




















































Sustainable and Equal Quality Educational Opportunities for All

<p>Key results/outcomes: 1: Local implementing partners follow their country-specific Theory of Change in promoting advocacy issues for Inclusive Education from the grassroots level to the national level 2: Local implementing partners empower CS groups to take a central role in promoting inclusion of children with special education needs (CSEN) and girls in social structures and their countries' educational systems 3: Innovative promotion of IE in fragile contexts through a nexus approach (for Sudan and South Sudan only)</p> <p>Justification for support: The programme focuses on children facing barriers to learning (CFBL), with particular attention placed on children with special educational needs (CSEN), and girls facing barriers to learning. The program operates in two different contexts (stable and fragile) but pursuing the similar objectives. Thus, Kenya and Tanzania have stable programme contexts while South Sudan and Sudan represent fragile contexts. In this third phase there will be more focus on advocacy led by local partners, especially in the stabile contexts. 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>Major risks and challenges: The risk management plan and strategy identify, and categorises, potential risks into the following: financial, political, operational, social and cultural, logistical and physical, and (in the case of South Sudan) power and interest. The programme has put in place strategies on how to mitigate the identified risks.</p>	File No. 2019-1911																	
	Country Kenya, Sudan, South Sudan and Tanzania																	
	Responsible Unit HCE																	
	Sector 15150																	
	<i>DKK mill.</i>																	
	Commitment 3.7 3.7 3.7 3.7 15																	
	Projected Disb. 3.7 3.7 3.7 3.7 15																	
	Duration Jan. 2022 - Dec. 2025 (48 months)																	
	Finance Act code. 06.33.01.12																	
	Head of unit Mette Thygesen																	
	Desk officer Marie Theil Kjær																	
	Financial officer CISU's controller																	
	Relevant SDGs <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 & Production</td> </tr> <tr> <td> Climate Action</td> <td> Life below Water</td> <td> Life on Land</td> <td> Peace & 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

	Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
Cost category						

A1	Direct activity cost	5.417.296	1.354.324	1.354.324	1.354.324	1.354.324	29%
A2	Implementation through local independent partner	9.332.804	2.333.201	2.333.201	2.333.201	2.333.201	50%
A3	Allocated programme support cost	1.416.368	354.092	354.092	354.092	354.092	8%
A5	Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	321.600	80.400	80.400	80.400	80.400	2%
A6	Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	947.260	236.815	236.815	236.815	236.815	5%
A7	Auditing in Denmark	60.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	0%
B1	Administration in Demark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	1.224.672	306.168	306.168	306.168	306.168	7%
	Total applied amount before scoring	18.720.000	4.680.000	4.680.000	4.680.000	4.680.000	
	Total granted amount after scoring	14.980.000	3.745.000	3.745.000	3.745.000	3.745.000	

After scoring a total of **DKK 15 mill.** is approved (against applied DKK 18,7 mill.). The budget will be adjusted proportionally before signing final agreement with CISU.

1. Introduction

- **Parties:**

CISU and International Aid Services (IAS)

The present development engagement document details the objectives and management arrangements for the development cooperation concerning Sustainable and Equal Quality Educational Opportunities for All 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.

IAS-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, 5, 10, 16 and 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 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 five other programme applicants. The assessment was based on 12 criteria. Embassy comments has been received from Tanzania 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 (1-7), including a ToC and overall result framework.
- Review report by external consultant.

2. Background

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

The programme focuses on children facing barriers to learning (CFBL), with particular attention placed on children with special educational needs (CSEN), and girls facing barriers to learning. Programme partners operate under two different programme contexts but pursuing the same objectives. Thus, Kenya and Tanzania have stable programme contexts while South Sudan and Sudan represent fragile contexts.

In Kenya, the programme is in Tana River County, a marginalized area with low literacy levels and very high unemployment and criminal rates. The Government of Kenya recognizes IE as an important sector for accelerating the attainment of Education for All goals, and the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 4. However, the national education system lacks structures and facilities that respond to the challenges faced by CSEN. At county level, competing interests and limited resources implies that investment in education is still low, and investment in IE is out of question. This intervention will plug into the existing legal framework and efforts towards achieving inclusive and equal education in Kenya. The national education coalition (Elimu Yetu Coalition) has ensured that Kenya continues to participate in the Global Action for Education, in support of the human right to quality, inclusive and universal education.

In Tanzania, the programme partners work in Rukwa Region and are establishing a firmer footing in the administrative capital city, Dodoma. Barriers to education include lack of a formal assessment system; lack of trained teachers; lack of accessible learning materials; inaccessible school environment (including toilets); negative parental attitudes; negative attitudes of teachers and peers; etc. Policy development is anchored on the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) ratified by Parliament in 1991, and the United Nations' Convention for the Protection of Rights and

Dignity of Persons with Disabilities (2007) ratified by Parliament in 2009, but there exists no comprehensive national policy on inclusive education in Tanzania. A number of interesting developments may however advance access to education for excluded children in the country, including the recent Reviewed National Strategy on Inclusive Education 2018-2021. In general, the legal framework provides an ideal platform from where to advocate for increased access to equal and quality educational opportunities for all children.

In South Sudan, the programme is implemented in Terekeka, a context characterized by inter-communal conflict which is fuelled by cattle-raiding to meet marriage demands, as well as revenge and other social issues. The South Sudanese government has set out to completely restructure its education sector, but access to education remains limited for children with disabilities, women and girls. Thus, the provision of inclusive education (IE) by using a Child-Friendly School approach is a long way from being realised and ensuring that CSEN receive quality education is not yet a priority. Gender inequity in education remains an issue. Females make up only 12 percent of the country's teaching population and cultural notions that women are child-bearers and homemakers drive inequity. In fact, South Sudanese women and girls are more likely to die during childbirth than complete primary education. South Sudan recently enacted an inclusive education policy framework (July 2021) that address specific needs of individual learners with disabilities to learn in inclusive settings. With the help of this policy, the programme will work (in year 1) to engage with the local government in seeking positive change for CSEN through IE.

In Sudan, the programme is implemented in South Kordofan, where local OPDs and CS groups will be empowered to take a more central role in promoting inclusion of children with special educational needs (CSEN). Sudan's educational policy framework is anchored in the supreme law of the country with provisions to facilitate investment in human capital at all levels of education and training. The country adheres to global commitments such as Education for All (EFA) Goals, The Beijing Platform for Action (PFA) and the United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI). It is party to the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which renewed global commitments, including to EFA, under the SDG4. Sudan is developing a new girls' education sub-sector strategy to help make further evidence-based progress towards fulfilling the rights of the Sudanese girls to quality basic education. In 2017, Sudan ministry of Education signed a declaration of 2018 to be the year of people with disabilities, with commitment to the establishment of special needs education in all states by the end of 2020.

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 from Programme phase II

Advocacy gap: CS groups face severe challenges in escalating advocacy to the national level which has reduced effectiveness in advocacy for IE. The future role of CS groups in advocating for inclusive education is crucial for the sustainability of the good benefits of the previous phases, and measures should be taken to prepare and support them well for this responsibility.

Synergy: Synergy across local partners has not been complete, due to cultural barriers.

South Sudan programme: Lots of challenges in the implementation of Phase 2, including security, changing the programme location, and the need for service delivery interventions. The fragile context implies difficulties in that taking advocacy beyond the local level. South Sudan will consequently not be part of phase III programme after Year 1 of implementation.

The voice of the child: The voice of children has generally been missing in the advocacy efforts. Yet such voices could be effective in positively influencing community attitude change. Measures should be taken to engage children, particularly CSEN and excluded girls, in broader community awareness and advocacy for IE.

Covid-19: Covid-19 disrupted the implementation of the programme, with schools closed, large gatherings forbidden, and restrictions imposed on movement. This spilled over into 2021 when the programme targets new enrolments in schools and into the programme. The challenge was even greater with more children out of school than ever.

Key results from Programme Phase 2

Component 1: Local implementing partners play their roles as catalysts and promote the civic engagement of CS groups with MDBs and FDBs; a clear pathway on strategic advocacy is in place and used to bring policy change at local levels in some countries; capacity building for CS groups completed in terms of IE and advocacy.

Component 2: Establishment of IE networks comprising both MDBs and FDBs; capacity building of IE networks completed; noticeable attitude change towards CFBL; and local partners have joined their respective national education coalitions.

Component 3: Lobbying by CS groups to improve the existing national policy documents on IE; teacher training on inclusive pedagogy/assessment completed; trained teachers using their acquired skills and knowledge; assessment centres and model schools operational, and examples of replication of disability friendly schools.

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

The programme includes the following local (and international) partners:

IAS Kenya (IAS K) established in 2004 as an International NGO and re-registered as a national, local NGO in 2017. The organisation operates within the thematic areas of inclusive education; integrated water resource management; civil society development; peace building, resilience and disaster risk reduction; and humanitarian intervention (including emergency relief) in various parts of Kenya. In this phase of the programme, IAS K will only act as a catalyst in engagements with Tana River County Umbrella Organization of Persons with Disabilities (TRCUOPD) and Tana River County Community Chairpersons Association (TRICCCA), the two CS groups bringing together a number of OPDs in the target programme location of Hola, in Tana River County.

The Free Pentecostal Church of Tanzania (FPCT) founded in 1932 has grown to become one of the prominent Pentecostal Churches in Tanzania. Apart from spiritual nurture, the Church provides social services regardless of religious affiliation, gender, ethnicity, economic status, linguistic differences, race or disability and it runs some 150 social projects including the provision of health and education services. In this programme, FPCT will build the capacity of leaders (pastors) to use the churches as a platform to carry out awareness raising and sensitization campaigns to change the attitudes of the target communities towards CFBL, and work with CS Groups in particular the Tanzania Federation of Disabled Peoples' Organisations (SHIVYAWATA). Moreover, FPCT will work in partnership with the Information Centre on Disability (ICD) which will be engaging policy makers at the national level, advocating for the implementation of IE policies. It will also be instrumental in documenting lessons learnt and carry out operational research for evidence-base for IE advocacy.

National Christian Development Organisation (NCDO) a national local NGO established in 2008, with the objective of bringing about transformation in the rural communities and marginalized sections of the South Sudanese population. NCDO has been involved in IE/SNE since 2009 and will work closely with communities as well local authorities for the promotion of IE. Given the fragile context of South Sudan, taking advocacy beyond the local level will be very difficult, hence their exit at the end of Year 1 of the implementation.

Zahara Center for Integrated Development Services (Zahara) established in 2011 as a national, voluntary charitable humanitarian non-governmental study centre, and based in South Kordofan State, Sudan. Zahara is working in health, education and water sanitation, peace building and conflict prevention. In this programme, they will work closely with IAS Sudan in civic engagements and advocacy for inclusive education.

International Aid Services, Sudan (IAS SU) formed in 1989, and registered in 2003 (as an international NGO). IAS SU has experience with project implementation in some of the most vulnerable and underserved areas of the country and has been working with IE/SNE projects since 2009 in South Kordofan State. At the national level, IAS Sudan is a member in the education advisory group, and chair the inclusion and disability working group. In this programme, IAS SU will act as catalysts for civic engagement, with shared responsibilities with Zahara and the IE network, and SCEFA.

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)

The overall objective of the third phase is to see children facing barriers to learning in Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan and Tanzania enjoy recognition and inclusion in social structures and have sustainable educational opportunities that positively affect their life quality and development as human beings. Phase III has the following three outcomes:

Outcome 1, *Local implementing partners act as catalyst for CS groups to gain capacity to promote advocacy issues for IE from the grassroots level to the national level. Central to achieving this objective are the following priorities.*

While Phases 1 and 2 had IAS and local partners advocating for and with the CS groups, respectively, the CS groups will take lead in engagements with the community, government institutions, and policy makers in phase 3. Local partners will offer mostly technical and advisory support to enhance the sustainability. Key strategic approaches include advocacy capacity building for the CS groups, to empower them to take advocacy issues from the grassroots level to the national level. At local level, CS groups and local IE networks will review their advocacy strategies and develop new and joint advocacy strategies. At national level, CS groups will develop strategies with national education coalitions who will act as intermediators to push through policy proposals. At the moment, the CS groups have no infrastructure or resources for escalating advocacy issues to the national level (there is a so-called advocacy gap). The advocacy gap will be addressed by establishing a structured link between local level CS groups with national level advocacy groups, led by respective National Education Coalitions (NEC). In South Sudan and Tanzania, this is done by forming Education Sub- Committees (within the national education coalitions) and in Kenya and Sudan, where these already exist, by strengthening them. The sub-committees will be the link with grassroots level advocacy efforts from CS groups and shall be the receiving points of advocacy issues raised from the local level. The programme will work towards bringing together key stakeholders like OPDs into education coalitions, as a key strategic choice to strengthen advocacy for IE advocacy at the national level.

Once the mechanism is established, local CS groups will identify advocacy issues and desired outcomes and share these with the Inclusive Education Sub-Committee who will verify and formulate them into national level advocacy issues and champion them within National Education Coalitions (NEC). The NEC will then take the advocacy issue to the national level policy makers/authorities. The sub committees will then perform the reverse task of obtaining as well as conveying any information or feedback to local level CS groups, thus sealing any advocacy gaps.

The strategy has four main elements: (i) initiating civic engagement and organisational development; (ii) public services and institutional arrangement; (iii) linking needs to institutions and instruments giving entitlements; and (iv) moving towards practical frameworks for social accountability – in the latter CS groups will be supported in the use of tools for social action i.e. strategic communication tools; Community Charters; Community Score Card; and where possible Public Expenditure Tracking System.

Outcome 2, *for sustainability and continuity, local implementing partners empower CS groups to take a central role in promoting inclusion of children with special educational needs (CSEN) and girls in social structures and their countries' educational systems. The key priorities in this regard are discussed below.*

CS groups are anticipated to take a central role in collaborating with formal duty bearers in promoting the inclusion of CFBL in social structures and educational systems. This is done through modelling best IE practices contributing to qualified teachers trained in inclusive pedagogy, child, disability, safe and gender-sensitive education facilities and learning environment, and accessible and inclusive curricula and assessment to monitor all learners, including those with disabilities. Moreover, a strengthening of the existing Assessment Centres/Assessment Model Schools to be Inclusive Education Resource Centres will complement the work of former and newly trained assessment teachers and serve the programme areas sustainability for many years. The programme will train school inspectors/supervisors /quality assurers to ensure that they live up to the expected standards after their training.

Strategic service delivery will focus on 1) advanced capacity building for OPDs and CS groups, aimed at enhancing their effectiveness in their efforts to promote IE, 2) capacity building of CSEN and girls for self-advocacy and community awareness activities, and 3) enhanced capacity for early identification of CSEN by refurbishing and equipping assessment centres. Self-advocacy by children is an innovate approach where the affected children will tell their story and pass their message in their own words, for greater impact in changing mindsets and idea towards CSEN and girls, first in family and social structures, and then in education processes.

Outcome 3: *Innovative promotion of IE in fragile contexts through a nexus approach (for Sudan and South Sudan only)*

As an innovate element the programme infuses IE awareness message into peace-building activities, for wider reach and effectiveness. Among the planned activities are community mobilization and awareness in transition camps, where integrated IE awareness will be undertaken through peace-building sessions. The programme also provides

support to infrastructure development for IE in emergency situations, including refresher or advanced training for trainer-of-trainers of assessment teachers, training of teachers by ToTs in screening and assessment of returnee children, and provision of teaching and learning materials and stationery. Local and national governments will be invited to co-fund the initiative, for sustainability.

The visibility and power of service delivery creates hope in the lives of the affected children, grows motivation in the work of the CS groups, and creates commitment and ownership in government institutions. For this reason, strategic service delivery will include supporting the identification, protection, documentation, screening, placement, and follow up of CSEN, Provision of assistive devices, teaching and learning materials, basic learning furniture and equipment, special teaching and learning aides, and inclusive and safe learning environments.

Summary of assumptions:	KEY ASSUMPTION
Programme Outcome 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased lobbying by CS groups has made National Coalitions to recognize their obligations towards IE mainstreaming, and assert their collective influence on the national governments for the implementation of IE policies and guidelines. Pressure from CS Groups, with the support of Local Partners, to address the needs of Children with Special Educational Needs (CSEN) results in initiatives for the implementation of IE guidelines by the local government authorities.
Programme Outcome 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CS groups are successfully empowered and have taken up their roles and are effectively leading in enhanced institutional infrastructure for IE, and the promotion of IE for CSEN and Girls, with support from partners. Engagements by CS groups, Children (through girls' and IE clubs and other advocacy activities), and other stakeholders (with support from Local Partners) has motivated vulnerable children, caregivers and local leaders to speak out on injustice and discrimination of CSEN and Girls.
Programme Outcome 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relative peace exists for OPDs, CS groups and National Education Coalitions (with the support of Local Partners) to engage with decision makers and tell their stories of change, and how decision makers can minimize barriers to IE linked to the SDG framework while transitioning to development. The authorities are willing to discuss with the CS Groups about their responsibilities to provide IE. Awareness creation by CS groups across the wider society increases the recognition of the needs of vulnerable children and motivates change within the community and the local government system.

Summary of results framework:

Programme objective	Children facing barriers to learning in Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan and Tanzania enjoy recognition and inclusion in social structures and have equal educational opportunities that positively affect their life quality and development as human beings	
Outcome 1	Indicator	Target (end of programme per country and/or core partner)
1.1: Local implementing partners have established a comprehensive and inclusive pathway for the escalation of IE advocacy issues from the grassroots to the national level policy makers	A clear pathway on strategic advocacy is in place and is helping all IE stakeholders to influence policy makers to improve education opportunities of children facing barriers to learning	– Three pathways by the end of 2025 (1 per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)
1.2: Local implementing partners are promoting IE advocacy through alliances	Joint advocacy and other issues successfully championed by the alliances, from local to national levels	– At least 9 issues by 2025 (3 per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)
1.3: Local implementing partners are using evidence-based data for the promotion of effective IE advocacy	The number of annual MEAL reports published by IE partners at local, national and international levels	– At least 13 reports by year 4 (1 annual MEAL report for South Sudan by 2022) – At least 12 annual MEAL reports by 2025 (4 annual reports per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)

Outcome 2	Indicator	Target (end of programme per country and/or core partner)
2.1 CS groups are effectively playing their lead role in promoting inclusion of CSEN and Girls in social structures and country educational systems as a result of advanced capacity building	CS groups display advanced competence in playing their role in the promotion of IE Advanced competence in at least 4 capacity areas per country by 2025,	Advanced competence in at least 4 capacity areas per country by 2025,
2.2: Collaboration between CS groups, Formal Duty Bearers and IE stakeholders to enhance the inclusion of CSEN and GIRLS in social structures and educational systems	An increase in the capacity of CS Groups to come up with and implement joint initiatives with FDB and other IE stakeholders for the inclusion of CSEN and GIRLS	Capacity to collaborate in at least 6 initiatives per country by 2025, for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania
2.3: Collaboration between CS groups, Formal Duty Bearers and IE stakeholders to enhance institutional infrastructure for IE	Increased access to quality IE for CSEN and Girls through improved infrastructure	At least 900 CSEN assessed by 2025 (300 per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)
		At least 450 CSEN enrolled by 2025 (150 per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)
		At least 1200 girls enrolled (by 2025 (400 per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)
		At least 3 facilities improved by 2025 (1 per country for Kenya, Sudan and Tanzania)
2.4: CSEN and Girls actively enhancing awareness on IE by self-advocacy through the “Voice of the Child” initiative	An increase in continuous community awareness on IE	At least 120,000 people reached by 2025 (40, 000 people per country)
Outcome 3	Indicator	Target (end of programme per country and/or core partner)
3.1: Increased community awareness on IE through peace-building initiatives	Increased community awareness on IE	At least 45,000 people (5000 for South Sudan in 202
3.2: Enhanced assessment of children in emergencies through strengthened infrastructure for inclusive education	Enhanced capacity for the assessment of CSEN in emergency situations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – At least 10 ToT trained in 2022 (5 per country for South Sudan and Sudan) – At least 10 new teachers trained by 2022 in South Sudan – 30 new teachers trained in Sudan by 2025 in Sudan only
3.3: Increased access to inclusive education for CSEN and Girls in emergencies	CSEN and Girls in emergency situations enjoying quality inclusive education	– At least 50 CSEN assessed in South Sudan by 2022
		– At least 200 CSEN assessed in Sudan by 2025
		– At least 25 CSEN enrolled by 2022 South Sudan
		– At least 100 CSEN enrolled by 2025 in Sudan
		– At least 100 girls enrolled by 2022 in South Sudan
		– At least 400 girls enrolled in by 2025 in Sudan

Target groups and beneficiaries:

The primary target groups (Rights Holders) consist of children with special educational needs (CSEN), and the girl child. The general term of these two groups is Children Facing Barriers to Learning (CFBL).

NB. The target group description mentions specific characteristics, including challenges and needs but contains no quantitative figures for the target groups of CSNE and girl children.

The secondary target group consists of 1) Moral Duty Bearers, including parents/caregivers, teachers, school leadership, religious leaders, CSOs/CBOs, OPDs and other NGOs, who are in a position to influence the lives of the targeted CSEN and girls, and 2) Formal Duty Bearers, including government representatives (MoE and other line ministries); political authorities; and decision makers at local, regional and national levels who have the responsibility of a legal framework

protecting the targeted CSEN and girls, and ensuring a conducive and inclusive environment where their rights are realised at local, regional and national levels. Formal duty-bearers need to be lobbied to make policies and decisions that promote IE.

Monitoring & Evaluation:

The monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning (MEAL) system will be revamped, digitalised and centralized to make it more vibrant and interactive, and to generate lessons learned and evidence-base for advocacy purpose, at the local and national level. The MEAL system is supported by designated MEAL staff in each country.

With proper management, the MEAL system will promote timely identification of implementation weaknesses and gaps, for immediate redress. It will build the capacity of CS groups to ensure quality standards are met and sustained beyond the programme period. The MEAL team will also ensure that accountability is practiced among the primary and secondary target groups, and that lessons learnt, and best practices are documented and shared out at different levels, thereby promoting sustainability through learning.

Risk analysis and risk management:

The risk management plan and strategy identify, and categorises, potential risks and details the strategies to mitigate the risks that may arise. There will be continuous monitoring and management of the identified risks by the MEAL staff in each country programme. In the more stable context (Kenya and Tanzania) the frequency of monitoring the risks will be quarterly, while in fragile and high-risk context, the monitoring frequency will be monthly. The programme will use learning from the research report on resilience conducted in Phase 1, to inform an improved common framework and standards for risk management across the four local implementing partners. Among other things, this will improve comparison of risks and remedies, reduce the time taken to initiate management responses at country level, help identify interdependencies between risks across the programme, and link up with existing in-country early warning and risk frameworks.

Sustainability and phasing out:

The long-term impact and sustainability of the IE programme is pegged on the involvement and empowerment of the target communities, and the anticipation that the skills and knowledge gained will be used by the target communities beyond the programme period. In the last programme phase, partners will take the role of catalysts while the empowered CS groups and OPDs, will be entrusted with the responsibility for their activities as well as the investments created by the programme.

After vigorous awareness creation and sensitisation campaigns in the previous phases of the programme, a marked change of attitude has been noted, and this has led to a significant increase in the number of families bringing out their children with special educational needs for screening, assessment and enrolment in schools. These efforts will be sustained further during this programme, to enhance the gains made so far, and in the process increase the inclusion of CSEN and girls in education. In three countries (Kenya, Sudan, and Tanzania), the implementation will focus on collaboration between OPDs, CS groups and different actors (e.g regional, state or county education offices (local level) and National Education Coalitions (national level) in bringing lasting change in IE for CSEN and Girls, including development and enactment of legislations and improved access to new or existing government initiatives. In the much less stable South Sudan, focus will be on continued empowerment of CS groups, OPDs and communities to enhance and sustain community awareness on IE through continuous peace-building initiatives; continued provision of the much-needed infrastructure development; and strategic service delivery in the provision of IE for the targeted children.

Another point of sustainability will be institutional infrastructure put in place by this intervention, in the form of the constructed and improved assessment centres and Assessment Model Schools. The ToT approach to teacher training in IE by this programme is to ensure the presence of trained teachers in target programme locations during this programme and even after.

South Sudan will be part of the programme for the first year only, after which it will cease to be part of the programme. For sustainability purposes, IAS DK will explore possible options for an alternative intervention targeting the much-needed service delivery in the country. Remaining countries will be phased out by 2025.

4. Overview of management set-up at programme level

Overall organization:

Learning from previous phases has showed that the programme is best/most effectively managed by a strong local Programme Team that is responsible for the overall implementation. A local partner (IAS Kenya) will host the Programme Team in Nairobi. The team includes a Lead Programme Manager, MEAL Coordinator and Financial Controller. This will ensure that the IE country programmes are effectively supported in all aspects (programme and financial issues). The Programme Team reports to IAS DK Programme Coordinator.

The Programme Team works closely with the local partners, including the **Programme Management Board (PMB)** consisting of Country Directors and the **Regional Coordinating Committee (RCC)** consisting of programme Managers and IE Programme Coordinators from the countries. The national coordination is led by the national Programme Managers and Coordinators in the form of **Country Project Steering Committees (CPSC)** where representatives of the CS groups and relevant key stakeholders will be included so as to have ownership of the project.

Financial Management:

A part-time Financial Controller based in Nairobi will coordinate financial management activities across the four programme countries, in a structure designed to support the overall oversight efforts of the IAS DK Finance Manager. The IAS DK Finance Manager will take overall responsibility for the financial management of the programme, under the supervision of the Director of IAS DK, who will also approve all financial transactions and payments.

5. The programme budget

Turnover Budget - CSF and co-financing		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of PPA
A. Expected Liquid Funds (funds raised in Denmark)		407.196,00	101.799,00	101.799,00	101.799,00	101.799,00	2,5%
B. Programme CSF Funds		18.720.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	n/a
C. Expected Co-financing		1.629.980,00	407.495,00	407.495,00	407.495,00	407.495,00	10%
D. TOTAL		20.757.176,00	5.189.294,00	5.189.294,00	5.189.294,00	5.189.294,00	
Liquid Funds (funds raised in Denmark) (A) in % of PPA		2,5%	2,5%	2,5%	2,5%	2,5%	
Co-financing (C) in % of PPA		10,1%	10,1%	10,1%	10,1%	10,1%	
<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)		16.166.468,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	86%
Outcome 1	Country programmes follow their country-specific Theory of Change in promoting advocacy issues for Inclusive Education from the grassroots level to the national level	6.233.916,00	1.558.479,00	1.558.479,00	1.558.479,00	1.558.479,00	39%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A1</i>	2.015.452,00	503.863,00	503.863,00	503.863,00	503.863,00	32%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A2</i>	3.746.340,00	936.585,00	936.585,00	936.585,00	936.585,00	60%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A3</i>	472.124,00	118.031,00	118.031,00	118.031,00	118.031,00	8%
Outcome 2	For sustainability and continuity, country programmes empower CS groups to take a central role in promoting inclusion of children with special education needs (CSEN) and girls in social structures and their countries' educational systems	6.415.952,00	1.603.988,00	1.603.988,00	1.603.988,00	1.603.988,00	40%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A1</i>	1.605.908,00	401.477,00	401.477,00	401.477,00	401.477,00	25%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A2</i>	4.337.924,00	1.084.481,00	1.084.481,00	1.084.481,00	1.084.481,00	68%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A3</i>	472.124,00	118.030,00	118.030,00	118.030,00	118.030,00	7%
Outcome 3	Innovative promotion of IE in fragile contexts through a triple nexus approach (for Sudan and South Sudan only)	3.516.600,00	879.150,00	879.150,00	879.150,00	879.150,00	22%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A1</i>	1.795.936,00	448.984,00	448.984,00	448.984,00	448.984,00	51%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A2</i>	1.248.540,00	312.135,00	312.135,00	312.135,00	312.135,00	36%
	<i>Hereof Cost Category A3</i>	472.124,00	118.031,00	118.031,00	118.031,00	118.031,00	13%
		0,00	0	0	0	0	0%
		0,00					
		0,00					
		0,00					
I. Total PPA Costs Budget		16.166.468,00	4.041.617	4.041.617	4.041.617	4.041.617	86%
A5. Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)		321.600,00	80.400	80.400	80.400	80.400	n/a
A6. Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)		947.260,00	236.815,00	236.815,00	236.815,00	236.815,00	n/a
A7. Auditing in Denmark		60.000,00	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	0%
II. Total Direct Costs Budget		17.495.328,00	4.373.832	4.373.832	4.373.832	4.373.832	93%
III. B1. Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)		1.224.672,00	306.168	306.168	306.168	306.168	n/a
IV. Grand Total Costs Budget		18.720.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	186%
	Variance		0	0	0	0	
CSF Budget: Summary table of Cost Categories (Automatically calculated.)							
Cost category		Total all years	2022	2023	2024	2025	% of Total
A1	Direct activity cost	5.417.296	1.354.324	1.354.324	1.354.324	1.354.324	29%
A2	Implementation through local independent partner	9.332.804	2.333.201	2.333.201	2.333.201	2.333.201	50%
A3	Allocated programme support cost	1.416.368	354.092	354.092	354.092	354.092	8%
A5	Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA)	321.600	80.400	80.400	80.400	80.400	2%
A6	Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15% of PPA)	947.260	236.815	236.815	236.815	236.815	5%
A7	Auditing in Denmark	60.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	15.000	0%
B1	Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget)	1.224.672	306.168	306.168	306.168	306.168	7%
	Total / control	18.720.000	4.680.000	4.680.000	4.680.000	4.680.000	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)		16.166.468,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	n/a
PPA Geographical breakdown of A1+A2+A3 in intervention countries:							n/a
	Kenya	4.581.802,00	967.951,00	1.204.617,00	1.204.617,00	1.204.617,00	24%
	Tanzania	3.380.001,00	667.500,00	904.167,00	904.167,00	904.167,00	18%
	South Sudan	710.000,00	710.000,00				4%
	Sudan	3.261.001,00	637.750,00	874.417,00	874.417,00	874.417,00	17%
		0,00					0%
		0,00					0%
Total PPA in intervention countries		11.932.804,00	2.983.201,00	2.983.201,00	2.983.201,00	2.983.201,00	64%
Geographical breakdown of A1+A3 in non-intervention countries:							n/a
	Global Cross-Cutting expenses (A3 global costs)	0,00					0%
	Not Denmark nor intervention countries (A1 + A3)	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0,00	0%
	Country/region 1	0,00					0%
	Country/region 2	0,00					0%
	Denmark (A1 + A3)	4.233.664,00	1.058.416,00	1.058.416,00	1.058.416,00	1.058.416,00	23%
Total PPA in non-intervention countries		4.233.664,00	1.058.416,00	1.058.416,00	1.058.416,00	1.058.416,00	23%
I. Total PPA Costs Budget		16.166.468,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	4.041.617,00	86%
Other costs in Denmark (A5, A7 and B1)		1.606.272,00	401.568,00	401.568,00	401.568,00	401.568,00	9%
	<i>Information activities in Denmark (max 2% of PPA), A5</i>	321.600,00	80.400,00	80.400,00	80.400,00	80.400,00	n/a
	<i>Auditing in Denmark, A7</i>	60.000,00	15.000,00	15.000,00	15.000,00	15.000,00	0%
	<i>Administration in Denmark (max 7% of II. Total Direct Costs Budget), B1</i>	1.224.672,00	306.168,00	306.168,00	306.168,00	306.168,00	7%
Unallocated Funds and Budget Margin (max 15 % of PPA), A6		947.260,00	236.815,00	236.815,00	236.815,00	236.815,00	n/a
IV. Grand Total Costs Budget		18.720.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	4.680.000,00	100%

6. Overall assessment according to CISU Programme guidelines

STRATEGIC RELEVANCE		Score 1-5
Criteria 1	Strategic orientation: Strengthening civil society in the global South and relevance to the Sustainable Development Goals	Score:
<p>Assessment: The overall strategic orientation of the proposed programme is strengthening civil society to improve access to equal and quality education for children facing barriers to learning (CFBL), including children with special educational needs and girls, and to ensure the sustainability of their efforts beyond the programme period. This is generally aligned with IAS Denmark's focus areas which are described to be saving and sustaining life, social justice, marginalized groups (especially children) and strong local partners (cf. the organizational strategy 2019 – 2021, annex 3.3). Thematically IAS works with inclusive education, civil society development, disaster relief, nexus (bridging between relief and development) and resilience (the ability to withstand and recover quickly from the effects of natural or man-made disasters). As such, the overall strategic orientation and the programme objectives indicate coherence with IAS' overall mandate, vision and strategy. However, in the view of program phase III being an exit phase, the programme document does not sufficiently substantiate the strategic orientation towards exiting and ensuring the sustainability of efforts beyond the programme period (cf. assessment under assessment criteria 10).</p> <p>The third phase of the programme is noted to bring innovative strategic approaches within the following two areas 1) <u>self-advocacy by children</u>, thus moving from a strategy of working <i>for</i> children with disabilities to also working <i>with</i> children by strengthening their voice and enabling them to pass on their messages in their own words, and 2) <u>promoting IE in fragile contexts through a triple nexus approach</u> targeting peace building, infrastructure development, and IE service delivery (Sudan and South Sudan only). The innovative approaches are assessed as relevant and will potentially be strengthening the catalytic approach within the programme, but the approaches are found not to be presented in sufficient detail in the programme document.</p> <p>The programme is assessed as relating to the SDG, in specifically in relation to SDG 4, but also SDG 5, 10, 16 and 17. Thus, there is solid indication that the programme will apply the crosscutting priorities of SDG 16 (governance) and SDG 17 (partnership) in its overall strategic approach and contribute to SDG 4, 5 and 10.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant does not agree with the critique of the strategic orientation towards exiting and ensuring the sustainability but recognizes that the strategy of the programme might pursue sustainability best in the stable contexts of Kenya and Tanzania.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, the overall strategic orientation of IAS-DK's programme indicates that the programme will be contributing to strengthen civil society in the global South (Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan and Tanzania) so that it has the independence, space diversity and capacity to influence and promote the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDG 4, but also SDG 5, 10, 16 and 17. Given that the programme phase III is an exit phase, the assessment committee notes that the programme document does not strongly reflect the strategic orientation towards exiting and ensuring the sustainability of efforts beyond the programme period.</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>		3
Criteria 2	Relevance of civil society partners and their local, national and/or global networking partners	Score:
<p>Assessment: IAS continues its engagement with 7 local partners in four locations in Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan and Tanzania. All but two partner organizations (IAS South Sudan and IAS Sudan) have local NGO registration. The two partners in South Sudan are noted to be phased out (together with the programme in South Sudan) by the end of the first year of phase III. The partnerships are guided by a Partner Manual and IAS-DK is generally assessed as demonstrating a relevant track-record for engaging in meaningful equal and mutually committing partnership with relevant south based actors.</p>		3

IAS DK describes the capacity building of local partners (i.e. empowering them to become drivers of change) to be central to its civil society development projects. In addition, the local partners are all involved in strengthening local CS groups (CBOs) to promote advocacy issues for inclusive education (IE) from the grassroots level to the national level and to take a central role in promoting inclusion of CSEN in social structures and their countries' educational systems. In general, IAS demonstrates a relevant track-record and approach to capacity building of the local CS groups and networks while it is less evident how partners are capacitated to support implementation and in particular the *use* and *maintaining* of results, thus supporting the *sustainability* of the results. Programme phase III aspires indirectly to contribute to the effective implementation of SDG 4 together with Global Campaign for Education and International Disability Development Consortium. It is noted that the programme will address the existing advocacy and synergy gap (as has been pointed out in the reviews of the two previous phases) by developing a mechanism that will link local level advocacy efforts by CS groups with national level initiatives. Thus, there is indication that the new phase of the programme will involve networking partners and the Global Campaign for Education to promote a catalytic role of civil society. However, considering the nature, position and limited capacity of the local CS groups, the mechanism to link local level advocacy issues with national level agendas seems quite fragile. In the feedback on concept note, IAS was advised to provide details of the intermediaries and local partners role in supporting the local evidence-base, linking it to the national level and engaging with key duty-bearers in high-level advocacy. Unfortunately, the programme document provides no clear details of the local partners' role, and without the local partners strength and co-ownership to the advocacy issues as well as their continuous support it appears unrealistic to be able to lift local issues, pursue them at the national level and maintain results.

In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant accepts the critique and agree that the lifting and pursuing of local advocacy issues to national level could be more substantiated.

In conclusion, IAS-DK is assessed as presenting a partnership engagement that potentially can contribute to developing a strong, independent, vocal and diverse civil society in the Global South, particularly at local level, through meaningful, equal and committing partnerships. However, it is noted that while the track-record and approach to continued capacity building of the local CS groups and networks is fairly clear the catalytic potential of the programme (i.e. lifting and pursuing local advocacy issues at a national level), is not sufficiently substantiated. Finally, IAS DK is assessed as having demonstrated capacity to work with partners in fragile situations (Sudan and South Sudan).

The score based on the assessment criteria is 3, which is given, when there is indication that supports the criteria

CAPACITY		Score 1-5
Criteria 3	Organisational capacity and popular involvement	Score:
<p>Assessment: IAS DK has over twenty years of experience working to promote special needs/inclusive education for marginalized children in East Africa and is co-operating with organisations of persons with disabilities (OPDs) in Denmark and internationally. IAS DK is supported by an international alliance structure in which members commit to collaborate in areas such as fundraising and co-financing; policy and methodology development; capacity building and programme development; monitoring of projects; reporting of any suspicion of irregularities and fraud relating to IAS Country Offices or local partners; etc. IAS DK is found to have relevant management systems for planning, implementing and monitoring the overall programme portfolio, including an inclusive education manual (annex 3.7), a financial manual (handbook, annex 2.3), a brief partnership policy/strategy (annex 5.1), and an international Partner Manual (annex 5.3). Moreover, security policies and guidelines are mentioned, and it is noted that a PSEAH policy and mechanisms are under development 2021 – 2023 (cf. annex 7.5) and that projects are implemented in an ethical manner corresponding with the Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS). In</p>		4

	<p>general, the organizational structure is assessed as being able to ensure a satisfactory accountability while also promoting responsiveness and flexibility, including in fragile contexts. IAS DK has 7 staff. The programme team (based in Copenhagen and at the headquarter in Jutland) is mentioned to possess expertise within humanitarian and disaster management, resilience, Nexus, civil society development, inclusive education, MEAL, and risk and crises management. Moreover, the team is supported by an inclusive education project manager/ Lead Programme Manager, a MEAL Coordinator and a Financial Controller based in Nairobi. The organisation is - based on the information provided - assessed as having human resource strategies and systems to ensure that staff can sustain main strategic intervention areas of the proposed programme, but it is observed that the quality of the programme document does not adequately reflect/demonstrate the organization's programmatic competencies.</p> <p>Finally, IAS DK is a member of Globalt Fokus and the Global Campaign for Education (GCE) National Educational Coalition in Denmark and the Disability and Development Consortium (IDDC) and the Inclusive Education Task Group. The Communication and Fundraising Strategy (annex 2.7) is assessed as substantiating IAS DK's popular engagement, and engagements with The Danish Association of People with Physical Disability (DHF), The Danish Association of the Blind (DBS), public and private schools demonstrate a proven capacity to extend and develop its popular engagement.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant explains that the quality of the programme document is a result of a long-standing dialogue and inclusive processes with the implementing partners in Sudan, Kenya, Tanzania and South Sudan. Moreover, IAS refers to the external review which states that: "IAS-DK holds significant capacity to manage the IE Programme. It has high proficient staff and strong systems in place, both at the office in Denmark and in the wider system, including the Global Team based in Nairobi".</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS-DK is assessed as having solid organizational capacity, including human resources, to enhance development effectiveness of the organization by maintaining satisfactory professional competency and technical capacity, but it is noted that the quality of the programme document does not adequately reflect/demonstrate the organization's programmatic competencies. IAS is considered demonstrating a solid record of involving relevant groups and stakeholders in the Danish society to broaden and sustain popular engagement with development cooperation. Finally, IAS is found to demonstrate capacity to operate in fragile contexts.</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>	
Criteria 4	Financial management and administrative capacity	Score:
	<p>Assessment: IAS-DK demonstrates a diversified support from private supporters, foundations and institutional donors (including CISU CSF/DERF), and annual turnover of 19 million DKK (2020). Financial management is guided by a financial manual (handbook, annex 2.3), which includes relevant anti-corruption guidelines, but it is not explicitly mentioned how the guidelines are implemented also at partner level to prevent, disclose and actively follow up on financial irregularities at all levels, both internally and, when relevant, with respect to partners. However, IAS-DK, in conjunction with the Global Team in Nairobi, is generally assessed as having systems, procedures and capacities (a Financial Controller assigned the programme) to assess and monitor financial performance, including adequate internal financial and administrative control systems. Finally, IAS-DK's ability to track and document <u>expenditures at partner level</u> is backed by the review, but the assessment of the concept note found that it was unclear to what extent it has been possible to track <u>expenditures in relation to result achievements</u> in previous programme implementation. The programme document does not add clarity to this assessment criteria.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant disagrees with the critique raised regarding the tracking of expenditures in relation to results in previous phases. IAS-DK finds it unjustified and a consequence of CISU's previous budget and report templates.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS-DK is assessed as maintaining a satisfactory internal level of financial management and administrative capacity, adequate for meeting the overall responsibilities related to management of CISU grants.</p>	3

<i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 3, which is given, when there is indication that supports the criteria</i>		
Criteria 5	Analytical capacity and learning	Score:
<p>Assessment: IAS DK is assessed as demonstrating ability to ensure relevant context analysis and to some extent stakeholder analysis as a basis for programme design, planning and innovation. It is noted that relevant research reports have been developed on the status of IE and the existing networks on education (including IE) in Tanzania, Kenya and South Sudan (annex 6.1). Unfortunately, these reports are generally not well reflected in the context and stakeholder analysis nor the strategic approach. In addition, it is observed that the reference to stakeholders and duty-bearers, appears arbitrary and not systematic. It is thus unclear who the relevant stakeholders are and how they are expected to be included in the program.</p> <p>IAS DK has in the past years focused specifically on risk, security, and crises management; safeguarding, and PSEAH and Covid-19 and there is solid indication that the organisation is in the possession of effective risk management systems. As for learning and innovation the review of phase II concludes that IAS DK holds a strong analytic and learning capacity that is evidenced in comprehensive context analysis and high-quality reporting, and the organisation describes itself as having a culture of learning, including methodologies to enhance learning, coordination and coherence in programmes and a MEAL system supporting the learning elements. This is however not well reflected in the programme document which reflects on only some key lessons learned in phase II. These appear to be of a general nature and mainly confirming assumptions in the programme strategy and do not account for the experiences and what programme partners have learned from it. Moreover, it is noted that the issue of limited synergy between programme partners, which is regarded to be a serious limitation, has not been addressed beyond the development of a digital and centralized MEAL system. There is thus some indication of learning and knowledge management for generation of evidence-based learning and innovation from programme implementation, reviews etc.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant partly accepts the critique raised in relation to stakeholder and synergy. IAS-DK has provided some information about stakeholders and the commissioning of a study (cf. recommendation #1 in the review) on the limited synergy between programme partners and casual effects.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS-DK is assessed as having solid capacity to undertake context analysis and risk assessments, but the stakeholder analysis contained in the programme document for phase III is assessed as deficient, and the capacity to utilize evidence-based learning from programme implementation to inform analysis, planning and innovation of strategies and operational approaches is not strongly reflected in the programme document.</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>		3
Criteria 6	Delivering and documenting results	Score:
<p>Assessment: The programme document contains a summary of results from phase II. In addition, more detailed information about results is available in a Previous Results Report (Annex 4.3). Key results are noted to be capacity building of local CS groups, clear pathways for strategic advocacy at local level and public awareness raising (component 1); establishment and capacity building of local IE networks, awareness creation on inclusion and retention of CFBL, country programmes having joined their respective national education coalitions, and strong CS groups and IE networks effectively advocating for improved implementation of IE at local and national levels (component 2); and finally training of 166 teachers in basic inclusive pedagogy, enrollment of 1,021 CFBL and establishment of 7 model schools as well as teachers utilizing their skills, retainment of CFBL's and replication of model schools (2 in Kenya and 6 in Tanzania) (component 3). Of these results the effective advocacy for improved implementation of IE at local and national levels (component 2) is regarded a potential outcome. Yet, since no concrete examples of the effect of advocacy are mentioned and considering the previous advocacy gaps (in lifting local issues to the national level) it is not regarded a strongly substantiated outcome. As for the results under component 3, the following are considered actual outcomes: the teachers utilizing their skills, the CFBL's who are retained in the schools, and the model schools that are replicated, but unfortunately the qualitative</p>		2

<p>extent of these outcomes is not evident. Thus, IAS DK demonstrates a track-record of delivering and documenting results progressively and to some extent at outcome level, as well as capacity to monitor and report on significant changes at the level of the rights holders. It is noted that the review report for phase II points to a need for further attention to the documentation of local results and that previous phases have not been able to document achievements in relation to a number of indicators due to lack of baseline data and inadequate outcome measures. The programme document for phase III does not suggest that these shortcomings have been addressed (cf. assessment under criteria 8).</p> <p>Finally, it is not possible to access IAS-DK's track-record of prioritizing budget resources in cost-effective manner, but it is noted that IAS-DK is implementing its programme in remote and fragile areas which inevitably will impact the cost of logistics and service delivery, on the other hand, the presence of the Global Team in Nairobi will lower the cost of monitoring and technical assistance to partners. Thus, there is indication of a track-record of prioritizing budget resources in a cost-effective manner.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant partly accepts the critique raised in relation to documenting results and explains that COVID-19 has been contributing to shortcomings. It is stated that the documentation of results will be improved in Phase III by a new MEAL system.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS-DK is generally assessed as having demonstrated ability to deliver results progressively and to some extent at outcome level in a relatively cost-effective manner in the previous Danida funded programme phases. It is noted however, that previous shortcomings in relation to documenting results have not been sufficiently addressed in phase III.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 2, which is given, when there is some indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>	
--	--

PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES		Score 1-5
Criteria 7	Theory of Change and programme synergy	Score:
<p>Assessment: Phase III of the EI programme has as its change objective to minimize barriers to learning for CFBL - equally to the past two phases. The key difference is mentioned to be the emphasis on sustaining the desired change beyond the programme. The ToC presented in annex 3.1 is based on an analysis of the stable / fragile contexts at local and national level in the respective programme countries. Stakeholder analysis is noted to be vague and not well reflected in the ToC. The ToC specifies the desired changes at local, national and international level, and is assessed as presenting a link from the context to the intervention logic. And, in the view of the context, the ToC is generally assessed as containing a coherent and relevant balance between strategic deliveries, capacity building and advocacy. However, the ToC does not sufficiently reflect the fact that it is a third (and exit) programme phase. At local level - where changes must be expected to be institutionalized - the desired changes remain to be <i>"lobbying for representation of PWDs and OPDs in public bodies"</i> and <i>"help in building local capacity in government institutions"</i>. Moreover, strategic best practice models continue being practiced – but it is unclear how widespread they are, how they are established and documented for wider application and how they will be sustained? Moreover, the key assumption at national level that <i>"the CS groups has made National Coalitions recognize their obligations towards IE mainstreaming and assert their collective influence on the national governments for the implementation of IE policies and guidelines"</i> is found not to be substantiated by the strategic approach to advocacy presented in the programme document. The strategy for outcome 1 describes a pathway (i.e. a mechanism to deal with the identified advocacy gap) from local level to national level advocacy. This pathway is based on continued capacity building of CS groups and the creation of a link between the groups and the National Education Coalitions through Inclusive Education Sub-Committees as intermediaries. The IE Sub-Committees will thus function as the entry point for the local advocacy issues. In the view of the review of phase II (and its conclusion that it is not realistic for local CS groups to move beyond local advocacy p. 22), it remains unclear how these links will be established, how local advocacy issues will be presented and pursued at a national level, and how potential advocacy results will be documented and maintained. In general, the programme document is found not to reflect the</p>		2

recommendation from the review of phase II to conduct a thorough review of the particular causal effects and development synergies in the present programme composition to be able to capture the most effective of the underlying development dynamics. There is thus no solid description of the causal relationship and development synergy between strategic deliveries (including the modeling of IE practices) and advocacy in particular, and it is not evident how IAS will bring operational experience and objectives to bear in relevant national, regional and/or global policy processes.

IAS DK is noted to have risk analysis (annex 7.1) including relevant risks for the individual programme countries that may hinder or delay programme outcomes.

In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant partly accepts the critique raised in relation to the ToC. IAS-DK restates the assumption that the CS groups will be able to make National Coalitions recognize their obligations towards EI mainstreaming (with IE sub-committees as intermediators). Once established, the structure is mentioned to require evidence-based information from CS groups, to facilitate the advocacy efforts at national level. To aid future advocacy efforts, advocacy processes and results will be documented and hosted in the MEAL system that will be managed by the CS groups after the programme period.

In conclusion, IAS DK presents how the respective programme interventions are expected to create synergy to the overall programme approach in the form of a Programme Theory of Change. The ToC (including the ToC model) is assessed as relatively clear and relevant to the different programme contexts (fragile and stable) and the different levels on which it operates (local, national and international), but it does not sufficiently reflect a third (and exit) phase of the programme. The strategic choice of linking local CS groups to national level advocacy, and the key assumption that the local CS groups will be able to engage national structures through the IE sub-committees (as intermediaries) and influence national policies and guidelines on inclusive education is found not to be sufficiently substantiated whereby there is some uncertainty about the contribution to the objectives and outcomes of the programme. Finally, IAS DK is assessed as taking sufficiently account of the risks that may hinder or delay programme outcomes.

The score based on the assessment criteria is 2, which is given, when there is some indication that supports the criteria.

Criteria 8	Result Framework and M&E system	Score:
	<p>Assessment: The project document contains a summary results framework covering 3 specific objectives:</p> <p>1: Local implementing partners follow their country-specific Theory of Change in promoting advocacy issues for Inclusive Education from the grassroots level to the national level, 2: For sustainability and continuity, local implementing partners empower CS groups to take a central role in promoting inclusion of children with special education needs (CSEN) and girls in social structures and their countries' educational systems, and 3: Innovative promotion of IE in fragile contexts through a nexus approach (for Sudan and South Sudan only). The specific objectives are supported by 3 – 4 outcomes and outcome indicators. A detailed results framework containing target is provided in Annex 4.1. In general, the results framework is assessed as mainly output-oriented (capturing what can be guaranteed or likely guaranteed by the implementing partners) and not reflecting changes at outcome level. Thus, it is noted that the results framework does not adequately reflect or qualify/quantify the desired changes that appear in ToC, for example: representation/engagement of PWDs and OPDs in public bodies/budgetary processes; school Board of Management/School Management Committees expanding child/ disability/ gender-sensitive and safe education facilities and learning environment; IE curricula and assessment used regularly to monitor all learners (local level); and the influence of CS groups on policies, mainstreaming and budget processes with impact at regional and national level, and the engagement of national decision-makers in strengthening IE institutions, IE teacher training, and IE curriculum development (national level). If these changes are not captured in the results framework and supported by relevant outcome indicators and targets, and subsequently backed by baseline data, the partners will continue experiencing shortcomings in measuring and documenting progress at outcome level. Moreover, indicators and targets covering the primary target group of CFBL needs to be disaggregated according to gender and disability in order to be able to measure</p>	2

	<p>and document the programmes achievement on girls and children with disabilities respectively. In the programme document girls are mentioned only in extension of CFBL).</p> <p>The programme document presents a brief outline of the intended approach to M&E based on a revised digital and centrally managed MEAL system supported by a MEAL coordinator, an IT technician and country-level MEAL managers. The description in the programme document is supported by an overall M&E Plan for programme phase III (Annex 4.2). It is noted that the M&E Plan contains baseline data for the indicators under objective 1, but the nature of the indicators under objective 2 suggest that it will be difficult to establish solid baseline data that can be used to measure and document progress of relevance to objective 2. It is also noted that the dual/triple purpose of the MEAL-system implies that the system should be usable not only for performance reporting and learning but also generating evidence-base for advocacy purpose at local and national level. In the feedback on the concept note IAS was advised to consider having a designated system for collecting and proficiently packing local level evidence to be used in national advocacy. This is noted not to be considered nor is the programme document substantiating that the proposed digital and centralized MEAL system will be able to effectively aggregate evidence for advocacy purposes. Finally, it is noted that the programme document contains solid reflections on the monitoring of identified risk factors and strategies for risk mitigation, but is not adequately specific in describing the approach to 1) preparing and carrying out programme M&E that encourages reflection on the ToC-assumptions, and 2) creating and sharing knowledge, data and analyses and promoting mutual learning and innovation among CSOs and other relevant stakeholders in general and at the specific country level.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant accepts the critique raised in relation to the results framework, and will revise and correct shortcomings in the results framework, including the outcome indicators, during inception of the programme.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS DK presents a summary results framework at programme level. The results framework is assessed as partly coherent, mainly output-based and not sufficiently reflecting and qualifying/quantifying the desired changes in the ToC. The programme document does not mention any system for operating sub-results frameworks at thematic and/or country level for relevant parts of the proposed programme. There is found to be a description of the M&E approach to be applied on a programme level, including a digital and centrally managed MEAL-system and a M&E Plan, but the approach is assessed as containing a number of shortcomings. <i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 2, which is given, when there is some indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>	
<p>Criteria 9</p>	<p>A human rights-based approach (HRBA)</p>	<p>Score:</p>
	<p>IAS-DK is generally assessed as having a solid track-record and approach to mainstreaming the HRBA principles of participation, accountability, non-discrimination, and transparency (PANT) in the individual components, with partner organisations and within the applicant organisation. It is noted that programme phase III will introduce the Convention for the Rights of the Child (CRC), and Child Protection policies at the community level, and launch self-advocacy by children (the Voice of the Child initiative). Despite the expectation expressed in connection with the concept note, the approach to working with the CRC and child self-advocacy is not very elaborated in the programme document, nor is it clear how the programme in phase III will adopt and mainstream the principles and standards pertaining to child rights, including balancing vulnerability (disablement) and the rights of children when involving children in self-advocacy and how the risk of tokenism will be counteracted. Moreover, it is noted that a sub-section of marginalized children (i.e. children of nomads/pastoralists who were targets in phase II) has been omitted in phase III without any explanation.</p> <p>Generally, IAS DK is assessed as having a track-record and a focus on supporting girls in the fulfilment of their rights to education in the proposed partnership engagement. However, 'girls' as a specific target group does not appear well integrated and developed in the project; girls are mainly mentioned in the extension of CFBL, but without the particular attention the challenges faced by equal inclusion of girls in the education system (only the sections on South Sudan have a proper focus on girls).</p>	<p>2</p>

<p>In general, there is indication that the proposed programme will contribute to strengthen civil society organising to promote the fulfilment of rights and especially equal access to services and participation in order to bring about sustainable improvements for children facing barriers to learning, including children living in remote and fragile areas.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant partly accepts the critique raised in relation to the CRC/child self-advocacy and the integration of girls as a target group. IAS-DK explains that nomadic children are not included in phase III because of limited effectiveness in addressing these children in previous phases. The gender gap in education is mentioned being addressed through awareness creation, advocacy and partnering with other organizations supporting girls' education.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS presents a programme phase III which indicates that interventions are based on a HRBA, gender equality, and the principle of poverty orientation with a particular focus on poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups (cf. the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind'), but it is noted that the approach to working with the CRC and child self-advocacy is not very elaborated and that the approach to working with girls as a specific target group is not strongly reflected in the programme document.</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 2, which is given, when there is some indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		
Criteria 10	Sustainability	Score:
<p>Assessment: Programme phase III is noted to be an exit phase. This is to some extent reflected in the programme document in terms of the ambition to enhance sustainability of the roles and impact of CS groups (outcome 1) and collaborate with different stakeholders at different levels including (outcome 2). Given that it is an exit phase, the reflections on the strategic approach to achieving organizational, technical (in relation to the strategic models) and financial sustainability are assessed as vague and based on not very well-founded assumptions. It is consequently not made probable that local partners, local CS groups and the target groups will have sufficient capacity to sustain results beyond the programme and thus not end up in an inappropriate relationship of dependency. The programme document mentions that for sustainability purposes a carefully crafted exit strategy for South Sudan will inform a guided exit by 2021, but the programme document contains no elaborations on the exit strategy (beyond exploring possible options for an alternative intervention targeting the much-needed service delivery in the country) or annexes concerning an exit for South Sudan nor any plan for developing the strategies for exiting the remaining three countries by the end of 2025.</p> <p><i>In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant partly accepts the critique raised in relation to exit and sustainability especially in regard to the fragile countries of South Sudan and Sudan where the exit strategy could have been substantiated more. IAS-DK mentions that it and the IAS-LM Alliance plan to continue the support of the local partners in South Sudan also after the exit.</i></p> <p>In conclusion, IAS DK presents some reflections on sustainability but given that the proposed programme is an exit phase, the strategic approach to achieving sustainability of key expected changes is assessed as vague and based on not very well-founded assumptions. In addition, there are very limited reflections on the exit strategy for phasing out South Sudan by 2021, and no reflections whatsoever for the partners in Kenya, Tanzania and Sudan that will be phased out by 2025. There is found to be some indication that the intervention will strengthen civil society entities that promote social justice and has reflected on responsible climate and environmental conduct in line with the sustainability model (presented in the Guidelines for the Civil Society Fund).</p> <p><i>The score based on the assessment criteria is 2, which is given, when there is some indication that supports the criteria.</i></p>		2
Criteria 11	Financial resources and Cost Level	Score:
<p>Assessment: The total budget amounts to DKK 20.757.176, including DKK 18.720.000.000 from the CSF. DKK 407.196 (2,5 %) being expected liquid funds; and 1.629.980 (10 %) in expected co-financing. Of the 18.7 mil. DKK applied from the CSF DKK 16.166.468 is allocated PPA and distributed according to the three outcomes and the three cost categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome 1 Country programmes follow their country-specific ToC....: 39% of PPA budget. 		2

- Outcome 2: For sustainability and continuity, country programmes empower CS groups ...: 40% of PPA.
- Outcome 3: Innovative promotion of IE in fragile contexts: 22% of PPA.

The overall allocation to the 3 outcomes is assessed as balanced and reasonable, in the view of outcome 1 focusing on capacity building and advocacy, 2 containing service delivery and capacity building, and outcome 3 only implemented in fragile countries (Sudan 2022 - 2025 and South Sudan 2022). The detailed budget outlined in sheet 1C is output based but not specified by a description of unit type (i.e. type of cost). It is thus not possible to make a solid assessment of budget coherence, i.e. the relationship between the budget and the expected results, intervention logic and size of target group.

In terms of distribution between the three cost categories, DKK 9.332.804 (50%) of the total budget is noted to be transferred to local independent partners (A2), whereas DKK 5.417.296 (29%) is allocated direct activity cost (A1) and DKK 1.416.368 (8%) is allocated programme support cost (A3). The latter two categories cover cost incurred in Denmark. In general, the distribution of funds between local partners and IAS DK is considered unbalanced and the large cost allocation (37%) to IAS DK is not found to be substantiated by the programme document. Based on the description of programme management where the responsibility for programme management is largely assigned to the programme team in Nairobi (cf. section 3.7 in the programme document), the total budget for Danish payroll cost of DKK 2.853.828 (for staff at IAS offices in Denmark) is assessed high and not justified. There is thus indication that the cost effectiveness of Danish costs (spending on administration, travel, and salaries both in partner country and in Denmark) is low.

The approach towards obtaining supplementary resources in the form of liquid funds and co-funding is adequately specified in annex 2.5. A Corporate Brand & Communications strategy is attached (annex 2.7) but neither the programme document nor the annex mentions initiatives related to local resource mobilization at partner level (donor diversification) to boost the effect and sustainability of all their actions.

In commenting on the draft assessment, the applicant partly accepts the critique raised in relation to the budget. IAS-DK explains that IAS Sudan is part of the Danish Cost categories (A1 and A3) due to the fragile context in Sudan and the need to operate through an international solid partner (INGO). It is also mentioned that that the IE programme has no implementation through the IAS country office in South Sudan in phase 3, only through the independent local partner. As for the programme team in Nairobi, it is covered under the cost category A2 since all funds to the team activities are channeled through IAS Kenya which is an independent partner. Finally, IAS states that when submitting a revised budget after scoring, the Danish payrolls will be reviewed.

In conclusion, IAS DK presents a relatively clear and transparent budget that identifies and separates costs incurred at partner level and costs relating to the Danish applicant. There is found to be no indication in the programme document of how the applicant will be reviewing costs and outcomes during programme implementation to reallocate budgetary resources to enhance cost effectiveness, and with a programme team in Nairobi the size of the budget for Danish payroll cost is found not to be justified.

The score based on the assessment criteria is 2, which is given, when there is some indication that supports the criteria.

Criteria 12	Popular engagement and development education	Score:
	<p>Assessment: IAS DK is assessed as demonstrating a solid track-record of exploring new ways of engaging volunteers and a larger and more diverse segment of the Danish public. The programme document contains a plan for exploring new ways of engaging volunteers and a larger and more diverse segment of the Danish public, including through collaboration with the disability movement. The plan also contains a strategy for strengthening the understanding of and interest in global development challenges in the context of the SDG 4, and the role of civil society partners.</p> <p>In conclusion, IAS-DK is assessed as demonstrating a solid ability 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.</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

Overall conclusion and budget (based on scoring and former budget level):			
Scoring aggregated and weighted	International Aid Services	Average score for all applying programmes	Loss in % of International Aid Services
	51,3	77,2	20%
Budget:	Applied amount/year:	Loss due to competition:	Final budget amount/year
	4.680.000	936.000	3.745.000

Embassy screening (if any):

Comments from Embassies	<p>Tanzania: Overall, the Embassy has not read the proposal thoroughly in full and has not made an assessment of the method, ToC, results framework etc. – only commented on the context and relevance for Tanzania. The Embassy has not made a partner assessment of International Aid Service as organization, since the Embassy is not familiar with it.</p> <p><u>Context analysis:</u> The proposed has a valid context analysis for Tanzania, where inclusive education is most relevant, both with focus on children with special learning needs and girls in general. Strengthening civil society is also a noteworthy objective in itself.</p> <p><u>Alignment with local needs, priorities, etc:</u> As regards to alignment, the objective is definitely needed and is a spoken priority in Tanzania. However, the Embassy does not have the sufficient knowledge of national education- or disability policies to make an assessment, but the proposal mentions the lack of a comprehensive national policy on inclusive education in Tanzania. Strengthening civil society is also a noteworthy objective in itself.</p> <p><u>Harmonization with other donors/development interventions:</u> The proposal does not seem to mention other donors, but in Tanzania UNFPA, UK and Sweden work extensively with people with disabilities and/or education.</p> <p><u>Choice of local partner:</u> At the Embassy, we do not know the partner organisation.</p>
Response from applicant (if any)	<p>IAS-DK is closely connected to Läkarmissionen.se that is the Swedish partner of IAS-LM Alliance (since 2019). IAS DK is knowledgeable about the Swedish engagement in disability and education in Tanzania and has a strong link through the alliance with Läkarmissionen to connect the inclusive education programme into broader national networks of partners in Tanzania.</p> <p>It comes as a surprise that the Embassy state that they do not know the local partner in Tanzania. The Free Pentecostal Church of Tanzania (FPCT) is one of the major Christian church denominations in the country and has almost status of being as a state church. It was founded in 1932, has provided special social and health welfare, community activities and facilities in cooperation with the government since the 1950s. This includes education, health programs, and services for people with and without disabilities. FPCT has also been managing TV and radio broadcasts across Tanzania for decades.</p> <p>CKU (former DMCCDD) has visited the Embassy annually to share on the role of the major churches and religious actor's roles within development in Tanzania. IAS DK has often been represented together with CKU</p> <p>IAS-DK will ensure that FPCT is introduced to the Embassy employees.</p>

<p>Comments from Embassies</p>	<p>Kenya: Key strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programme is targeted at girls and children with special needs- having access to equal educational opportunities in a range of countries. • Programme operates within the educational sector and applies HRBA for Civil Society Development to promote inclusive education. • Focuses on Tana River county which is among the most marginalized, with some of the lowest literacy levels and very high unemployment and criminal rates in Kenya. • The primary target groups in the IE programme phase 3 are the Right Holders- these are children with special needs and the girl child – the need being met is clear and strongly demonstrated. • Secondary target groups are the moral duty bearers (parents/caregivers, teachers, school leadership, religious leaders, CSOs, CBOs and other NGOs) and the formal duty bearers (government representatives, political authorities and decision makers) therefore this is a wholistic approach by the programme. • The long term impact and sustainability of the programme is pegged on the involvement and empowerment of the target communities- build upon participatory approaches. Institutional infrastructure shall also be put in place-construct improved assessment centers and Assessment Model Schools, this can be replicated in other counties. <p>Some gaps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While, in phase 3- IAS will act as a catalyst in engagements with TRC Umbrella Organization of Persons with Disabilities and the Tana River County Community Chairpersons Association, a clearer demonstration of how they will engage the government both at the national and county levels and how the duty bearers responsibility is not usurped in the long term rather, they are compelled to supplement and compliment the support. • Lessons learnt from Year 1 and 2 will inform this third phase—includes advocacy gap, synergy, voice of the child, future role of civil society groups and COVID-19 disruptions. It would be good to see how the intervention will be sustained and owned by the community beyond the programme.
<p>Response from applicant (if any)</p>	<p>CS groups will engage the county governments directly, as they have already done in Tana River and achieved the enactment of the County Disability Act, and the annual allocation of funds for PWD. At the national level, they will go through the IE sub-committee of the National Education Coalition.</p> <p>CS groups have received capacity building to act only as catalysts for the formal duty bearers to honour their responsibility for the provision of IE. The role of the CS groups will remain as engagement partners with FDBs.</p> <p>During Phase 3, the programme will work with CS groups and key national stakeholders as intermediators to undertake activities addressing the identified advocacy gap, synergy, and child advocacy, among other things. CS groups will continue with these roles beyond the programme period. Efforts will be made to link them with Danish and other international OPDs for partnerships and continued sustainability of IE</p>

QUALITY ASSURANCE CHECKLIST

File number/F2 reference: 2019-1911

Programme/Project name: IAS - Sustainable and Equal Quality Educational Opportunities for All

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

Budget: 14.980.000

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: The overall strategic orientation of the proposed programme is strengthening civil society to improve access to equal and quality education for children facing barriers to learning (CFBL), including children with special educational needs and girls, and to ensure the sustainability of their efforts beyond the programme period. The overall strategic orientation of IAS-DK's programme indicates that the programme will be contributing to strengthen civil society in the global South (Kenya, South Sudan, Sudan and Tanzania) so that it has the independence, space diversity and capacity to influence and promote the realization of the Sustainable Development Goals, in particular SDG 4, but also SDG 5, 10, 16 and 17. Given that the programme phase III is an exit phase, the assessment committee notes that the programme document does not strongly reflect the strategic orientation towards exiting and ensuring the sustainability of efforts beyond the programme period.

☒ 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: LAS-DK is generally assessed as having a solid track-record and approach to mainstreaming the HRBA principles of participation, accountability, non-discrimination, and transparency (PANT) in the individual components, with partner organisations and within the applicant organisation. It is noted that programme phase III will introduce the Convention for the Rights of the Child (CRC), and Child Protection policies at the community level, and launch self-advocacy by children (the Voice of the Child initiative). LAS presents a programme phase III which indicates that interventions are based on a HRBA, gender equality, and the principle of poverty orientation with a particular focus on poor, marginalised and vulnerable groups (cf. the SDG principle of 'leaving no-one behind'), but it is noted that the approach to working with the CRC and child self-advocacy is not very elaborated and that the approach to working with girls as a specific target group is not strongly reflected 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: Yes.

☒ 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: LAS-DK is assessed as presenting a partnership engagement that potentially can contribute to developing a strong, independent, vocal and diverse civil society in the Global South, particularly at local level, through meaningful, equal and committing partnerships. However, it is noted that while the track-record and approach to continued capacity building of the local CS groups and networks is fairly clear the catalytic

potential of the programme (i.e. lifting and pursuing local advocacy issues at a national level), is not sufficiently substantiated.

☒ 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: LAS-DK is assessed as having solid organizational capacity, including human resources, to enhance development effectiveness of the organization by maintaining satisfactory professional competency and technical capacity, but it is noted that the quality of the programme document does not adequately reflect/demonstrate the organization's programmatic competencies. LAS is considered demonstrating a solid record of involving relevant groups and stakeholders in the Danish society to broaden and sustain popular engagement with development cooperation. Finally, LAS is found to demonstrate capacity to operate in fragile contexts.

☒ 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:



Date and signature of Management: