



ELIGIBILITY AND CAPACITY ASSESSMENT

CRITERIA AND SCORING

Annex B is a guide for scoring and assessing the prequalification form Annex 1. Applicants should not fill out the form in Annex B.

The eligibility requirements assess whether applicants are eligible for applying for a Strategic Partnership and can be confirmed or rejected by a simple yes or no. 100 percent compliance is required, and applicants who do not meet all the eligibility requirements will not be considered further. It is indicated where requirements are to be met by lead applicant only or by all applicants in a consortium.

The MFA will assess the submitted documentation, and if eligibility requirements are met, a capacity assessment is carried out.

The capacity assessment will be scored by applying an adapted version of the World Bank inspired rating scale 'LEADS', allocating scores from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent). Hence, the minimum an organisation/consortium can score is 1 and the maximum is 5. To receive a satisfactory score, and for an applicant to be invited to submit a full proposal, each criterion needs a minimum score of 2.

LEADS stands for		Score	The score is given when there is
L	Little action/evidence	1	Weak indication that supports the criteria
E	Some Evidence	2	Some indication that supports the criteria
A	Action taken	3	Indication that supports the criteria
D	Developed	4	Solid indication that supports the criteria
S	Sustainable	5	Comprehensive indication of implementation and/or indication of an established approach/system that supports the criteria

To score the capacity assessment, each criterion is broken down in sub-components with a weighted percentage. This means that each sub-component will receive a score of 1-5 and afterwards weighted with the respective percentage. The total score of the criterion will hence reflect the combined weighted scores of each sub-component. It is only the total score of the criterion that needs a minimum of 2, i.e., it is possible to receive a score below 2 in sub-components, and still receive a satisfactory score for the criterion.

PART B: ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS	Yes/No
Governance	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be a civil society organisation operating on a non-profit basis with a registered office and activities in Denmark. This includes organisations engaged in international development, humanitarian organisations, trade unions, business member organisations, and faith-based organisations. • Have approved articles of association. • Have an independent governing board. <i>(If part of a larger international alliance, the board must be appointed by the organisation based in Denmark and it must be free and able to make independent decisions on strategic and operational issues.)</i> 	
Membership	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Have at least 300 contributing members or individual regular sponsors in Denmark either directly or (for umbrella organisations) through at least one of its membership organisations.</p>	
Programme management and country presence	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Document experience managing development and/or humanitarian programmes totalling a budget of minimum 2 million DKK per year in at least two countries in Africa, Ukraine and European eastern neighbourhood and/or the Middle East eligible for ODA*. The presence must be current and have been on-going for at least the two preceding years 2023-2024 (<i>consortium as a whole</i>).</p> <p>* European neighbouring countries eligible for ODA are Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Ukraine. Middle Eastern countries eligible for ODA are Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, Syria, Türkiye, and Yemen. See also OECD list of ODA eligible countries.</p>	
Budgetary volume of development and/or humanitarian action	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Document management experience with development and/or humanitarian action (from MFA or other sources) which have been subject to reporting similar to what is required from MFA or CISU) in excess of DKK 25 million in at least one of the following years; 2022, 2023 and 2024 or equivalent fiscal years (<i>consortium as a whole</i>).</p>	

<p>If the applicant is part of an international alliance, the applicant must have been fully accountable for the funding in question.</p>	
Annual turnover	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Document having at least 25 pct of annual turnover sourced from other channels than its MFA-sourced main grant (e.g., SPA main grant, CISU main grant etc.). For consortia, the requirement applies only to the lead applicant.</p>	
Audit reports	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Have audit reports including compliance audits without substantial qualifications for the preceding two years (2023 and 2024 or equivalent fiscal years).</p>	
Integrity and solvency	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Testify to and upon request document that it has not been in any of the following situations (within the previous five years since beginning of 2020 and ongoing):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is bankrupt, subject to insolvency or winding-up procedures, where its assets are being administered by a liquidator or by a court, where it is in an arrangement with creditors, where its activities are suspended, or where it is in any analogous situation arising from a similar procedure. • It has been established by a final judgment or a final administrative decision that the applicant is in serious breach of its obligations relating to the payment of taxes or social security contributions in accordance with the law of the country in which it is established, or those of the country of the performance of the partnership. • It has been established by a final judgment or a final administrative decision that the applicant is guilty of grave professional misconduct. • It has been established by a final judgment that the applicant organisation or individuals in the management of the organisation is guilty of fraud, corruption, money laundering, terrorist financing including financing entities listed on EU on UN sanctions lists, child labour or other forms of trafficking in human beings. 	
Anti-corruption and Conflict of Interest	
<p><u>Applicants must:</u></p> <p>Have an anti-corruption policy and conflict of interest policy or similar in place.</p>	

PSHEA, Code of conduct and Child Protection	
<u>Applicants must:</u>	
Have a PSHEA policy, a Code of Conduct and a policy against child labour in place.	
Anti-terror	
<u>Applicants must:</u>	
Have an anti-terror policy in place that addresses how the organisation will take all reasonable steps to secure that no funds in relation to their projects and programmes will – directly or indirectly – benefit persons, groups or entities associated with terrorism or subject to UN Sanctions or EU restrictive measures.	
Complaints handling mechanism	
<u>Applicants must:</u>	
Have a complaints-handling and whistle blower mechanism in place that employees, partners, communities, beneficiaries etc. can access.	
Core Humanitarian Standards	
<u>Applicants who intend to engage in humanitarian action with MFA humanitarian funds must:</u>	
Be independently verified or certified against the CHS or in process of individually verification or certification. If the organisation is verified, certified or in process as a part of a federation/alliance, the Danish organisation’s humanitarian funding received from MFA, should be covered in the CHS audit scope.	
The verification or certification process (both individually or part of federation/alliance) should be concluded by end of 2026. If not manageable within the given deadline, the applicant should notify the MFA.	

PART C – CAPACITY ASSESSMENT ¹	Score 1-5
<p>1. Strategic Capacity (Weighted score 25%)</p>	
<p><u>The assessment of the criterion will include assessment of the following sub-criteria:</u></p> <p>1.1 Documented track record on delivering relevant development and/or humanitarian results at outcome level, including results from strategic dialogue and cooperation with MFA or other key stakeholders both in Denmark and at country level, as well as documented contribution in leveraging or scaling results through membership or representation in federations, alliances, networks, or other. (Weighted score 60%)</p> <p>1.2 Documented strategic approach and track record in resource mobilization for development/and or humanitarian purposes, including how MFA or similar funding is used to mobilize funding from other donors or financing sources other than traditional ODA, including documented experience with innovative and blended finance. (Weighted score 20%)</p> <p>1.3 Documented strategic approach and track record on information and public engagement in Denmark including rootedness and outreach in Denmark through memberships, volunteering, people-to-people engagement, or other public engagement activities, as well as ability to build synergies with international programme activities. (Weighted score 20%)</p>	<p><u>Basis for assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted Application Form • Latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the organisation (if in consortium the latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the consortium or lead-organisation). If no MFA or CISU review has been carried out, an external review report or similar should be attached. This includes management response and latest updated follow-up matrix. • Referral to case(s) providing two recent examples illustrating relevant track record within this criterion.

¹ For applications by a consortium, the assessment of standards for applications will be for the consortium as a whole with relevant contributions from all consortium members (excluding financial management which will be for the lead applicant).

2. Programmatic and Operational Capacity (Weighted score 20%)	
<p><u>The assessment of the criterion will include assessment of the following sub-criteria:</u></p> <p>2.1 Documentation of programming approaches that the applicant has committed to in its programme strategy (including HRBA, local leadership, LNOB, HDP nexus, gender, youth, inclusion of people with disabilities, or other), including how it is applied in programme design, existing guidelines, expertise, and systems in place to support the implementation of approaches and procedures for monitoring and accountability towards defined minimum quality criteria of the programming approaches. (Weighted score 30%)</p> <p>2.2 Documentation of institutionalised project management cycle, including standard operating procedures and support systems for programme formulation and implementation, guidelines for identification of stakeholders and target group and their involvement in project design and systems, and procedures for risk identification, mitigation and management. (Weighted score 30%)</p> <p>2.3 Documented approach to and application of results-based management and MEAL systems, including quality of global results framework, approach and capacity for capturing, documenting, and consolidating results at outcome level across projects and programmes, clear procedures for adaptation also to new or changing needs, as well as systematic use of data and evidence-based learning e.g., in programme development. (Weighted score 40%)</p>	<p><u>Basis for assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted Application Form • Latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the organisation (if in consortium the latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the consortium or lead-organisation). If no MFA or CISU review has been carried out, an external review report or similar should be attached. This includes management response and latest updated follow-up matrix. • Global Results Framework and a Country/Programme Results Framework from either 2024 or 2025 • Referral to case(s) providing two recent examples of concrete application of these approaches, systems and procedures

<p>3. Partnership Capacity (Weighted score 30%)</p>	
<p><u>The assessment of the criterion will include assessment of the following sub-criteria:</u></p> <p>3.1 Documentation of a clear partnership approach to working with both Danish, international and local partners, including a clear and strategic division of roles between applicant and partners, clarity on the applicant’s expected organisational added value in partnerships, as well as documentation of a structured and systemic approach to mutual evaluation and partner feedback between applicant and partners. (Weighted score 30%)</p> <p>3.2 Documentation of clear and strategic procedures for partner mapping, identification, and selection, including measures to ensure relevant diversity as well as representativeness of partners, procedures for due diligence and partner capacity assessment, as well as procedures for entering, maturing and exiting partnerships. (Weighted score 20%)</p> <p>3.3 Documented approach to and progress on local leadership, including track record of increasing quality and quantity of financial transfers to local partners, applied partner capacity strengthening and -sharing, implemented mechanisms for transfer of ownership and leadership to local partners in programme design and management as well as involvement and representation of local partners in coordination mechanisms and policy fora. (Weighted score 50%)</p>	<p><u>Basis for assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted Application Form • Latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the organisation (if in consortium the latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the consortium or lead-organisation). If no MFA or CISU review has been carried out, an external review report or similar should be attached. This includes management response and latest updated follow-up matrix. • Partnership Strategy or similar • Recent partnership evaluation or feedback report or similar (individual and/or consolidated assessment from local partner(s) of the applicant). • Local Leadership Strategy or similar • Documentation of funding transferred

	<p>to local partners 2022, 2023 and 2024 (Annex C)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referral to case(s) providing two recent examples illustrating application of approaches and relevant track record within this criterion.
<p>4. Organisational and Administrative Capacity (Weighted score 10%)</p>	
<p><u>The assessment of the criterion will include assessment of the following sub-criteria:</u></p> <p>4.1 Documentation of the organisational structure, including clear division of roles in governance, management, and programming functions, between HQ, regional, country, or federation offices as relevant, as well as adequate technical capacity to support monitoring, documentation, and consolidation of results and learning, and other support function such as finance, HR, IT or other. (Weighted score 40%)</p> <p>4.2 Documentation of sufficient systems for human resource management, including capacity development and staff retention, and adequate procedures and systems to ensure the safety and security of both staff and partners. (Weighted score 20%)</p> <p>4.3 Documentation and effectiveness of systems and practices in place that ensures anti-corruption and safeguarding (including PSEAH-, anti-child-labour and anti-terror), including systems supporting implementation, established complaint handling mechanism and documented procedures for timely and adequate handling of suspected irregularities</p>	<p><u>Basis for assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted Application Form • Latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the organisation (if in consortium the latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the consortium or lead-organisation). If no MFA or CISU review has been carried out, an external review report or similar should be attached. This includes management response and latest updated follow-up matrix. • Organisational organigram

<p>and adherences to MFA guidelines. (Weighted score 25%)</p> <p>4.4 Documentation of managing environmental and carbon footprint, including quality of monitoring and reporting procedures as well as progress in implementation. (Weighted score 15%)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-corruption policy or similar • Environmental footprint strategy or similar
<p>5. Financial Management Capacity (Weighted score 15%)</p>	
<p><u>The assessment of the criterion will include assessment of the following sub-criteria:</u></p> <p>5.1 Documentation of financial management systems, compliance and control procedures at all levels (incl. roles and responsibilities in budgeting and accounting locally and at HQ) functioning and adhering to MFA Financial Management Guidelines including internal financial and administrative control systems and clear roles and responsibilities across finance staff, as well as transparent, relevant and thorough management- and board financial reporting. In case of consortium, the approach and procedures for coordination, decision making, financial reporting and -monitoring within the consortium. (Weighted score 40%)</p> <p>5.2 Documentation of organisational structure in place for financial capacity assessment, monitoring and oversight of local partners' financial management- and integrity systems, including overall setup of due diligence and auditing processes as well as internal control procedures related to fund transfers, and documented utilization of financial monitoring data in adjustment of programmes and operation. (Weighted score 40%)</p> <p>5.3 Documented approach to promote value for money (VfM) (economy, efficiency, effectiveness, equity) including principles for measurement and analysis of relevant indicators with the aim to ensure progression in strengthening VfM and a reasonable</p>	<p><u>Basis for assessment:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitted Application Form • The most recent MFA or CISU external financial monitoring report of the organisation including updated follow-up response or matrix (if in a consortium latest MFA or CISU report and response from lead-organisation). If no MFA or CISU financial monitoring has been carried out, an external financial monitoring report or similar should be attached. This includes management response and latest updated follow-up matrix. • Latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the

balance between goal achievement and actual costs across the value chain. (Weighted score 20%)

organisation (if in consortium the latest MFA or CISU commissioned review report of the consortium or lead-organisation). If no MFA or CISU review has been carried out, an external review report or similar should be attached. This includes management response and latest updated follow-up matrix.

- Two recent examples of financial monitoring reports produced by the organisation including documentation for follow up on any recommendations (if in a consortium two recent examples produced by consortium lead-organisation)
- Documentation of a financial capacity assessment of a local partner (if in a consortium one example produced by lead-organisation)
- The most recent financial monitoring visit plan including

	description of the procedures for follow up and status (if in a consortium a plan and procedures from each consortium partner is required)
--	--