




















































## A more equal and just world through quality education and a strong civil society – 2. phase 2022-2025

<p><b>Key results/outcomes:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- By 2026, new participatory and pedagogical models and approaches have been proven to improve equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the target groups.</li> <li>- By 2026, programme partners and stakeholders have effectively advocated for better equity, inclusion, and quality in education towards local, regional, and national duty bearers.</li> </ul> <p><b>Justification for support:</b></p> <p>Globally, the focus in education has for decades been on <i>access</i> to education rather the <i>quality, equity or inclusion</i> of the education provided. While education is the best way to achieve equity and equality in society at large, whether it can do so depends not only on access to education but also on the quality, equity and inclusion in the education provided. The programme is founded on the achievements, results, and learnings from the previous projects and programme and on the specific needs and possibilities in the contexts in which it takes place. The objective of the program is aligned with the principles for civil society support outlined in "The World We Share" and in the "Policy for Danish Support to civil society". The program has a relevant civil society approach, combining strategic service, capacity building and advocacy.</p> <p><b>Major risks and challenges:</b></p> <p>1) Changes in political agendas that produce barriers/new conditions impacting the outcomes. Mitigation: Consistent engagement of authorities and advocacy. 2) Changing teaching methods, curricula, learning materials and content may not be accepted by stakeholders. Mitigation: Participatory dialogue and locally adapted approaches, working through local partners. 3) A protracted COVID-19 pandemic may impact implementation for the foreseeable future. Mitigation: Continued monitoring and increased focus on digital tools. Axis has proven its capacity to deal with and mitigate risks.</p>	<b>File No.</b>	2019-1911																						
	<b>Country</b>	Bolivia, Peru, and Ghana																						
	<b>Responsible Unit</b>	HCE																						
	<b>Sector</b>	15150																						
		<i>DKK mill.</i>	<b>2022</b>	<b>2023</b>	<b>2024</b>	<b>2025</b>	<b>Tot.</b>																	
	<b>Commitment</b>	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	16.6																		
	<b>Projected Disb.</b>	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	16.6																		
	<b>Duration</b>	Jan. 2022 - Dec. 2025 (48 months)																						
	<b>Finance Act code.</b>	06.33.01.12																						
	<b>Head of unit</b>	Mette Thygesen																						
	<b>Desk officer</b>	Marie Theil Kjær																						
	<b>Financial officer</b>	CISU's controller																						
	<b>Relevant SDGs</b> [ <i>Maximum 5 – highlight with grey</i> ]																							
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr> <td> No Poverty</td> <td> No Hunger</td> <td> Good Health, Wellbeing</td> <td> Quality Education</td> <td> Gender Equality</td> <td> Clean Water, Sanitation</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Affordable Clean Energy</td> <td> Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth</td> <td> Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure</td> <td> Reduced Inequalities</td> <td> Sustainable Cities, Communities</td> <td> Responsible Consumption &amp; Production</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Climate Action</td> <td> Life below Water</td> <td> Life on Land</td> <td> Peace &amp; Justice, strong Inst.</td> <td> Partnerships for Goals</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>							 No Poverty	 No Hunger	 Good Health, Wellbeing	 Quality Education	 Gender Equality	 Clean Water, Sanitation	 Affordable Clean Energy	 Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth	 Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure	 Reduced Inequalities	 Sustainable Cities, Communities	 Responsible Consumption & Production	 Climate Action	 Life below Water	 Life on Land	 Peace & Justice, strong Inst.	 Partnerships for Goals	
 No Poverty	 No Hunger	 Good Health, Wellbeing	 Quality Education	 Gender Equality	 Clean Water, Sanitation																			
 Affordable Clean Energy	 Decent Jobs, Econ. Growth	 Industry, Innovation, Infrastructure	 Reduced Inequalities	 Sustainable Cities, Communities	 Responsible Consumption & Production																			
 Climate Action	 Life below Water	 Life on Land	 Peace & Justice, strong Inst.	 Partnerships for Goals																				

### CSF Budget: Summary table of Cost Categories

Cost category		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
		A1	Direct activity cost	2.825.162	705.661	635.667	750.667
A2	Implementation through local independent partner	10.200.000	2.580.000	2.580.000	2.520.000	2.520.000	64%
A3	Allocated programme support cost	835.327	184.455	234.457	199.457	216.957	5%
A5	Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	120.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	1%
A6	Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	660.634	164.164	180.156	160.157	160.157	4%
A7	Auditing in Denmark	200.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	1%
B1	Administration in Demark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	10.838.878	259.720	259.720	259.720	259.720	7%

Total applied amount <b>before</b> scoring	15.880.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	100%
Total granted amount <b>after</b> scoring	16.640.000	4.160.000	4.160.000	4.160.000	4.160.000	

After scoring a total of **DKK 16,6 mill.** is approved (against applied DKK 15,9 mill.). The budget will be adjusted proportionally before signing final agreement with CISU.

## 1. Introduction

- **Parties:**

CISU and AXIS:

The present development engagement document details the objectives and management arrangements for the development cooperation concerning *A more equal and just world through quality education and a strong civil society*, 2. phase 2022-2025 as agreed between the parties specified below. The development engagement document together with the documentation specified below constitutes the agreement between the parties.

The AXIS-programme will be financed within the current Civil Society Fund (CSF) administered by CISU.

The objective of the programme is aligned with the principles for civil society support outlined in "The World 2030" and in the "Policy for Danish Support to civil society".

The programme has a relevant civil society approach, combining strategic service, capacity building and advocacy. There is a focus on SDG 4, SDG 5, SDG 10 and SDG 17.

Assessment process: The programme has been through a comprehensive process according to the agreed CISU procedures for programme organisations. An external consultant has made a review/appraisal as a basis for the assessment conducted by the CSF Assessment Committee. The final programme document has been desk appraised by two internal CISU Assessment Consultants, followed by an overall assessment by the CSP granting committee, in which the programme has been in competition, according to merits, with 5 other programme applicants. The assessment was based on 12 criteria. Embassy comments has been received from [none] and observations has been addressed in the assessment process.

Quality control: Monitoring of result framework and learning on overall Theory of Change will be done as part of CISU-led yearly consultations. An external review will be conducted in last year of the programme phase.

The CSF Assessment Committee recommends the programme for final approval by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

### Key documentation:

- Programme document with annexes, including an overall result framework.
- Review/appraisal report by external consultant.

## 2. Background

- **National, thematic or regional context, key challenges and opportunities relevant to the proposed programme**

Globally, the focus in education has for decades been on *access* to education rather the *quality, equity or inclusion* of the education provided. While education is the best way to achieve equity and equality in society at large, whether it can do so depends not only on access to education but also on the quality, equity and inclusion in the education provided.

The programme is founded on the achievements, results, and learnings from the previous projects and programme and on the specific needs and possibilities in the contexts in which it takes place. Through the previous projects and programme, AXIS and partners have learned important lessons about how to improve quality, equity and inclusion in education in some of the most marginalized areas of the world. These learnings have showed the impact that relatively small changes in education can have on students, teachers and the community at large. These are lessons and results achieved in partnership with strong and capable local civil society organizations, in networks with other CSOs and allies, the programme will continue to build upon these lessons to create systemic and sustainable change.

*A more equal and just world through quality education and a strong civil society* is the phase 2 of AXIS' programme. Building on programme phase 1, the focus is on equity, inclusion and quality in education and involves six partners, two in each of the three programme countries Bolivia, Peru and Ghana. The programmatic evolution means that there is now a greater focus on consolidating methods and experiences from Phase I, scaling them up, and advocating duty bearers for their inclusion in policies.

The thematic focus area of the programme is Quality Education for All, which is both a human right and an enabler of other rights. Quality education is a key tool in empowering poor and marginalized people to become active citizens who can influence decision-makers. AXIS believes a strong civil society is a precondition for sustainable development and supports strengthening the capacity of partners to influence policy making processes. This will improve the lives of target groups and strengthen civic space through policies that support equity, inclusion and quality in education.

Economic-, gender- and social inequality is a fundamental threat to the creation of fair and equitable societies. Inequality in education is evident: Privileged upper- and middle-class children have access to quality education with well-trained teachers who speak their mother-tongue, are well paid and supported. Underprivileged children, often minorities who reside in rural areas or urban slums, do seldom have access to the same opportunities. Their schools are often underfunded and understaffed, and girls are more likely to leave education early due to social norms, violence, and teenage pregnancies - if they attend school at all.

Bolivia, Peru and Ghana vary in terms of poverty rates and inequality, but all three programme countries face similar challenges. Poverty and marginalisation are common across their populations in general, for certain ethnic groups and/or in certain geographical areas. The COVID-19 pandemic has intensified these challenges in all three countries, where sharp increases in poverty rates have accompanied serious challenges to the education sector. The three programme countries are highly hierarchical and unequal societies, where men generally exercise power over women, elders over youth and the wealthier and educated over the poor and uneducated. The unequal balance in power often manifests itself as abuse (emotional, physical, sexual, economic, and cultural). Power is kept in the hands of the few. Women, youth, and indigenous people are often prevented from taking part in decision-making, resulting in central authorities lacking gender equality and respect and understanding for indigenous or traditional cultures. Lack of access to mother-tongue education is a barrier for indigenous peoples' access to quality education. The programme specifically targets indigenous populations in Peru and Bolivia as poverty rates, ethnicity and culture are strongly linked in these two countries.

The education systems in the three countries are also characterized by high levels of inequality, where low completion rates, low quality of education, lack of inclusion, high teenage pregnancy rates more disproportionately affect poor and minority populations – in particular girls and young women.

### 3. Presentation of programme

- **Lessons learned and results from previous interventions hereunder follow-up on latest Capacity Assessment/reviews (summary of management response or similar) and other assessments:**

#### Key lessons learned in phase 1

- **Importance of cross-partner collaboration** has been made very clear over the last programme period and will be explored and institutionalised further in the new programme period. For instance, in Peru, where the two partners are collaborating in the national education coalition to highlight the importance of quality and participatory methods in education and CSE. Or in Ghana where the partners have validated each-others' models and methods and will build on this to do joint advocacy in the new programme phase.
- **Equity, inclusion, and quality in education** is the common denominator in the interventions, and programme phase 2 will not be divided into the two thematic focus areas; a) Context-based Education and b) Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Education.
- The first programme brought about great results, but a more systematic approach to **documenting results** is necessary. This is essential both for the general documentation of the validity of the ToC, for advocacy efforts and to create learning. AXIS and partners have developed several models, manuals, reports etc. which will be used in the next programme to inform the work of all partners. As a result of this learning, AXIS has commissioned the aforementioned impact studies to explore and analyse the impact of previous interventions. The new phase will continue to focus on documenting tangible results and impact in a long-term perspective.
- **Partnership encounters and conferences** must continue to be prioritized and are crucial to fostering stronger collaborations and cross-project learnings.
- The **M&E activities** have always been rooted in a systematic approach using best practice tools and formats. However, AXIS wants to further strengthen the dialogue and mutual learning between the project groups in

Denmark and among the partners in Ghana, Bolivia, and Peru. The new Programme Group will play an important role in facilitating this.

- **Too much flexibility in terms of funding** creates additional work for partners. The procedures in the current programme allowed for flexibility in terms of funding with annual revisions on budgets and intervention activities. It was believed this would be practical for the partners. However, it created an extra and unnecessary workload especially in light of the pandemic that necessitated a rethink of many planned activities. Intervention planning and budgeting in the new programme will be done with a time frame of 4 years (high level planning) and each year, partners will create annual action plans.
- **COVID-19** has meant that schools have been closed for up to a year in the three implementation countries by now. This has been a severe challenge for any educational intervention. However, through a willingness to adjust and adapt the interventions, it has been possible to stay connected to teachers and students and continue the interventions in some form. Partners have found new ways of communicating and collaborating during the lockdowns and school closures. So, while COVID-19 has been a disaster for education, there are also learnings to take from this period.

Following the review cum appraisal/CapApp, March 2021, a management response has been developed outlining how the nine key recommendations are to be followed up. Some recommendations points to adjusting the programme management by establishing a Programme Group, enhancing the partner synergy and finetuning the MEL approach, which already forms part of AXIS' work and can be understood as good advice.

- **Partners in the Programme including the role and responsibilities of the key drivers of change**

**AXIS** was formed in 1995 and sees quality education as an enabler for marginalized children, youth and adults to influence their societies and the development path they take. AXIS' work is based on solid capacity and knowledge obtained by years of experience working in difficult and remote areas in partnership and with community-based interventions with some of the most marginalized people in the world.

AXIS has always been a mainly voluntary CSO with a small secretariat staffed by the Executive Director (15 hours per week) and Finance Manager (25 hours per week). They are responsible for daily operations and support to the project groups and partners, while the Quality Assurance (QA) group supports the individual projects in the project design phase and when progress reports are due. Project groups of three to five members (project coordinators) are organized according to partner organization and country and these project groups handle the daily or weekly contact with partners. Furthermore, a programme group is in the process of being established to ensure knowledge sharing, explore synergies and strengthen capacity across the entire programme.

AXIS has a solid track record with CISU. Since December 2017, AXIS has worked with Tarea in Peru on a three-year, 5 million DKK project focusing on quality education, financed by the Hempel Foundation. It is expected that Hempel will continue their support at least till 2025. AXIS has a strong engagement in Danish civil society networks relevant to the organisation, including the Danish NGO Education Network under Global Focus, which is the Danish part of the Global Campaign for Education – a global CSO network of organisations and unions working to achieve SDG4. AXIS has a wide experience in terms of different ways to promote popular engagement and share information about development issues. These include volunteers making presentations at Danish education institutions, the use of website and social media plus recently the development of teaching material for Danish schools.

AXIS is overall responsible for managing the programme but with emphasis creating a common ownership to the programme among the 6 partners to be involved. All partners are well-established in the civil society networks of their respective countries and have a track-record with equity, inclusion and quality in education and a strong track record developing high quality pedagogical methods, approaches, and curriculum to support this. Most of the partners have competencies within the areas of teacher training and development, indigenous peoples' rights, education rights, Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights (SRHR) as well as democracy, active citizenship, and youth empowerment.

In Peru:

**Tarea** is a leading Peruvian civil society organisation, founded in 1974, known for its long-standing efforts in bilingual, intercultural and democratic education. They work in Lima, Ayacucho and Cuzco on vulnerable groups, quality education, political and social participation and rights. Tarea participates in regional, national and Latin American networks and is in charge of the National Education Council. Tarea has wide experience in guiding young students in participating in democratic processes and exercising their active citizenship. TAREA will work in partnership with teacher training colleges and other NGOs in Peru (including Kallpa), using project results to advocate for a wider

incorporation of intercultural and gender perspectives in the curriculum for teacher training within the frame of citizenship. The combination of IBS and AXIS is also seen as a strong possibility for not only achieving national advocacy, but also combine it with activities in Bolivia.

**Kallpa** was founded in 1990 and has worked in SRHR for 15 years and have substantial experience and knowledge on SRHR in rural communities in Peru. In addition, they have an extensive network of local, regional and national partners in the public educational sector and are part of several alliances in the field of SRHR also on national and regional level. Furthermore, Kallpa has strong ties to regional youth organizations who they support in their advocacy efforts. Kallpa and TAREA will coordinate their activities within the education sector to implement new norms and policies to support equity, inclusion and quality in high-school and university education. Kallpa will also be able to provide stronger support to the national network on comprehensive sexuality education/CSE and involve experiences from Bolivia and Ghana on CSE.

In Bolivia:

**CETM** was founded in 1986 and is based in Cochabamba. CETM works to eliminate oppression and discrimination against women by strengthening women's knowledge and improving their abilities to take care of their own lives by, for example, confronting domestic violence and sexism. CETM's purpose is to promote social change processes in Bolivia that creates gender equality and promotes education, personal development, active citizenship and health. As a regionally-based NGO their participation in the programme is a possibility for having greater national impact which CETM plan to achieve through collaborations with Pueblo Diferente. During phase 2, new education models on SRHR will be implemented, one for peasant women from local communities. Trained female and youth leaders will share their knowledge on SHRH in their respective communities and secondary schools and carry out massive information and awareness-raising campaigns in public spaces, plus advocacy processes towards municipal and educational authorities to achieve the approval and implementation of a municipal public policy on SRHR.

**Pueblo Diferente** is a civil society organisation in Bolivia, founded in 2015 and working within the areas of Sexual Rights and Reproductive Health in formal and non-formal Education. The objective of Pueblo Diferente is to improve the formal and non-formal educational management in the different levels of the Bolivian educational system. Pueblo Diferente aims to introduce sexual and reproductive rights education in an intercultural and bilingual Bolivian context through participatory and inclusive pedagogy. By training teachers to include a new curriculum, the aim is to show the Bolivian government the effectiveness of the training, in order for them to implement the subject in the national curriculum and expand the training to all teacher training schools in the country.

In Ghana:

**NORSAAC** is a civil society organisation in Northern Ghana dedicated to improving the lives of women, youth and marginalised groups. They work within the areas of areas of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights; Gender and Governance; Livelihood; and Education. NORSAAC will continue to focus on working with the colleges of education and to get the national guideline on Reproductive Health Education/RHE approved and launched. NORSAAC is one of the major NGOs in Northern Region recently reaching influence on national level. NORSAAC aims at developing into an important agent in West Africa on sexual rights and considers the participation in the programme important for achieving this.

**RAINS** was founded in 1993 in Tamale. Since then, RAINS has focused on improving the quality of life for vulnerable groups especially children, women, girls and people with disabilities by strengthening local structures to take actions to promote and ensure fairness for all people in the society. RAINS has worked closely with state authorities through well-established working relationships with the Ministry of Education (MoE) as well as the Ministry of Gender, Children and Social protection. RAINS is a member of key networks on child protection and education. RAINS will work to promote of the use of participatory teaching and learning methodologies in basic schools in Northern Ghana and advocacy aims at improving the quality of education will target and benefit Parent Teacher Associations (PTAs) and School Management Committee (SMCs) in schools, teacher trainees and School Improvement Support Officers from Ghana Education Services.

- **Overall strategy (Intervention logic, Theory of Change or Rationale) and key assumptions related to the programme strategy (how the programme will achieve the outcome level, outcome indicators and targets)**

Globally, the focus in education has for decades been on access to education rather the quality, equity or inclusion of

the education provided. While this focus has, fortunately, allowed millions more children and youth to enter education, at the same time, it has put education financing and systems under extreme pressure in terms of quality, equity and inclusion.

Across the three AXIS' programme countries, similar challenges are identified in the education sectors: Poor, indigenous and marginalized groups have less access to quality education and have worse education outcomes than national averages. Girls and young women are disproportionately represented in the various negative statistics concerning low completion and progression rates, and there are high teenage pregnancy and sexual violence rates. There is widespread lack of capacity (financial, human resources and appropriate education tools and methods). All of these challenges have, unfortunately, been exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, in particular affecting girls and young women. There is a need to advocate duty bearers to take on the responsibility they have in terms of education of the most marginalized – the programme target groups. On this basis, a Theory of Change has been developed, reflecting the following two outcomes, which are based on the listed key assumptions:

**Outcome 1.1**

By 2026, new participatory and pedagogical models and approaches have been proven to improve equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the programme target groups

**Outcome 2.1**

By 2026, programme partners and stakeholders have effectively advocated for better equity, inclusion, and quality in education towards local, regional, and national duty bearers.

<b>Summary of assumptions:</b>	<b>KEY ASSUMPTION</b>
<b>Programme Outcome 1</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We assume that if children and young people get an inclusive and equitable quality education based on local language, traditions and culture, then learners will learn more and be more engaged in education further on in life and then they are more likely to become active citizens who exercise their rights which is essential to leading dignified and fulfilled lives.</li> <li>We assume that if knowledge on SRHR improves, then we will see a change in risky behaviour for the better and a reduction in sexual violence, teenage pregnancies, and school dropouts.</li> </ul>
<b>Programme Outcome 2</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We assume that if education institutions, local authorities and communities are engaged continuously and strategically, then they are more likely to take over at the end of the programme.</li> <li>We assume that if education institutions, local authorities and communities are made aware of the lack of quality, equity, and inclusiveness in the education system then they will take actions to change this.</li> </ul>

The programme has the following strategic priorities, each based on a sustainable development goal:

- To improve quality of education based on participatory methodologies, which seek to increase the knowledge and skills of the target groups within the fields of human rights, gender equality, sexual and reproductive health and rights, active citizenship, and recognition of cultural diversity => SDG4
- To increase gender equity in education in general, but especially through Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE). And through CSE and gender transformative education to increase SRHR in society at large => SDG5
- Through quality education to increase the competences and ability of the target groups to influence social, cultural, economic, and political decision-making processes relevant to their lives and to reduce inequality => SDG 10
- To strengthen the partners' competences in developing and applying participatory models and approaches for equity, inclusion, and quality in education, and their ability to influence social, cultural, economic, and political processes to improve the livelihood of the target groups as well as improve the civic space => SDG17

• **Summary of results framework:**

<b>Programme objective</b>	By 2026, local, regional, or national policies to support equity, inclusion and quality in education have been approved, implemented and/or funded in Ghana, Peru and Bolivia.
<b>Programme theme/component 1</b>	Models and approaches for equity, inclusion and/or quality in education

<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (end of programme per country and/or core partner)</b>
<p>Outcome 1.1 By 2026, new participatory and pedagogical models and approaches have been proven to improve equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the programme target groups</p>	<p>Ind. 1: Percentage of target groups who express or demonstrate that an improvement has been made with regards to equity, inclusion and/or quality in education.</p> <p>Ind. 2: Number of schools, teacher training colleges and other educational bodies where tests and records show an improvement in retention and learning of the target groups.</p> <p>Ind. 3: Number of external assessments of models and approaches that validate evidence of improvements in equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the target groups.</p>	<p><b>Bolivia</b></p> <p><b>Ind. 1:</b> At least 60 % of target groups (rural women, young men and women, teachers in teacher training colleges, students enrolled at teacher training colleges, students in indigenous schools and families of the students) express or demonstrate improvements on equity, inclusion and/or quality in education.</p> <p><b>Ind. 2:</b> 12 educational bodies demonstrate an improvement in retention and learning among the target groups, documented by questionnaires and tests.</p> <p><b>Ind. 3:</b> 4 external assessments validate evidence of improvements in equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the target groups.</p> <p><b>Peru</b></p> <p><b>Ind. 1:</b> 80% of target groups (incl. higher education students, teachers and authorities) express or demonstrate improvements on equity, inclusion and/or quality in education.</p> <p><b>Ind. 2:</b> 10 educational bodies demonstrate an improvement in retention and learning among the target groups, documented by questionnaires, a/v material, etc.</p> <p><b>Ind. 3:</b> 4 assessments of exercises of models and approaches validate improvements in equity, inclusion and/or quality in education. 10 education authorities validate programme contributions to equity, inclusion and/or quality in education.</p> <p><b>Ghana</b></p> <p><b>Ind. 1:</b> 80% of direct beneficiaries express an improvement in equity, inclusion and/or quality in education. 90% of youth groups, PTAs, SMCs, School improvement officers, teacher trainees and colleges express an improvement in equity, inclusion and/or quality in education.</p> <p><b>Ind. 2:</b> 80% of schools and colleges record an improvement in performance of children and students in retention and learning. 30% improvement in girls and persons with disability retention in schools.</p> <p><b>Ind. 3:</b> Five assessments by external consultants and one validation by National Council for Curriculum and Assessment, Teacher Unions and Ghana Education Service.</p>
<b>Programme theme/component 2</b>	Advocacy for equity, inclusion and/or quality in education	
<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target (end of programme per country and/or core partner)</b>
<p>Outcome 2.1 By 2026, programme partners and stakeholders have effectively advocated for better equity, inclusion, and quality in education towards</p>	<p>Ind. 4: Number of advocacy activities carried out in collaboration between two or more programme partners and/or other stakeholders.</p>	<p><b>Bolivia</b></p> <p><b>Ind. 4:</b> 30 advocacy activities (meetings, events, workshops etc.) carried out jointly programme partners and/or in collaboration with other stakeholders.</p> <p><b>Ind. 5:</b> 14 local, regional and/or national decision-making bodies have been reached by partners and stakeholders (including; the Ministry of Education, school directors at</p>



<p>local, regional, and national duty bearers.</p>	<p>Ind. 5: Number of local, regional and/or national decision-making bodies that have been reached by partners and stakeholders through advocacy efforts to increase equity, inclusion, and quality in education.</p> <p>Ind. 6: Number of public statements made and/or concrete actions taken by duty bearers in favour of increased equity, inclusion and/or quality in education as a result of programme advocacy.</p>	<p>schools and teacher training colleges, the Municipal Government of Sacaba and more).</p> <p><b>Ind. 6:</b> 18 statements made and/or actions taken by duty bearers (public statements, declarations, decrees, municipal laws etc.)</p> <p><b>Peru</b></p> <p><b>Ind. 4:</b> 90 advocacy activities (meetings, events, workshops, seminars, media coverage, a/v material, etc.) carried out jointly by programme partners.</p> <p><b>Ind. 5:</b> 23 local, regional and/or national decision-making bodies/authorities have been reached by advocacy activities. 60 higher education institutions and coordinating bodies have been reached by advocacy activities.</p> <p><b>Ind. 6:</b> 164 statements and/or actions by duty bearers (public statements, policy changes, organizational changes, etc.) that support increased equity, inclusion and/or quality in education.</p> <p><b>Ghana</b></p> <p><b>Ind. 4:</b> 56 advocacy activities carried out in collaboration with other CSOs, local decision-making bodies, teaching unions and Ghana Education Service.</p> <p><b>Ind. 5:</b> 18 regional and national decision-making bodies have been reached by advocacy for better equity, inclusion and quality in education.</p> <p><b>Ind. 6:</b> 30 statements made and actions taken by local and national level decision-makers.</p>
--	---	--

- **Target groups and beneficiaries:**

AXIS' intended target groups in the programme are first and foremost marginalized people, especially marginalized, children youth and women. Secondly, the programme targets civil society organizations, national education networks and fosters synergies among partners.

**MARGINALIZED PEOPLE.** The target groups are individuals who have been marginalized due to poverty, inequality, ethnicity, gender etc.

In the programme countries, the marginalized people comprise of similar groups: the poorest, minorities, girls, people from rural communities and people from certain geographical regions. Main development challenges for marginalized people in Ghana, Peru, and Bolivia include a) To overcome poverty and social, ethnic, sexual, gender, and/or economic inequality, b) To obtain equal opportunities for all and c) To secure and maintain quality education for all.

**CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS.** CSOs in South America and West Africa are both partners and among the target groups. CSOs are a **target group** as it is a strategic priority for AXIS to assist partners in strengthening their capacity and stakeholders to strengthen their ability to influence social, cultural, economic, and political processes to improve the livelihood of target groups as well as to strengthen civic space. Through organizational capacity development, AXIS strengthens the partners' ability to implement activities, work in networks with other CSOs, create impact and sustain results. CSOs are also indispensable **partners** as they are legitimate and the ones to make their governments accountable for change and who have the daily and operative cooperation with the target groups. They also provide local management and professional support according to the agreed terms of each intervention. Main development challenges for CSOs in Ghana, Peru, and Bolivia include a) To promote social action and empower local communities in

decision making processes, and b) To work in a political climate where liberal and conservative values sometimes clash.

<b>SOUTH AMERICA</b>						
<b>Countries</b>	<b>Primary/Secondary</b>	<b>No of people</b>	<b>Composition in %</b>			
			<b>Gender (M F)</b>	<b>Youth (age 15-24)</b>	<b>Children (below 15)</b>	<b>Indigenous</b>
Peru	<i>Primary</i>	2055	32% 68%	61%	-	48%
	<i>Secondary</i>	21144	46% 54%	22%	78%	91%
Bolivia	<i>Primary</i>	5800	41% 59%	64%	27%	57%
	<i>Secondary</i>	24800	49% 51%	44%	18%	47%
<b>WEST AFRICA</b>						
Ghana	<i>Primary</i>	5579	57% 43%	1%	78%	N/A
	<i>Secondary</i>	9455	46% 54%	16%	16%	N/A
<b>TOTAL</b>						
Total	<i>Primary</i>	13434	46% 54%	37%	44%	55%
	<i>Secondary</i>	55399	47% 53%	31%	41%	67%

- **Monitoring & Evaluation:**

The programme approach to monitoring encapsulates two levels of interventions in one system: The project level and the programme level. Whereas partner level monitoring deals with the single partner project, the programme level monitoring tracks the overall programme progress in a broader perspective, taking the partner level progress into consideration. There is a close relation and hierarchy between the specific objectives of the six partner projects and the objective, outcomes, and indicators of the programme.

The partner interventions will have their own specific objectives and indicators to monitor progress, which are in alignment with the objective, outcomes and indicators of the overall programme but constitute only fragments or parts of these. The outcomes of the six projects contribute to the outcomes of the programme and the data collected, stored, and analysed at partner level constitute a major part of programme monitoring. AXIS will conduct a mid-term review assessing progress across the six projects and the programme.

The programme M&E system is based on revised formats and guidelines of the first programme phase, and the qualitative and quantitative indicators, in particular, have been co-developed with partners to ensure a common understanding and alignment with partners' own M&E systems.

The programme M&E approach enables AXIS to create and collect knowledge, data and analyses across the six projects of the programme, with the aim to promote mutual learning and innovation among AXIS' partners and, when relevant, other stakeholders. The programme group will - in coordination with the secretariat and project coordinators - ensure that important reflections, risk mitigation measures, important results etc. are captured and shared amongst the partners.

- **Risk analysis and risk management:**

Risks can be both internal and external, and may be of an environmental, programmatic, or operational character. The last 18 months in programme phase 1 have demonstrated just how difficult it can be to predict risks and the biggest disruption to education ever is the COVID-19-related school closures, where several of the intervention countries were particularly hard-hit. Additionally, there was political unrest in Bolivia, and a significant social and political shift to the sexual rights in Ghana, which meant that Comprehensive Sexuality Education became politically controversial, jeopardizing sexual rights.

Based on these experiences, AXIS has developed a risk management tool, which aims to identify and mitigate risks that, if they occur, will jeopardize the achievement of programme goals. Central to the tool is a risk management log, which is to be updated at least twice a year, in a process that supports an ongoing dialogue between the partners around potential disruptions and thereby enable a proactive approach to risks.

- **Sustainability and phasing out:**

In the AXIS' experience, it is essential that the programme does not create dependencies and that activities are focused on strengthening capacities among local stakeholders. AXIS considers organizational, technical, economic, political, social, and cultural sustainability to be prerequisites for successful interventions that achieve impact.

AXIS and partners work continuously with the different aspects of sustainability – dependent on the context and experience of partners. For five programme partners, funding through AXIS constitutes a small percentage of the total partner turnover, reducing the risk for dependency. For one programme partner, Pueblo Diferente, AXIS is the sole donor. As a consequence, the programme is focused on strengthening Pueblo Diferente's capacity for fundraising, developing project proposals, etc.

Additionally, the programme approach to working with sustainability includes:

- Developing locally relevant and feasible models and approaches for quality education, rather than importing standard solutions. It is a best-fit rather than a best-practice mindset.
- Advocating duty bearers such as local education authorities, rather than working on isolated flagship projects that are not fit for system-wide policy changes
- Involving duty bearers in developing solutions and methods early on to ensure their ownership
- Including deliberate exit strategies in all projects and across the programme from the design phase. Basically, AXIS and partners don't design projects that will create dependencies.
- Strengthening local CSOs' capacity as a continued and persistent force in society to claim marginalized groups' rights
- The focus on and direction of programme intervention towards institutional and cultural change

Also, the partners' participation and performance in different networks and alliances to share experiences and knowledge and to enhance policy impact is prioritised. Finally, the approach to sustainability includes responsible climate and environmental conduct in all possible aspects of the programme.

#### 4. Overview of management set-up at programme level

- **Overall organization:**

Being a mainly voluntary CSO, the AXIS' secretariat is small, and staff includes the Executive Director (15 hours per week) and Finance Manager (25 hours per week). They are responsible for daily operations and support to the project groups and partners, while the Quality Assurance (QA) group supports the individual projects in the project design phase and when progress reports are due. Project groups of three to five members (project coordinators) are organized according to partner organization and country and these project groups handle the daily or weekly contact with partners. Furthermore, a programme group is in the process of being established to ensure knowledge sharing, explore synergies and strengthen capacity across the entire programme.

MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE	
<b>AXIS Secretariat</b>	The secretariat includes the Executive Director (ED) and Finance Manager (FM). The secretariat supports the coordinators' work and makes sure that all CISU, DANIDA and AXIS policies are followed.
<b>Technical support</b>	AXIS' Quality Assurance Group is a permanent technical support function that provides support to coordinators during project and programme development with regards to Theory of Change and the Logical Framework Approach. AXIS also depends on experts in the areas of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights and Learning & pedagogical and participatory tools and methods. Ad hoc technical support groups are sometimes established to support capacity building in a specific area, e.g., gender and advocacy.
<b>Coordinators organized in project-specific groups</b>	AXIS' project coordinators are organized in groups with 3-5 members in each group. Each project intervention group is responsible for each partner intervention. The coordinators keep the day-to-day communication with partners and are responsible for the development of new intervention proposals, monitoring and evaluation of existing activities in close dialogue with partners.
<b>Programme group</b>	The programme group will be established during 2021 with the overall responsibility to ensure synergy across projects, systematic focus on the programme's ToC, goals, and results framework,

	contribute to learning and knowledge sharing in Denmark and in the south and contribute to the professional qualification of volunteers.
<b>Programme partners</b>	The six programme partners are at the forefront of implementation and community engagement, as well as the legitimate voices in the dialogue with the duty bearers and key stakeholders. The partners have a close relationship with the target groups, in-depth knowledge of the local context and professional competencies to work for equity, inclusion, and quality in education. Each partner organization will, alone or together with other partner organizations (e.g., two partners collaborating on joint objectives) have responsibility for one programme intervention in cooperation with AXIS. With support from AXIS, the partners will support local and national advocacy to scale up local experiences, create impact and ensure sustainability.

- **Financial Management:**

The day-to-day financial management is carried out by a Finance Manager (FM) with the help of an assistant. The FM and the Executive Director (ED) make all payments related to projects and programme interventions on request from partners. The ED and FM both have access to the bank account and all payments from the bank must be approved by both. The ED and/or Chairman of the Board approve payments related to organizational matters.

When preparing new projects, the partner and coordinator group prepare a 1-page document with a project description. This must be approved by the representative of the QA group. After approval, the partner and coordinator group proceed with the preparation of the project, in continuous dialogue with the QA group. When the work is completed, the document and budget must be approved by the ED and FM by agreement and by the representative from the QA group.

AXIS' partners request money for the project quarterly. The amount they request are set in a budget, approved by both parties or based on the project's total budget, where the various budget items relating to the partner are divided into the number of trimesters they apply for. The coordinator group checks and approves the transfer request and then forwards it to the FM, who is responsible for placing the transfer. Furthermore, AXIS' voluntary coordinator groups collaborate with the partner in Bolivia, Peru, or Ghana with various task related to the budget .

At least once a month the financial assistant makes organizational accounting of all financial activities. The FM revises and approves all entries before final entry into the accounting system. Programme accounting is done yearly by an external accountant.

Four times a year the Secretariat/FM present a financial status to The Executive Committee under the Board. Once a year, The General Assembly approves the organizational budget for the coming year. AXIS has established financial thresholds and review procedures for overspending at the budget line level.

By the end of the year, an external accountant will audit AXIS' organizational accounts. Each partner will send audited accounts from AXIS programme activities audited by local auditors. The local auditors' reports will form part of the overall annual audit report on AXIS' financial activities. Any remarks from local auditors must be reviewed as part of the audit for the following year.

AXIS uses hourly registrations when salaries for Danish staff are settled in the program. These hourly registrations are included as appendices in the bookkeeping.

AXIS has an anti-corruption policy, which is now also being included and reflected in AXIS' agreements with its partner organisations. The policy includes action plans and lines of communication, in case of any suspicion of misuse of funds, fraud, bribe and other corrupt practices. Danida's anti-corruption clause is being included in the partner agreements.

## 5. The programme budget

AXIS " A more equal and just world through quality education and a strong civil society"						
<i>Budget in DKK</i>						
Turnover Budget - CSF and co-financing	Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of PPA
A. Expected Liquid Funds (funds raised in Denmark)	0	0	0	0	0	0,0%
B. Programme CSF Funds	15.880.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	n/a
C. Expected Co-financing	6.000.000	1.500.000	1.500.000	1.500.000	1.500.000	43,3%
D. TOTAL	21.880.000	5.470.000	5.470.000	5.470.000	5.470.000	
Liquid Funds (funds raised in Denmark) (A) in % of PPA	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	0,0%	
Co-financing (C) in % of PPA	43,3%	43,2%	43,5%	43,2%	43,2%	
<i>Budget in DKK</i>						
CSF Budget - Outcome and Cost Category breakdown						
Main budget lines	Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
I. Programme and Project Activities (PPA) (Details below)	13.860.488	3.470.117	3.450.124	3.470.124	3.470.124	87%
Outcome 1	7.032.833	1.816.160	1.807.076	1.736.227	1.673.371	51%
<i>Head Cost Category A1</i>	1.412.581	352.830,63	317.833,50	375.333,25	366.583,50	20%
<i>Head Cost Category A2</i>	5.202.589	1.371.101,25	1.372.013,99	1.261.164,99	1.198.308,99	74%
<i>Head Cost Category A3</i>	417.663	92.227,69	117.228,56	99.728,56	108.478,56	6%
Outcome 2	6.827.655	1.653.956,95	1.643.047,96	1.733.896,71	1.796.752,96	49%
<i>Head Cost Category A1</i>	1.412.581	352.830,63	317.833,50	375.333,25	366.583,50	21%
<i>Head Cost Category A2</i>	4.997.410	1.208.898,64	1.207.985,90	1.258.834,90	1.321.690,90	73%
<i>Head Cost Category A3</i>	417.663	92.227,69	117.228,56	99.728,56	108.478,56	6%
II. Total PPA Costs Budget	13.860.488	3.470.117	3.450.124	3.470.124	3.470.124	87%
A5. Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	120.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	n/a
A6. Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	660.634	160.164	180.156	160.157	160.156	n/a
A7. Auditing in Denmark	200.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	1%
III. Total Direct Costs Budget	14.841.122	3.710.281	3.710.280	3.710.280	3.710.280	93%
III. B1. Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	1.038.878	259.720	259.720	259.720	259.720	n/a
IV. Grand Total Costs Budget	15.880.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	100%
CSF Budget: Summary table of Cost Categories (Automatically calculated.)						
Cost category	Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
A1 Direct activity cost	2.825.162	705.661	635.667	750.667	733.167	18%
A2 Implementation through local independent partner	10.200.000	2.580.000	2.580.000	2.520.000	2.520.000	64%
A3 Allocated programme support cost	835.327	184.455	234.457	199.457	216.957	5%
A5 Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	120.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	1%
A6 Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	660.634	160.164	180.156	160.157	160.156	4%
A7 Auditing in Denmark	200.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	1%
B1 Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	1.038.878	259.720	259.720	259.720	259.720	7%
Total / control	15.880.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	100%
CSF Budget - Geographical breakdown						
Main budget lines	Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
I. Programme and Project Activities (PPA) (Details below)	13.860.488	3.470.117	3.450.124	3.470.124	3.470.124	n/a
PPA Geographical breakdown of A1+A2+A3 in intervention countries						n/a
Peru	3.625.000	895.000	923.333	903.333	903.333	23%
Bolivia	3.260.000	830.000	823.333	803.333	803.333	21%
Ghana	3.315.000	855.000	833.333	813.333	813.333	21%
Total PPA in intervention countries	10.200.000	2.580.000	2.580.000	2.520.000	2.520.000	64%
Geographical breakdown of A1+A3 in non-intervention countries						n/a
Denmark (A1 + A3)	3.660.488	890.117	870.124	950.124	950.124	23%
Total PPA in non-intervention countries	3.660.488	890.117	870.124	950.124	950.124	23%
II. Total PPA Costs Budget	13.860.488	3.470.117	3.450.124	3.470.124	3.470.124	87%
Other costs in Denmark (A5, A7 and B1)	1.358.878	339.720	339.720	339.720	339.720	9%
Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA), A5	120.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	30.000	n/a
Auditing in Denmark, A7	200.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	50.000	1%
Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget), B1	1.038.878	259.720	259.720	259.720	259.720	7%
Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA), A6	660.634	160.164	180.156	160.157	160.156	n/a
IV. Grand Total Costs Budget	15.880.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	3.970.000	100%

## 6. Overall assessment according to CISU Programme guidelines

STRATEGIC RELEVANCE		Score 1-5
<b>Criteria 1</b>	<b>Strategic orientation: Strengthening civil society in the global South and relevance to the Sustainable Development Goals</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS' overall goal and strategy with a focus on quality education and active citizenship are reflected in the programme's objectives, Theory of Change (ToC) and strategy. The programme objective is: "By 2026, local, regional, or national policies to support equity, inclusion and quality in education have been approved, implemented and/or funded in Ghana, Peru and Bolivia". It is noted that the original development objective has been taken out. The programme objective is supported by two outcomes: 1. By 2026, new participatory and pedagogical models and approaches have been proven to improve equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the programme target groups. 2. By 2026, programme partners and stakeholders have effectively advocated for better equity, inclusion, and quality in education towards local, regional, and national duty bearers.</p> <p>Overall, the programme document reflects coherence of AXIS' overall mandate, vision and strategy with the objectives and the strategic orientation. AXIS and partners are engaged in promoting and advocating for the fulfilment of the Sustainable Development Goals, focusing on quality education and SRHR/SDG 4, and SDG 5 on gender equality, SDG 10 reduced inequalities just as the crosscutting priorities of SDG 17 (partnership) form part of the overall strategic approach. The partners are catalysts for change as they – alone or in alliance with targets groups and other civil society organisations – make awareness of problems in equity, inclusion and quality in education and push for duty bearers to take responsibility for bringing about necessary social, cultural, and political change. In terms of proposing new and innovative strategic and professional approaches within the thematic field covered by the application, it is mentioned that during phase 1, programme partners together with AXIS have taken the first step in an innovation process by shaping, moulding and adapting participatory pedagogical methods to a new context and validated that they work. In the second programme phase partners across West Africa and South America will both continue to develop teaching methodologies, while also taking the next step in the innovation process: Scaling up by advocating and engaging duty bearers. This process will be supported by a position paper on quality education, which though being quite brief is now in place.</p> <p>In conclusion, the AXIS' programme is assessed to present an overall strategic orientation, which is solid and will contribute to strengthen civil society in the global South so that it has the independence, space, diversity and capacity to influence and promote the realisation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		4
<b>Criteria 2</b>	<b>Relevance of civil society partners and their local, national and/or global networking partners</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS is assessed to have a track record in engaging in meaningful, equal, and mutually committing partnerships with relevant South-based actors. The approach is described by AXIS in the following way: Partnerships that are both broad in scope, deep in content and with a high frequency of meetings enables AXIS to tailor the programme to the context and react quickly and appropriate to changes. AXIS now has a partnership strategy in place, which reflects an approach to assessing partners based on the "to be- to do – to relate model", and therefore the approach, which is still being developed, reflects a lean and uncomplicated tool for partner assessment. Overall, the programme document is suggesting that AXIS has a good track record and approaches within capacity development to strengthen partners in implementing activities and in using and maintaining results sustainably.</p> <p>AXIS will be phasing out two of its partners (Pachatusan in Peru, CARL in Sierra Leone), and the thus the new phase will include six partners as opposed to the current eight, which also reflects the situation that by having eight partners, the budget for some partners would be lower than during the current phase, just as a programme with six partners would be more manageable. This also has the consequence that the AXIS programme will no longer include Sierra Leone.</p> <p>In terms of networking, the programme document includes some examples of networking, e.g. in</p>		5

<p>Ghana, where the partners NORSAAC and RAINS are both active members of regional and national networks on the implementation of the SDGs, education, SRHR, Comprehensive Sexuality Education (CSE) and Child Protection. There are similar examples in Peru, and it should be noted that also in Peru, Danish International Børnesolidaritet (IBS) and AXIS have begun the coordination of a joint project with TAREA on youth and citizenship.</p> <p>Commenting on the draft assessment, AXIS informs that the coordination between AXIS and IBS stretches beyond Peru and both AXIS and IBS work with citizenship in projects in Peru and Bolivia, which is seen as a good possibility to develop the theme further than the project with TAREA.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to present comprehensive partnership engagements, which are contributing to the development of a strong, independent, vocal, and diverse civil society in the global South through meaningful, equal, and mutually committing partnerships. AXIS is phasing out two of its partners, and thus the programme no longer includes Sierra Leone. The new phase will include six partners as opposed to the current eight, which would make the programme more manageable. A partnership strategy is now in place, and as part of this an assessment tool, which will be further developed.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>	
---	--

<b>CAPACITY</b>		<b>Score 1-5</b>
<b>Criteria 3</b>	<b>Organisational capacity and popular involvement</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS is assessed to have adequate management systems in place for planning, implementing, and monitoring the overall programme portfolio. This includes human resource strategies and systems to ensure that staff can sustain main strategic intervention areas of the proposed partnership engagement. The AXIS has recently finalized a partnership strategy, which includes a framework for both assessing new partners and continuous dialogue with existing partners. In the planned programme phase, the number of partners is reduced from eight to six to avoid spreading the efforts too thinly. AXIS has always been a mainly voluntary CSO with a small secretariat and will continue this strategy. When AXIS became a programme organization, a new management structure was introduced, but as it turned out to be too complex, it was later adjusted. Inspired by input from external consultants plus the recent external review, AXIS is in the process of establishing a programme group that aims to ensure knowledge sharing, explore synergies and strengthen capacity across the entire programme, which includes facilitating the volunteers' engagement in AXIS. Overall, this is indicating that the organisational structure also in the new phase is able to ensure satisfactory accountability while also promoting responsiveness and flexibility. A special characteristic of AXIS is the high degree of involvement and commitment on the part of its volunteers. A coordinator group has been established for each partner. It carries out follow-up on project formulation and implementation. The volunteers come from all areas of society, age groups etc. with several new organizational bodies to promote more synergies, cross-project learning, stronger advocacy, and thereby strengthen the capacity to deliver results in a cost-effective manner. On this basis, AXIS is assessed to hold proven capacity to extend and develop applicant's position to create popular engagement in development cooperation.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS has a solid track record with CISU. The organisation is assessed to demonstrate effective organisational capacity, including human resources, to enhance development effectiveness of the organisation by maintaining satisfactory professional competency and technical capacity. A "programme group" is in the process of being established aimed at addressing issues pertinent to the programme level and enable the volunteers' engagement in AXIS. AXIS is a mainly voluntary CSO with a solid practice of facilitating the volunteers' engagement. On this basis, AXIS is assessed to show a record of involving relevant groups and stakeholders in the Danish society to broaden and sustain popular involvement and engagement with development cooperation.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		4

<b>Criteria 4</b>	<b>Financial management and administrative capacity</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS is assessed to generally meet the requirements set by CISU. The assessment is based on the external review report and the latest financial monitoring visit from CISU to AXIS (February 2021), where only minor issues for follow-up were identified. This is suggesting that systems, procedures, and capacities to assess and monitor financial performance, including adequate internal financial and administrative control systems, are in place. It is noted that the AXIS' financial manual has recently been updated. This includes a brief internal procedure for the use of Technical Assistance, Global Activities and Unallocated Funds. Finally, in terms of AXIS' ability to track expenditures in relation to results achievements during programme implementation, this is to be facilitated by the adjusted programme budget, as it is expected that results monitoring will be linked to the budget thus enabling resource reallocation if necessary.</p> <p>The organisation confirms that an anti-corruption policy is now in place, ready for implementation, including training and implementation also at partner level. The anti-corruption policy includes clear measures, which are to prevent, disclose and actively follow up on financial irregularities at all levels, both internally and, when relevant, with respect to partners. A plan for PSHEA, which includes the protection of whistle-blowers, has been developed and is to be further elaborated in 2021 and 2022.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to maintain a very satisfactory internal level of financial management and administrative capacity, which is adequate for meeting the overall requirements and responsibilities related to management of CISU grants.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		4
<b>Criteria 5</b>	<b>Analytical capacity and learning</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS is assessed to demonstrate ability to ensure context and stakeholder analysis as a basis for programme design, planning and innovation, though stakeholder analysis could have been more elaborate in the present programme document. The global COVID-19 pandemic has hit the partner countries hard. Several context-related challenges have influenced the programme, including political instability, e.g. in Bolivia. AXIS has been following the different contexts very closely and made adaptations, which include some adjustments of results with slightly lower targets. The organisation now has a risk management plan in place, which includes as sample of risks and a risk-log that is to be updated twice year. In terms of learning, the program document explains that learning in AXIS takes place in a synergetic dialogue across the organization as well as in the direct collaboration with individual partners. In order to anchor learning across the programme more firmly in the M&amp;E, AXIS has changed the programme setup to include a Programme Group who will be responsible for learning and synergy across the programme. A structure of learning is reflected. Commenting on the draft assessment, AXIS informs that thorough stakeholder analyses have been completed with all partners at project level looking into strengths, weaknesses, possibilities in their context and with regards to their specific stakeholder, both in terms of target groups, allies, CSO partners and targets of advocacy.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to have solid capacity to undertake comprehensive context analysis and risk assessments, and to utilize evidence-based learning from programme implementation to inform analysis, planning and innovation of strategies and operational approaches. The capacity has been tested during the global COVID-19 pandemic, which has hit the partner countries hard. In terms of risk management, a risk management plan is now in place.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		4
<b>Criteria 6</b>	<b>Delivering and documenting results</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS is assessed to demonstrate capacity – together with partners in the global South – to monitor and report on significant changes at the level of targeted rights holders. A results framework has been established at programme level and for each of the partner interventions. Each intervention now has a set of objectives, results and indicators that are directly related to the overall programme level. In addition, each partner intervention has a specific objective, results and indicators which are relevant for each of the partners. The external review of phase 1 concluded</p>		4



<p>that in general, there is a solid logic between the different levels, and it has been possible to formulate indicators that have quantitative targets as well as targets defined by partners, just as there is a coherence and linkage between programme and partner interventions. Thus, AXIS has track record on delivering and documenting results progressively. However, in terms of documenting significant changes at outcome level, AXIS aims to develop a more systematic approach, and also validate the quality of the ToC, and therefore the organisation has initiated three country-level studies, which show interesting results. Furthermore, the general documentation of the “quality part” of the indicators is an issue, which AXIS plans to improve during the last 6 months of the phase 1 – in dialogue with partners, and thereby be in place before the upstart of phase 2. In particular, there is need for investing in documenting how participants apply knowledge or change behavior. Finally, AXIS is assessed to have a track record of prioritising budget resources in cost-effective manner, which in the external review report has been based on the following: In Denmark, salaries follow the level of teachers; per diem is lower than the Danida rates; project coordinators are paid a fee when on travel, but the fee has been maintained at the same reasonable level since 2018, just as AXIS does not pay incentives to workshop participants when carrying out activities in the Global South.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to have demonstrated solid ability to deliver results progressively in a cost-effective manner in previous Danida funded interventions. It is noted that in terms of delivering and documenting results at outcome level, AXIS and partners have by use of impact studies come a good way in regard to monitoring and reporting on significant changes at the level of targeted rights holders.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>	
---	--

<b>PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES</b>		<b>Score 1-5</b>
<b>Criteria 7</b>	<b>Theory of Change and programme synergy</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>In general, the AXIS’ ToC reflects a logical link between the context and the interventions. The change triangle is central to the ToC and strategy, and advocacy is clearly reflected. The programme document states that the specific approaches have been chosen based on the local needs, the capacity of partners and the possibilities in terms of changing local, regional or national policies and decisions, which will help ensure sustainability. On this basis, AXIS and partners are assessed to have based the ToC on thorough analyses of the context, desired changes, and to some extent stakeholder identification, including duty bearers and rights holders.</p> <p>Two programme outcomes constitute the proposed engagement: 1. Outcome 1.1 By 2026, new participatory and pedagogical models and approaches have been proven to improve equity, inclusion and/or quality in education for the programme target groups; 2. Outcome 2.1 By 2026, programme partners and stakeholders have effectively advocated for better equity, inclusion, and quality in education towards local, regional, and national duty bearers.</p> <p>The ToC diagram and the narrative describing the change pathway are assessed to reflect a coherent and relevant balance between the programme’s strategic deliveries, capacity building and advocacy, with clear potential for advocacy. The presentation of the preconditions in the ToC diagram is slightly confusing and while the budget breakdown section (p. 39) clarifies somewhat how the programme gets from A to B, it is confusing that the sequence is different in the two sections. The previous SRHR-element forms part of the definition of equity. Following up on the external review in regard to strengthening the synergy between partners and in the programme as a whole, AXIS and partners have identified targets at country level interventions that contribute to the programme level. This includes advocacy activities, which are carried out jointly by programme partners. Overall, the ToC is assessed to present a sufficiently clear and logical link from the context and stakeholder analyses, to intervention logic and key assumptions, to objectives and outcomes. In regard to what can be termed the programme’s policy link, AXIS’ track record in bringing operational experience and objectives to bear in relevant national, regional and/or global policy processes seems less tangible, but it must on the other hand be observed that a lot has proven impossible due to the Covid-19 pandemic. However, it is noted that in the planned programme</p>		4

	<p>phase, the policy link is weakened by the somewhat general stakeholder analysis plus “weak” outcome indicators on the effect of advocacy (ref. results framework).</p> <p>Commenting on the draft assessment, AXIS informs that thorough stakeholder analyses have been completed with all partners at project level. In terms of the outcome indicators, AXIS explains that as partners across the programme are working at different levels, from local to national and beyond, and as their focus is on various stakeholders, different processes and to change various issues related to quality, equity and inclusion in education, the outcome indicators at programme level are broad and do not cover the detailed changes captured in each project document.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to present how the respective programme interventions create synergy to the overall programme approach in the form of a programme Theory of Change. Furthermore, AXIS presents a relevant ToC, which includes each of the two programme outcomes that constitute the proposed engagement. However, it is noted that the ToC elements in the ToC figure have not been numbered just as the sequence is not identical with the ToC elements listed elsewhere in the programme document. In regard to strengthening the synergy between partners and in the programme as a whole, AXIS and partners have identified targets at country level interventions that contribute to the programme level. The narrative description considers some of the relevant risks that may hinder or delay programme outcomes. Overall, the pathway from local to national level advocacy initiatives has been further elaborated in the full programme document. However, in terms of what can be termed the policy link, the key assumption that the partners and local stakeholders via advocacy will be able to engage duty-bearers not only at the local level is weakened by the somewhat general stakeholder analysis plus “weak” outcome indicators on the effect of advocacy. Thus, the policy link would benefit from being further substantiated in order to make it probable that the programme effectively will contribute to achieving the objective and outcomes.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 4, which is given, when there is solid indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>	
<b>Criteria 8</b>	<b>Result Framework and M&amp;E system</b>	<b>Score:</b>
	<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The results framework presented is assessed to reflect coherence and linkage between programme and partner interventions, including the expected outcomes and problems, which the programme addresses. However, in terms of outcome 2, the indicators would benefit from being more outcome-oriented if they are to support the documentation of the expected change achieved based on advocacy, with the project specific targets for outcome indicator 6 being a good and relevant example of what is required in order to measure change.</p> <p>The approach to programme monitoring includes both the project level and the programme level. The partner interventions will have their own specific objectives and indicators to monitor progress, which are in alignment with the objective, outcomes and indicators of the overall programme but constitute only fragments or parts of these. The outcomes of the six projects contribute to the outcomes of the programme and the data collected, stored, and analysed at partner level constitute a major part of programme monitoring. On this basis, the approach to programme monitoring and evaluation is assessed as relevant as it encourages reflection on the ToC-assumptions on which the programme is based. It will be the role of the new programme group to capture and share the risk factors and strategies for risk mitigation, though it is not clear who will from part of the programme group. At the planned monthly coordination and progress meetings, focus will be on systematizing mutual learning and innovation related to the programme, also aimed at integrating MEL systematically with partners, including using ToC as a tool for planning and learning. This is suggesting a relevant approach to creating and sharing knowledge, data and analyses and promoting mutual learning and innovation among CSOs and stakeholders. Commenting on the draft assessment, AXIS explains that as partners across the programme are working at different levels, the outcome indicators at programme level are broad. Furthermore, AXIS argues that the combination of outcome 2 indicators presents a fuller picture, which is output-oriented.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to present a fairly coherent summary results framework at programme level, but it is noted that some of the indicators would benefit from being more outcome-oriented. Furthermore, AXIS is assessed to have a proven system to operate sub-results</p>	3

frameworks at thematic and/or country level for relevant parts of the proposed programme. Furthermore, AXIS has a description of the M&E approach to be applied on a programme level. <i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 3, which is given, when there is indication that supports the criteria.</i>		
<b>Criteria 9</b>	<b>A human rights-based approach (HRBA)</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The human rights-based approach is an essential part of the programme, where all interventions are focused on equity, inclusion, and quality in education, and people are empowered to demand their rights and change society. The programme is focused on building capacity of rights holders to claim their rights as well as building the capacity and willingness of duty bearers to meet the demands and take on their responsibilities. On this basis, AXIS is assessed to have a track record and approach to mainstreaming HRBA principles of participation, accountability, non-discrimination, and transparency (PANT) in individual components, with partner organisations and also internally.</p> <p>It is noted that the first phase of the programme included two thematic focus areas Context-based Education and Sexual and Reproductive Health and Rights Education, but these have now been merged into: Equity, inclusion, and quality in education, which includes SRHR. AXIS is assessed to have a track record and approach to supporting women and girls in the fulfilment of their rights in the proposed partnership engagement and in individual interventions. As for non-discrimination against any group, it is noted that AXIS cannot promote LGBTI issues in Africa at the moment, but speaks broadly about the importance of tolerance and acceptance of plurality among young persons. Overall, the programme is assessed to a high degree to contribute to strengthen civil society organising and to promote the fulfilment of rights and equal access to an education for everyone, including indigenous people, which signals that the programme aims to bring about sustainable improvements for poor, marginalised and vulnerable target groups (the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind').</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to present a proposed programme with interventions clearly based on a HRBA, gender equality, and the principle of poverty orientation with a particular and strong focus on poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups, incl. indigenous people (the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind').</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		5
<b>Criteria 10</b>	<b>Sustainability</b>	<b>Score:</b>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The AXIS' programme document contains reflections on the programme's sustainability, including that sustainability must be incorporated in the design and be an integrated part of the ToC and methodological approach. The understanding of sustainability of the interventions includes: developing locally relevant models; advocating duty bearer locally; involving duty bearers in developing solutions; and methods; the focus on and direction of programme intervention towards institutional and cultural change; and finally, not least the strengthening local CSOs' capacity as a continued and persistent force in society to claim marginalized groups' rights and also engage them in development processes. On this basis, the programme is assessed to have potential to ensure that local partners and target groups have strengthened capacity and does not end up in an inappropriate relationship of dependency. For one partner, Pueblo Diferente in Bolivia, AXIS is the sole donor, and thus the programme is focused on strengthening Pueblo Diferente's capacity for fundraising, proposal writing etc. In terms of exit-strategies, AXIS will be including deliberate exit strategies in all projects and across the programme from the design phase.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to present a convincing analysis of the sustainability of key expected changes achieved during the programme period, including how the intervention strengthens civil society entities that promote social justice. In terms of exit-strategies, AXIS will be including deliberate exit strategies in all projects and across the programme from the design phase. Reflections on responsible climate and environmental conduct in line with the Sustainability Model (presented in the Guidelines for the Civil Society Fund) are included in the programme document.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		5

Criteria 11	Financial resources and Cost Level	Score:
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>The total applied budget amounts to DKK 15.880.000 – with a four-year annual distribution of DKK 3.970.000. Expected co-financing, in total 6 Mio. coming from Hempel Foundation, brings the total budget to DKK 21.880.000.</p> <p>DKK 13.860.488 covers PPA costs, covering the two outcomes and the three cost categories, but the budget only contains a general specification of the costs.</p> <p>With regard to the three cost categories (A1, A2, A3), DKK 2.825.162 (18 %) covers direct activity costs (A1), DKK 10.200.000 (64%) of the applied budget covers implementation (A2) in Bolivia, Ghana and Peru, whereas DKK 835.327 (5%) has been allocated to programme support costs. A mid-term evaluation is included.</p> <p>In total DKK 2.688.164 has been allocated to Danish Pay roll costs, equivalent to 17% of the applied budget.</p> <p>The detailed budget (sheet 1.c) is structured around the six elements derived from the ToC (numbering is not reflected in the ToC diagram), organized by outcome. Under each of the two outcomes, three ToC elements are highlighted, and in the programme document, it is explained that each ToC element has a corresponding budget line under which all programme-related costs are categorized, which aims to illustrate how resources are linked to the ToC pathways.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the budget line references do not include budget line numbers in the programme document (page 39). The detailed budget has been drawn up at a fairly high level, in the sense that the unit types primarily refer to the ToC elements, e.g.: ToC 1.1 (where the text is: <i>AXIS supports partners in building their capacity with regards to participatory models and approaches for equity, inclusion and quality in education</i>). This use of cost sub-categories is assessed as not being in line with the new CISU programme budget guide and must be corrected. Also noted is that the support by AXIS (1.2.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2) is included under A2, which does not reflect a correct use of the A-cost categories.</p> <p>In response to the draft assessment, AXIS has submitted a revised budget, where the use of cost sub-categories has been adjusted so that it is now in line with the new CISU budget guide, just as the phrasing of the budget-lines 1.2.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2 included under A2 has been corrected.</p> <p>On this basis, there is now solid indication of coherence, as the detailed budget reflects relationship between expected results, intervention logic and size of target group, including Danish costs. Funding from Hempel is mentioned and will be running till 2025, which signals that AXIS has been successful in obtaining supplementary resources (for both applying organization and relevant local partners), which could lead to mobilizing and cooperating with other actors to expand access to resources and financing, thus boosting the effect and sustainability of all their actions.</p> <p>In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to present a budget that identifies and separates costs incurred at partner level and costs relating to the Danish applicant. The detailed budget has been drawn up on the basis of the six ToC elements, which suggests that AXIS will be capable of reviewing costs and outcomes during programme implementation to reallocate budgetary resources to enhance cost effectiveness. In the revised budget, the use of cost sub-categories has been adjusted so that it is now in line with the new CISU budget guide, just as the phrasing of the budget-lines 1.2.1, 2.2.1, 2.2.2 included under A2 has been corrected. On this basis, the spending on administration, travel, and salaries both in partner country and in Denmark is assessed as proportionate to the cost level and the total budget. Co-financing has been secured.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 3, which is given, when there is indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>	<p>3</p>	<p>3</p>
<p>Assessment:</p> <p>AXIS is assessed to have a track record of exploring new ways of engaging volunteers and a larger and more diverse segment of the Danish public. AXIS has involved both specialists (resource persons, development workers) and wider population groups linked to the education sector (e.g. teacher seminars and student teachers) in the programme. An example shared in the CN showed that, independently of support from CISU, AXIS has contributed to approximately 350 young people who have worked with a partner in Peru, either as part of their teacher training and in collaboration with teacher seminars, or as volunteers. AXIS' volunteers take part in the Danish Education Coalition under Global Focus, which is the Danish part of Global Campaign for Education.</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>5</p>

In order to avoid that AXIS' volunteers become too stretched, as they have had to deal both with "their" project intervention while simultaneously think of programme synergy and connection with other partners, a Programme Group is now in place. A strategy for popular engagement is now in place, which reflect how AXIS plans to contribute and promote the approach of dialogue-based, participatory education. Three objectives have been formulated: visibility in public debate; increased digital presence; and increased number of volunteers. AXIS aims to share experiences and learning on the development challenges faced by systematizing materials and videos which can be used both in the Global South and in Denmark. On this basis, the organisation is assessed to strengthen the understanding of and interest in global development challenges e.g., in the context of the SDGs, and the role of civil society partners, and the new strategy for popular engagement provides a plan for how to for how develop this in future.

In conclusion, AXIS is assessed to a high extent to engage with relevant groups and stakeholders in Denmark to strengthen understanding of and interest in selected global development challenges, the role of local partners and civil society in general.

*The score based on the assessment criteria is 5, which is given, when there is comprehensive indication that supports the criteria.*

<b>Overall conclusion and budget (based on scoring and former budget level):</b>			
Scoring aggregated and weighted	AXIS	Average score for all applying programmes	Gain in % of AXIS
	82,4	77,2	5%
Budget:	Applied amount/year:	Gain / loss due to competition:	Final budget amount/year
	3.970.000	188.200	4.160.000

**Embassy screening (if any):**

Comments from Embassies	
Response from applicant (if any)	

Comments from Embassies	
Response from applicant (if any)	

## QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

File number/F2 reference: 2019-1911

Programme/Project name: AXIS - A more equal and just world through quality education and a strong civil society – 2. phase 2022-2025

Programme/Project period: Jan. 2022 - Dec. 2025 (48 months)

Budget: 16.640.000

Presentation of quality assurance process:

*Quality assurance has been implemented by Civil Society in Development, CISU, who are managing the pooled funds on behalf of the MFA and external consultants. Project documents have also been reviewed by the desk officer. The MFA has also provided input and comments for an earlier version of the concept note.*

The design of the programme/project has been appraised by someone independent who has not been involved in the development of the programme/project.

*Comments: The project design has been appraised by CISU and by an external assessment consultant. The partners are recommended to systematically monitor the TOC, including the underlying assumptions for change, and with focus on the partner component and the results of the Core Cost Grants.*

The recommendations of the appraisal has been reflected upon in the final design of the programme/project.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project complies with Danida policies and Aid Management Guidelines, including the fundamental principles of Doing Development Differently.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project addresses relevant challenges and provides adequate responses.

*Comments: AXIS' overall goal and strategy with a focus on quality education and active citizenship are reflected in the programme's objectives, Theory of Change (ToC) and strategy. The programme objective is: "By 2026, local, regional, or national policies to support equity, inclusion and quality in education have been approved, implemented and/or funded in Ghana, Peru and Bolivia". The AXIS' programme is assessed to present an overall strategic orientation, which is solid and will contribute to strengthen civil society in the global South so that it has the independence, space, diversity and capacity to influence and promote the realisation of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG).*

Issues related to HRBA, LNOB, Gender, Youth, Climate Change, Green Growth and Environment have been addressed sufficiently in relation to content of the project/programme.

*Comments: AXIS is assessed to present a proposed programme with interventions clearly based on a HRBA, gender equality, youth, and the principle of poverty orientation with a particular and strong focus on poor, marginalised and*

vulnerable groups, incl. indigenous people (the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind'). While the focus of the programme is not climate change or green growth, reflections on responsible climate and environmental conduct in line with the Sustainability Model (presented in the Guidelines for the Civil Society Fund) are included in the programme document.

Comments from the Danida Programme Committee have been addressed (if applicable).  
*Comments: N.A.*

The programme/project outcome(s) are found to be sustainable and in line with the partner's development policies and strategies. Implementation modalities are well described and justified.

*Comments: AXIS is assessed to present a convincing analysis of the sustainability of key expected changes achieved during the programme period, including how the intervention strengthens civil society entities that promote social justice. In terms of exit-strategies, AXIS will be including deliberate exit strategies in all projects and across the programme from the design phase.*

The theory of change, results framework, indicators and monitoring framework of the programme/project provide an adequate basis for monitoring results and outcome.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project is found sound budget-wise.

*Comments: Yes.*

The programme/project is found realistic in its time-schedule.

*Comments: Yes.*

Other donors involved in the same programme/project have been consulted, and possible harmonised common procedures for funding and monitoring have been explored.

*Comments: N.A.*

Key programme/project stakeholders have been identified, the choice of partner has been justified and criteria for selection have been documented.

*Comments: AXIS is assessed to present comprehensive partnership engagements, which are contributing to the development of a strong, independent, vocal, and diverse civil society in the global South through meaningful, equal, and mutually committing partnerships. AXIS is phasing out two of its partners, and thus the programme no longer includes Sierra Leone. The new phase will include six partners as opposed to the current eight, which would make the programme more manageable. A partnership strategy is now in place, and as part of this an assessment tool, which will be further developed.*

The implementing partner(s) is/are found to have the capacity to properly manage, implement and report on the funds for the programme/project and lines of management responsibility are clear.

*Comments: Yes.*

Implementing partner(s) has/have been informed about Denmark's zero-tolerance policies towards (i) Anti-corruption; (ii) Child labour; (iii) Sexual exploitation, abuse and harassment (SEAH); and, (iv) Anti-terrorism.

*Comments: Yes.*

Risks involved have been considered and risk management integrated in the programme/project document.

*Comments: Yes.*

In conclusion, the programme/project can be recommended for approval: Yes

Date and signature of Desk Officer: 05.11.2021

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Kjer', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Date and signature of Management: 05.11.2021