



**MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF DENMARK**

Q&A

**QUESTIONS RECEIVED BY 3 MARCH 2026
PRESENTED ON Q&A MEETING 6 MARCH 2026**

The presentation is updated with additional questions raised during the Q&A meeting on 6 March 2026

HUMCIV – 10.03.2026

GENERAL

1. Layout:

Is it allowed to add visual front pages to the different parts of the application (Cases, local leadership strategy etc.) without this counting towards the allowed number of pages?

1. Yes

2. Timeline:

Will the deadline for submission of ToCs still be 1 October despite the election?

2. Yes.

INFORMATION NOTE

1. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

In the information note, box 4 on Local Leadership – Six core elements and requirements, under point 01 Equitable Partnerships it says: “Strategic partners must demonstrate the equitable sharing of power between partners, address imbalances within local civil society and thus advance local leadership.” We ask MFA to:

- 1) Clarify if “sharing of power” are referring to between the Danish organization and the local organization OR between local organizations in a context, and
- 2) Give further explanation as to what it meant by “address imbalances within local civil society” and how the MFA considers this a prioritized strategy for advancing local leadership.

1. Ad 1) “Equitable sharing of power between partners”, refers to the relationship between the Danish strategic partner and its local partner organisations.

Ad 2) “Addressing imbalances within local civil society” refers to i.a. structural inequalities that may exist within local and national civil society ecosystems depending on context, including imbalances related to geography (capital-based vs. rural organisations), size and institutional capacity, access to funding, representation of constituencies etc. These are relevant to address in advancing local leadership.

INFORMATION NOTE

2. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

If an individual target is set that is higher than 35 pct., please confirm that it is enough to include the target in the Local Leadership Strategy and that the arguments behind the number should only be include in the bilateral approval process with MFA after the submission of the proposal.

3. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Box 4: 02 Financial resources and support. The footnote suggests that organisations that are “.. already above 35% in direct funding” should also consult and seek approval by the MFA for an individual target. We assume this is not necessary if well above the target? Can you confirm?

2+3. As stated in the Information Note p. 10, “...the proposal itself should present a suggested target by the applicant which will then afterwards be subject to discussion with and approval by the MFA.” This means that all partners should set a target and qualify this in the Local Leadership Strategy upon submission. Partners are expected to be ambitious even though they are beyond the minimum requirement.

INFORMATION NOTE

4. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Can the MFA confirm whether the 35% target for funds to local partners is in % of PPA or of the total SPA grant?

5. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Can the funding that we channel directly to youth groups (who are not formal partners) count towards the minimum of 35% of direct funding to local partners?

4. The 35% target refers to 35% of the PPA, as stated in the Information Note.

5. As long as the recipient of funding is included in the definition of local partners on p. 9 it can count towards the minimum of 35 pct. of direct funding to local partners.

INFORMATION NOTE

6. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Is there a distinction between the terms 'local partner' and 'local actor'? It seems to be used interchangeably e.g., in the requirement under core element 1 Equitable Partnerships.

6. The terms are used interchangeably. The term 'local partner' is the dominant term throughout the Information Note.

INFORMATION NOTE

7. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

The Q&A sheet specifies that the target for transfers to local partners applies to non-profit local partners only, but this is not clear from the Information Note. We would appreciate clarity on what is meant by non-profit and if it covers not-for-profit. Does the transfer of funds to non-profit local partners only mean that transfers to e.g., cooperatives and local social enterprises do not count as local partner transfers? An example: if we work with early-stage refugee-led enterprises that provides clean cooking solutions to underserved communities and support them to scale their reach?

7. It depends on the purpose. If the transfer has a development or humanitarian purpose, including a relevant target group for the intervention, it may be included. This should be reflected in all relevant agreements with local partners. If the purpose is to support profit-making beyond development or humanitarian purposes it cannot count.

The term 'non-profit local partners' is used to refer to entities that are not established for the purpose of distributing profits to owners or shareholders.

INFORMATION NOTE

8. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

1. For strategic partners that are part of an international federation with country offices, a global hub and regional offices, and where the country offices are not considered local partners: Can you specify what is meant when you refer to Danish partner versus strategic partner. Is there a difference?

2. And for organisations that are part of an international federation with country offices and regional offices that cannot be considered local partners, are they then included under the term “Danish partners”? This question is especially relevant for core element 6 of the local leadership strategy and we would recommend partners assess both entities.

8. Ad 1) The term strategic partner refers to either the single Danish organisation or the Danish consortium as a whole in a Strategic Partnership with the MFA. The term Danish partner is used in the same sense, i.e. the Danish strategic partner.

Ad 2) It depends on the individual organisational structure if a country office is a part of the Danish strategic partner or part of a federation. Regarding “Local assessment of the Danish partner” ref. Information Note p. 11: If the strategic partner operates through country offices of a federation it will most likely be relevant to include this aspect in the local assessment of the strategic partner. It should be noted, that the local assessment of the strategic partner may include other aspects as well. The precise format for this local assessment is up to the strategic partner to define – as long as it addresses the elements stated in the Information Note.

INFORMATION NOTE

9. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Can you confirm that “overhead” in box 4, 02 Financial Resources and Support in the Information Note is the same as “Administrative Fee” in A.2 in Annex 2E, and as Administration Fee in the Guidelines?

9. Yes

INFORMATION NOTE

10. Information and Public Engagement:

The Information Note states that as part of the reporting, organisations are required to document how engagement activities meaningfully include and promote the leadership of local and national partners. Does this refer to partners in the Global South? Or also in Denmark (if working with local and national partners)?

11. Gearing of resources:

Gearing of resources (p. 13) states that MFA funding beyond the SPA-grant cannot be included as own financing activities however, in SPA 2 Top-up funding was counted as own financing. Does this still apply?

10. This refers to partners in partner countries.

11. Own financing should be from sources other than the DK MFA.

INFORMATION NOTE

12. Budget frames:

How do you ensure that organisations placed in budget frames with upper ceiling close to current funding level are not put in a disadvantaged position as compared to organisations placed close to the bottom ceiling of the budget frame?

For transparency, would you please elaborate on the considerations that have gone into setting the budget frames? Especially the upper ceilings, which disproportionately limit the organisations whose current allocations are close to the upper ceilings.

Could you share the exact formula that has been applied for budgets frames- and/or clarify how the different factors have been weighted when placing an organisation in a budget frame?

Could you share the exact formula that will be applied for final grant allocation - and/or clarify how the different factors will be weighted and used in determining the final grant allocation?

12. Please see Information Note section 6 for a description of the factors determining a placement in a given application budget frame. A main consideration when setting the application budget frames has been to allow for a more level playing field for applicants based on capacity as measured by relevant budgetary volume and prequalification score. This approach parts with the path dependency of SPA main grant-levels that has characterized previous rounds.

The indicated proposal budget frame merely constitutes an estimated range for each applicant. The final allocation of grants could be both below and above the range. An applicant whose upper ceiling is close to current SPA-funding can therefore still end up with a final grant above that range depending on – inter alia – the overall Finance Act allocation for SPA3 and the quality of the application.

In line with previous SPA allocations, we do not intend to share the formula for calculations, but will explain the factors and principles informing budget ranges and final grant allocations.

INFORMATION NOTE

13. Budget Frames:

Please confirm that applicants should apply for an amount within the given budget frame, and not the amount they would like to receive.

14. Final Grant Allocation:

How much weight (if any) has the EoI in the assessment of the application for the full proposal?

13. This is confirmed. Applicants should apply within the given budget frame. This is however not the same as the final grant allocation, which can both increase or decrease from the budget frame.

14. The prequalification score is not included in the assessment of the full proposal as illustrated in the assessment overview in Annex 1B. As described in Information Note Section 6, the prequalification score is one of several factors that will be included in determining the final grant allocation.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

1. Executive summary:

The application form states a maximum 2 pages for the executive summary. Is this including or excluding the table on country engagements?

2. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Prior to the writing of the SPAIII application we have had extensive engagements with our local partners, to ensure their participation in decision-making of the framework for the SPAIII Application. These engagements will be followed up with project and programme development workshops later in 2026. Our question is, if we in response to 2.1.1., can include these engagements which have been implemented and therefore are not “planned” or if we can only include the process going forward?

1. This does not include the table on country engagement.

2. Yes, applicants may include both the engagements/consultations already conducted and the planned processes going forward. Although the question refers to the “planned process,” the intention is for applicants to demonstrate how local partner involvement is ensured throughout the development of the SPA 2027–2031 programme.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

3. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Is it possible to get clarification on how much time we will be given between receiving the final materials for the detailed ToC process and the deadline for our submission in October? This information is important for our planning, particularly for ensuring meaningful partner involvement.

4. Local Leadership and Danish added value:

Is the one page matrix-overview a minimum/maximum limit or can the length of the matrix-overview be defined by the applicant as long as the strategy with the matrix-overview does not exceed 10 pages?

3. Guidance and further information on submitting the ToCs will be shared when applicants receive the response to their proposal. Applicants are welcome to initiate the process beforehand, however final ToCs should follow the guidance shared later by the MFA for SPA 2027-2031.

4. The matrix can be defined by the applicant as long as the strategy with the matrix-overview does not exceed 10 pages.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

5. Information and Public Engagement:

Partners are required to include targets on reach and impact of IPE in the summary results framework (cf. requirements on section 2.2.1 of the application). Does this imply that IPE must have a separate outcome in the results framework or can IPE be integrated into other outcomes? For example an outcome on public and humanitarian engagement, which includes specific targets and sub-outcomes on IPE as well as on e.g. IHL, advocacy and humanitarian diplomacy.

5. IPE can be integrated in other outcomes. However, it should be easy to identify by the MFA which outcomes relate to IPE.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

6. Gearing of resources:

In the application format 2.3, it is stated that “The concept note may at this proposal stage 1) take shape as a preliminary concept note, covering broad and early considerations as well as 2) cover only a subset of the requirements set out in the guidelines section 11.3”. Are there any further requirements for the preliminary concept note?

6. No further requirements. Please refer to section 11.3 of the guidelines to see all requirements regarding the concept note. If applicants consider more elements should be included, applicants are allowed to cover additional elements (on top of the elements mentioned in section 11.3 of the guidelines).

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

7. Cross-cutting programming approaches:

Are applicants allowed to consolidate answers to sub-sections in the application formats, such as 2.4.2, 2.4.3, and 2.4.4, if it is clearly stated?

8. Cross-cutting programming approaches:

In the application form it is stated “Please describe the approach and ambition in the Strategic Partnership to ...”. However, the assessment and scoring note states that it will look at “demonstrate relevant considerations and application of cross-cutting approaches”. It is not fully clear if we should describe how we apply it? Or if we should describe further ambitions of enhancing the approach/taking it one step further.

7. Yes, under cross-cutting approaches, sub-sections can be consolidated as long as the approaches described are easy to identify for the MFA.

8. As stated in Annex 1B the proposal will be assessed on 'The extent to which the applicant demonstrates relevant consideration and application of the cross-cutting programming approaches outlined in the Information Note'. The 'extent to which' includes level of ambition.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

9. Thematic priorities:

3.1: “The description should include overall description of main partners and stakeholders.”

3.2: “This section should further include a brief description of country/regional/thematic/global engagements with overall thematic focus and partners.”

Can this be understood as ‘types of partners’ given that the detailed programming will take place later?

9. In section 3.1 it may be an overall description of main partners and stakeholders, including types of partners. Where possible in section 3.2, it should refer to actual partners. If specific partners have not yet been identified, a type of partner can be described.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

10. Thematic priorities:

We are in doubt on how to divide information between section 3.1 and 3.2 in Annex 1 of the Application and ask for a bit further guidance on what is expected where? 3.1 requests a description of the “entire Strategic partnership” including overall description of main partners and stakeholders. 3.2 should describe the “overall programme engagement” – and further include a brief description of country/regional/thematic/global engagements with “overall thematic focus areas and partners”.

10. The sections should be described as outlined in Annex 1. The two sections are interlinked and will be read together. The division is for applicants to structure their proposal. Where section 3.1 is an overall description and justification (of all the listed elements), section 3.2. should describe the actual intended programme engagement – e.g. elaborate on thematic priorities and activities, where the engagements will be implemented and with whom.

ANNEX 1 – APPLICATION FORM

11. Thematic priorities:

With regard to the request for considerations on Value for Money – in section 3.1 – can you elaborate on what might be expected?

12. Results framework:

Should applicants set targets for un-allocated funds?

11. This depends on the applicant and the proposed engagement. As part of the prequalification, applicants have described a Value for Money approach that most probably will inform their full proposal. Current SPA 2022-2026 partners are further required to have a strategy in place and it is a requirement for all partners when entering into SPA 2027-2031 as described in the guidelines.

Reference is also made to the Value for Money Guidance Note (Annex 11).

12. No

ANNEX 1A – INSTRUCTION TO PREPARATION OF CASES

1. If one case builds on evidence from multiple countries/programmes to give a broad illustration of the applicant's track record and added value in a given thematic priority area, should a cumulated budget from all included countries/programs thus be referenced? Or will budget and funding agencies in such a case not be relevant? (referencing the formulation: "Budget and funding agencies (if relevant)")

2. Can the same case cover more than one thematic priority area?

1. The applicant may accumulate the budgets from several programs, if this is deemed relevant.

2. Yes. One case can cover more than one thematic priority. If this is the case, it should be clearly stated.

ANNEX 1B – ASSESSMENT AND SCORING

1. Thematic Priorities:

“The extent to which the applicant presents clear and relevant overall rationale, justification, objectives and outcomes for the entire Strategic Partnership”. Then under “Basis for Assessment”: “A Summary Results Framework (max 4 pages) outlining overall outcomes and impact for the five-year period”. Question: How many result levels is the results framework expected to have? (Two = outcomes and impact? Three = outcomes, objectives, impact?)

1. The results framework should as a minimum cover objectives and outcomes. (Selected ‘output indicators’ should also be reflected – ref. Annex 9)

ANNEX 2 – BUDGET SUMMARY

1. Annex 2 states that engagements may include “regional and interregional activities” that are preferably divided among targeted countries. If no obvious target country/region they cannot count towards the 50% geographically aligned budget. This is clear. In case of a global thematic programme for which the exact geographical allocation is not clear yet, can this be put under “Regional (not country specific)” or i.e. “Global (not country specific)”.

2. Can outcomes per country be presented in summary/draft form (not finalized outcome statements) given that the detailed programming will take place later?

1. Yes. Please add as relevant under 'other regions' in Annex 2.

2. Yes

ANNEX 2 – BUDGET SUMMARY

3. When applying a nexus approach, where development programming happens in humanitarian contexts, is it acceptable to categorize all funding under development funding, while acknowledging that some activities could partly be categorized as - or shift toward humanitarian activities? Same question applies to the unallocated flexible funds: If it is the expectation that these would also to some extent could potentially be used in a smaller scale humanitarian response if needed, when working with development in a humanitarian context, would it then still be acceptable to categorize these under development?

4. On "Annex 2G Blended Finance": Will there be further instructions about how to fill out the annex?

3. If interventions are of development nature, they should be categorized as such in the budget, even though they take place in a fragile context. Should interventions change to humanitarian interventions, it will be possible to update the budget during the period of the Strategic Partnership.

4. There are no current plans for extra guidance text within Annex 2G (or 3G), but please share any input, questions or concerns directly with HUMCIV and we will try to accommodate and share any clarifications with all applicants (e.g. guidance text etc.)

GUIDELINES

1. Obligations of the strategic partner:

Will it be possible to include SPA programme activities in Ukraine - for example related to civil society support and NbS- having the without CHS certification?

1. Yes.

GUIDELINES

2. IATI and FTS reporting:

It is stated in the Guidelines that “Strategic partners with humanitarian activities are obliged to report humanitarian flows to FTS”, however this is not stated in Annex 10.

If this is a requirement then we have the following questions:

- Is this an actual requirement?
- If yes, from when would we be expected to be able to comply with this?

Regarding “It is recommended to include the additional elements in IATI that allows for a conversion to FTS reporting”

- What are the additional elements, that are mentioned on page 19 in relation to FTS reporting?
- Is it required to include these additional elements, or is it more of a recommendation?

Regarding “New humanitarian flows should be reported to FTS within a month.”

- We are currently updating our IATI reporting every quarter. Under SPA 2027-2031, are we required to start reporting on humanitarian activities once a month?

2. Yes, this is a requirement for SPA3, and is already a requirement under the current SPA2. The comments and questions are noted. Strategic partners will be invited for a technical meeting to discuss the details and implications of the FTS reporting requirement at a later stage.

GUIDELINES

3. Accounting principles:

Section 6,9 in the guidelines is not as detailed as the audit instructions, where it says the unaudited expenditures are reported based on the transfers. It would be great to clarify if unaudited local partner costs and advances can be included in Annex 2 and 3? Cost from our Country Offices only appear in our system one month after they occur.

3. Yes, unaudited local partner costs and advances can be included in Annex 2 and 3 but should be corrected once a certified financial statement or an audit is received.

GUIDELINES

4. Accounting principles:

The audit instructions ask Strategic Partners to verify the exchange gain/loss in the accounts. This is not mentioned in the guidelines or in Annex 2E. We would like clarification on how to report and verify exchange gain/loss.

4. The MFA does not require exchange gains/losses to be reported in the financial statements. The auditor would typically verify exchange gain/losses recorded in the accounts as part of the financial audit; this would fall under the auditor's review and verification of the various funds transactions in DKK and any other currency, which may have been involved in the funds transactions.

GUIDELINES

5. Accounting principles:

One of the procedures related to the compliance audit is the reconciliation of budgets. This can be challenging as the budgets are a mix local and Denmark costs/budgets. We would appreciate if the Audit Instructions could elaborate or differentiate on local and Denmark costs/budgets in order to avoid confusion by the local auditors.

5. The design and planning of the annual audit of the SPA financial reporting – the audit of the SPA partner as well as the local partners to the SPA partner – follows an agreement between the SPA partner and the Danish SPA auditor. Under this agreement – the audit assignment – the parties shall decide upon the requirements of the audit and the implications for the SPA partner as well as the local partners, thereby reaching an agreement on which audit tasks shall be carried out at “group level” and at local level.

The audit objective must be that the SPA auditor shall provide an opinion on the financial, performance and compliance audit; the audit tasks towards this objective, though, follows an agreement between the SPA partner and the auditor. Such an agreement will be a result of the SPA auditor weighing materiality and risk.

Most evidently, this is reflected in §3 of the audit instructions: “The scope of the audit depends on the Strategic Partner’s structure and practices...” as well as in the boxes providing examples of potential audit tasks for the financial, performance and compliance audit: “Procedures to be performed...could include:...”.

Relevant procedures relating to the compliance component to be conducted by the Danish SPA auditor could, for example, be to “Reconcile budget amounts included in the financial statements against the approved budget” whilst relevant procedures relating to the compliance component to be included in the local audit could, for example, be to “test, on a sample basis, that expenses and staff resources funded by grants through the MFA are not also funded from other sources.”

GUIDELINES

6. Financial mobilisation:

Does MFA recognize the unlocking of high-impact, high-integrity carbon credits as a way of mobilizing private impact investments through innovative and blended finance activities, provided that the programmatic standards and capacities required for financial intermediation are met?

7. Financial mobilisation:

Is it rightly understood that the points/requirements listed in section 11.3 of the guidelines should only be addressed depending on the relevance of the role the organisation is intending to take on (cf. box 5 in the information note) as well as the proposed activity? Not all points listed are relevant to all types of activities/partner role and the rearing response does not provide clarity on this (cf. p. 24 in the hearing response).

6. The MFA encourages organisations to include elements such as these in the relevant concept notes on the matter.

7. Yes

GUIDELINES

8. Financial mobilisation:

We would appreciate clarification on how reporting and reuse of funds should be handled under SPA III in relation to an in-house innovative finance modality. Specifically, should reporting and any approval of reflows take place at the overall facility level, or at the level of each individual transaction financed under the facility? In other words, if Danida funds is allocated to the modality, should reporting and approval relate to the total committed capital as one envelope, or to each underlying investment/project separately?

9. Financial mobilisation:

Are there any restrictions on the number of pages for the concept notes under 11.3?

8. The MFA will decide on specific reporting arrangements on the basis of each individual concept note on the matter.

9. There is no specific limit however, the MFA expects that applicants can keep concept notes within 3 pages.

ANNEX 9

1. In the guidelines for SPRS you mention that the three categories of output indicators (people, partners, policy) should be included in the Results Summary. Due to the lower measurement level of these indicators, we assume that they should be added during the next round when specifying the country-specific ToCs? If not, we recommend that we only include more generic output indicators across the three categories at this stage and first in the next round specify to match the country-specific ToCs.

1. Applicants are allowed to include more generic output indicators at this stage and adjust these when submitting ToCs and updated Results Frameworks by 1 October.

ANNEX 9

2. On provision of output indicators, with reference to annex 9 of the administrative guidelines: Is it correctly understood, that we will provide 2-5 indicators (on reach, number of partners, and/or contributions to policy changes) as part of the application (first part) and then there will subsequently be a dialogue with the ministry to refine and seek coherence across all strategic partners? Hence, suggested indicators may change after first round of the application? Examples in the guidelines seem to invite for both output and outcome indicators. Is this correctly understood?

2. Yes, it is correctly understood.

Annex 9 refers to the SPA Portfolio-level Results System (SPRS) across the Strategic Partnerships. Applicants should include/highlight in their Summary Results Framework the suggested 2-5 'output indicators' following the criteria listed in Annex 9. These may be adjusted in the subsequent programming phase.

There will in the autumn of 2026 furthermore be a separate process on the SPRS where the MFA will engage with successful strategic partners to ensure clear contributions towards the aims of the Danish development strategy across the SPA 2027-2031 portfolio.

Output indicators in the SPRS are referred to as "outputs" as they should capture the scale of interventions through quantitative counts, although SPA partners may decide to reflect achievements that are closer to realised outcomes.