reporting (incl. audits). IATI is not seen as a necessary component.

5. For measuring budgetary volume, referrals should be made to actuals.

6. The figure for annual turnover covers the whole of the Danish organisation. Annual budgetary volume covers expenses on development and/or humanitarian action (from MFA or other sources) which have been subject to reporting similar to what is required from MFA or CISU.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

7. Annual turnover: Can you confirm that the figures for Annual turnover for 2022, 2023 and 2024 refers to the total turnover of the organisation including the SPA/CISU main grant and funding from other sources?

8. Annual turnover: Please confirm that Top-ups are not considered part of the MFA sourced main grant. Meaning that the calculation of own-financing of at least 25% is based on the contracted main SPA2 grant allocation for a particular year (ranging from 2022 to 2024) against ODA turnover from non-MFA sources.

7. This is confirmed.

8. SPA top-ups are not considered part of the SPA main grant (MFA sourced main grant). Also, please note that the updated material no longer includes requirements in relation to "ODA turnover".

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

9. Audit: Please clarify whether we should submit the organisations audit reports, or consolidated SPA audit reports.

10. Audit: When requesting audit reports including compliance audit – are you referring to “protokollatet”? If not, what is meant by compliance audit?

9. Audit reports for the organisation as a whole should be submitted.

10. Reference is made to the concept of compliance audit (juridisk-kritisk revision) as an element of the audit. Auditors should confirm in the audit report that the scope includes compliance audit. Compliance audit is a requirement in the Danish Standards on public-sector auditing. This requirement is also part of the current SPA2 guidelines. It is not required to submit the long form audit report (protokollat).

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

11. Anti-terror: Could the MFA please provide a guiding tool similar to the one for Value for Money to assist us and partner organizations in the effort of developing an anti-terror policy?

12. Complaints handling mechanism: Applicants are asked to enclose a description of complaints handling and whistle blower mechanism. Please specify what is meant by description? Can this be e.g. a whistleblowing policy or policy?

11. For guidance, you may refer to the relevant clause in the current SPA2 guidelines. A guiding tool will not be developed at this stage.

12. The description can both be an SOP, or a policy, if the policy is describing complaints handling and whistle blower mechanisms.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

13. CHS: Regarding CHS verification, is the organisations' own letter of commitment to the process sufficient, or is a HQAI letter of commitment required?

13. It is sufficient that the organisation states its commitment to the certification or verification process in the application form. Further clarification can be given in the comment box.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

14. CHS: If the Danish organisation is not approved by HQAI for inclusion in the audit scope for our international alliance's renewal audit, and given that starting an individual CHS verification (or certification) process at that point may not be realistic before the end of 2026, what alternative solutions would MFA consider acceptable for meeting the requirement?

14. MFA encourages organisations currently CHS certified/verified through an alliance or federation to check the scope of their last audit to confirm/clarify the status of coverage of humanitarian funding received from MFA. If adjustments to the audit scope are required, these should be carried out at the next Renewal Audit within the on-going CHS audit cycle. Organisations should engage with the MFA on the matter if further clarification is required.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART B

15. CHS: What type of documentation does MFA consider acceptable as evidence that our Danish organisation will be included in the audit scope during the international alliance's renewal audit? Would a written confirmation from the international alliance's be sufficient?

16. CHS: Could MFA clarify what is meant by the requirement to "clearly demonstrate that humanitarian funding received from MFA is covered in the CHS audit scope"? Specifically, what level of documentation or assurance is expected from organisations operating within a federation/alliance?

15. Documentation can take various forms depending on the individual status and process of each organisation. A written confirmation from the international alliance is appropriate. If need be, the MFA will request further/elaborated documentation from applicants.

16. The description of the audit scope (also found in the Summary Report) should be sufficient assurance.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

17. Reference to cases: Refer to the specific case(s) providing two recent examples illustrating relevant track record within this criterion (Refer to Annex A). Could you clarify whether each of sections 1, 2, and 3 should include references to cases that, through two recent examples, illustrate all of the subsections (i.e., 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3)? Could you also clarify if all sub-themes should be covered by cases? What role will the cases play in the scoring?

17. It is recommended that all sub-criteria are covered by recent examples from the cases. Examples may cover more than one sub-criteria*. The role of the cases is to elaborate and document track record (i.e. to support claims made in the application), and thus also a part of the scoring.

* This reply has been updated after the Q&A session

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

18. Reference to cases: In part C, applicants are requested to refer to “two recent examples illustrating relevant track record within this criterion”. Please specify if it refers to two recent examples for each sub-criteria (e.g. to examples under 1.1 and 1.2). In case that MFA requests two examples for each sub-criteria, can these examples be presented in different cases, meaning that one case can present examples to as many sub-criteria as the applicants wish?

18. Two recent examples refer to the criterion as a whole. Recent examples can be presented in different cases.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

19. Reference to cases: When mentioning that “refer to the specific case(s) providing two recent examples illustrating application ...”. Does this mean that mean it is needed to refer to separate cases or can the two examples come from the same case?

19. Two recent examples can be presented within the same case or in different cases.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

20. Programmatic and Operational

Capacity: Describe the organisation's programming approaches" Please clarify if the mentioned programming approaches "(including HRBA, local leadership, LNOB [..]) are all mandatory to describe? In addition, we understand that we can choose to describe other programming approaches that we find relevant. Is that correct?

21. Programmatic and Operational

Capacity: Please specify what constitutes "an approach"? And if e.g. a Global Entity should be considered as an approach?

20. The examples listed in Annex 1 section 2.1 are not mandatory to include in the application, but can be included if relevant. It is possible for the applicant to include other approaches as relevant.

21. Please see Application Form section 2.1 for examples of programming approaches. It is up to the applicant to describe the approaches they find relevant. Global Entities would most likely be the result of an approach, rather than an approach in it self.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

22. Programmatic and Operational

Capacity: Applicants are asked to attach an example of a Global Results Framework and a Country/Programme Results Framework. Please specify what is meant by “Global Results Framework”? Could this be e.g. a Strategic Results Framework as in SPA2? Please give examples to clarify.

22. Global Results Frameworks could be e.g. Strategic Results Framework (SPA 2), or it could be results frameworks on an even higher level (e.g. organisational).

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

23. Partnership Capacity: Could the MFA please give an estimate to the weight and prioritization between explaining partnership approaches etc. with Danish partners and local partners in priority countries?

24. Financial Management Capacity: If the latest independent MFA-commissioned financial monitoring visit was conducted in 2021, would it be fine to attach only the general capacity review which is from 2023?

23. It is up to the applicant to elaborate on the partnership approach in the manner they find relevant for the prequalification. Partnerships with Danish organisations could be included if relevant.

24. Both the latest review report and latest financial monitoring report of the applicant should be submitted

ANNEX A – INSTRUCTION TO PREPARATION OF CASES

25. As per the instructions, applicants are requested to ‘prepare the cases in such a manner that the applicant’s track record and added value in relation to the concerned assessment criteria can be assessed solely on the basis of the cases presented.’ Please clarify whether “in such a manner” refers only to the minimum information listed in the bullet points, or if it also implies other aspects of how the cases should be presented? And if so, which ones?

25. Organisations are very welcome to include additional relevant information in the cases (beyond the minimum information listed in bullet form).

As a whole, cases should illustrate relevant track record, experience and added value of the applicant in the following capacity criteria:

1. Strategic Capacity
2. Programmatic Capacity
3. Partnership Capacity

ANNEX A – INSTRUCTION TO PREPARATION OF CASES

26. We understand that each sub-criteria need to refer to two specific cases, but that each overall capacity criteria, i.e. 1-3, may therefore refer to more than two cases. Is that a correct understanding?

26. The correct understanding is that organisations should submit a minimum of three cases (but it may be more), within the limit of 10 pages. Two recent examples providing documentation under each capacity criterion (1. Strategic Capacity, 2. Programmatic and Operational Capacity, 3. Partnership Capacity), should be reflected across the cases. The requirement of two relevant examples refers to the overall criterion as a whole, and not each sub-criteria. However, it is recommended that all sub-criteria are represented in each example.

* The reply has been modified, due to elaboration on the question during the Q&A session.

ANNEX B – ASSESSMENT AND SCORING

27. Overall: There is a list of documents in the column called "basis for assessment". Are these documents to be considered as an exhaustive list of documents being accepted for the prequalification process, or are we allowed to submit additional documents?

28. Partnership Capacity: What is meant by quality and quantity of transfers to partners?

27. The lists of documents requested in annex A and listed as the basis for assessment in annex B, are to be seen as exhaustive lists. If reference is made by the applicant to specific documents (e.g. method papers, evaluation studies, guidance notes etc.) in the application (incl. cases), the MFA may request these documents for validation if relevant. Active links may also be included in the application form and case descriptions for easy reference.

28. Quality of transfers may refer to elements such as the use of multi-year agreements, overhead for local partners, and level of flexibility etc. Quantity of transfers may refer to frequency and amount transferred.

ANNEX B – ASSESSMENT AND SCORING

29. Partnership Capacity: What is meant by capacity sharing?

29. Capacity sharing refers to the deliberate sharing of expertise, resources, and influence in a partnership.

ANNEX C – TRANSFER TO LOCALS PARTNERS

30. Does the "full amount transferred to local partners (in DKK and percentage of budgetary volume)" refer only to the transfers made to local partners, or does it include other types of financial transactions as well? The other types of transactions could be to use revolving funds, sent in earlier stage to partner, which returned directly to the project.

30. Returned and/or revolving funds may only be included once in this calculation.

ANNEX C – TRANSFER TO LOCALS PARTNERS

31. It is not clear to us under which of the measures in Annex C we should report our local partner transfers. It seems that the MFA wishes to distinguish local partner transfers simply on the basis of whether the organization is part of a federation or not. Is that correctly understood?

31. Please see Annex C for a definition of local partners.

In cases where a local partner is also a member of a federation/alliance, but the transfer is made directly to the partner, please use the field "hereof directly transferred to local partners".

In cases where a transfer to a local partner is being made via a federation/alliance entity (and in the case where this entity is not in itself a local partner), please use the field "hereof transfers through federation/alliance to local partners".

The full amount transferred to local partners will be a part of the documentation and assessment of the applicants' capacity within local leadership.

ANNEX C – TRANSFER TO LOCALS PARTNERS

32. In those cases where an alliance partner cannot be classified as local partner due to local restrictions but are in fact independent local organizations and are still allowed to 'contribute meaningfully to the partnership' (ref. Annex C). How should these partners be considered and classified in the partnership set up? – and in the budget?

32. The definition of local partners as stated in Annex C remains as is. If there are cases, where partners in country of implementation is not fully living up to the definition in Annex C due to specific, local restrictions etc., it is possible to include a description of these transfers to partners in the comment box in Annex C, but these transfers should not be included in the total amount transferred to local partners.

ANNEX C – TRANSFER TO LOCALS PARTNERS

33. Please confirm if the exercise should include all funding to development and/or humanitarian action or funding from the SPA/CISU main grant.

34. When referring to DAC eligible countries, does it then refer to the full DAC list of countries receiving ODA (within the specifically mentioned regions), or is it specifically the LDC (least developed countries)?

33. Budgetary volume of development and/or humanitarian action should be included. This includes funds originating from SPA/CISU grants and other sources as well.

34. The full list applies (all countries that are eligible to receive ODA).

Q&A

**QUESTIONS RECEIVED IN WRITING
BETWEEN 08TH-10TH OCTOBER**

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

35. In the Application Form Part C section 1 (but similarly under 2 and 3) it says: "*Refer to the specific case(s) providing two recent examples illustrating relevant track record within this criterion (Refer to Annex A).*"

If I understand correctly, 'this criterion' refers to the overall heading, e.g. Strategic Capacity (not two examples per sub-criterion) - is this correct?

It was said at the meeting today "It is not mandatory to cover all the sub-criterion", but I understood it is an advantage as it is a way to support the statements in the narrative description in the Application Form, thereby providing evidence or substance for the assessment. Can you confirm this understanding?

35. It is correct that the two recent examples refers to the over all criterion e.g. Strategic Capacity, and not to two recent examples per sub-criterion.

It is furthermore correctly understood that it is not mandatory to cover all sub-criteria in the cases, but it is recommended to do so, as it serves as documentation for the claims and statements in the application form. However, it is up to the applicant to prioritize in selection of cases.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

36. Financial management: In section 5. Financial Management Capacity (p. 13), applicants are required to submit an example of a financial capacity assessment of a local partner. Our local partners are members of the federation, and are based in the countries where we work, and the financial capacity assessment of them is done by the federation. Likewise, our country partners do financial capacity assessment of their local partners - could we provide such an example? Or would you rather that we provide an example of an assessment done by the federation of one of our direct partners? Kindly advise and elaborate on the expectations of the MFA on this.

36. The documentation requested (“an example of a financial capacity assessment of a local partner”) should serve as an example of the way the applicant conduct financial capacity assessment of their partner. It is up to the applicant to identify and share the most relevant and applied example of a capacity assessment between the applicant and their partner. If the applicant applies different methodologies of assessing local partners capacity, it is also possible to elaborate on in the application form.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM – PART C

37. Reference to cases: In the Application Form under each criterion, the applicants are to describe many elements of our operation. These elements are to be documented by reference to the specific case(s) providing two recent examples. Please clarify if a) we are to choose 2 of the elements that can be exemplified in detail in the case(s), b) we can provide up to 2 examples on each of all the elements that are relevant to exemplify, c) we can provide 2 examples per sub-criterion, or d) we can make all the references we find relevant to document or better explain our approach on these many elements, but all within 2 examples such as for instance comprehensive description of 2 partnerships, projects or country operations. In the case of d, please clarify what is then the difference between 'examples' and 'cases'?

37. Each overall criterion (1. Strategy Capacity, 2. Programmatic and Operational Capacity, and 3. Partnership Capacity) should be presented by two recent examples in either one or two cases. It is up to the applicant to decide how to present the two recent examples across cases. One case may present more than one example. It may also be that the applicant find it most relevant to have one example per case. In this situation, there is no difference between a case and an example.

EXPECTED TIMELINE FOR SPA3

