

Strengthening Civil Society: Questions and Answers

First of all, general questions regarding all four grant instruments will be answered, followed by specific instrument related questions.

The Hague, 19 December 2019

We want to **draw your attention** specifically to:

- **Question 6-11** for the definition of annual report for threshold criteria D.4.
- **Question 42** for the maximum number of words for the Track Record, which has been increased to 3,500 in total;
- **Questions 101-108** for the calculation method regarding the country selection.
- The online application portal will be available soon via:
<https://vmm.bzforms.mfaservices.nl>

Timeline

1. Will there be a possibility for a second round of questions? / Continue the good practice of wrapping up questions and answers every week until January / As the online application form is not available yet we kindly ask you to allow us to ask clarifying questions once the form has been published.

After publication of the online application portal, one extra round of questions regarding the online application portal can be submitted to the earlier mentioned email addresses, until 15 January 2020.

2. When will the application forms be published? / Could you please provide us with the link for the online application?

The application forms will be published before the end of 2019. Via:

<https://vmm.bzforms.mfaservices.nl>

3. Can the outcome of stage 1 be communicated earlier than 29 May 2020?

The outcome of the assessment of the threshold criteria will be communicated after the assessment of the threshold criteria is finished. This will be on a date before 29 May 2020.

Languages

4. Given the context of Colombia - do all annexes have to be translated into Dutch and/or English, such as the annual reports of the projects which could be used to show experience in capacity strengthening over the last three years?

Please note remark on page 13 of the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society.

Service delivery

5. More clarity on what service delivery entails in the linkage to lobbying and advocacy. There is a clear distinction between lobbying and advocacy and service delivery related to the advocacy goals. Can you kindly clarify how to classify the role of capacity building in terms of enhancing advocacy skills? Or similarly, the support provided to networks that protect the ability of marginalized groups to undertake effective advocacy? Would this type of activity be considered lobbying and advocacy, or service delivery?

Please see annexe 1 for the definition of service delivery. See also Chapter 2.3, sub G: Mutual Capacity Strengthening.

Threshold criteria

6. Section 3.B / Stage1 / Threshold / Criteria D.3 & D.4: "Annual reports" are mentioned as evidence. What is meant by this? Would annual reports as submitted to MoFA qualify? Or does this exclusively refer to organisational annual reports?
7. Threshold criteria D.3 and D.4. Statutes / Annual reports: is other evidence of experiences also possible? For example reports made as part of the previous Strategic Partnerships. / P14. Criteria D.4 sets out the required previous experience of the lead party. The explanatory note stipulates that evidence of this experience should come from the statutes and/or the annual reports. Our organisation's annual reports are written mainly for our public (individual) donors. We have over 20,000 individual supporters. We aim to keep our stories as relatable and tangible as possible, and therefore the selected examples more often refer to services and training rather than lobby and advocacy. In addition, the sensitivity of some of these activities can be a reason not to mention them concretely in the annual report. Therefore, we would like to ask if other documents, such as official donor reports of implemented projects, could be

used to demonstrate the experience as for D.4? / Regarding threshold criteria D.3 and D.4 for the Power of Women -- our INGO has worked to achieve women's rights, gender equality and inclusive development in low income countries (a) in cooperation with women's rights organisations; and (b) via the capacity-strengthening of women's rights organisations in the areas of lobbying and advocacy over three years, in at least one of our target countries. Notably, we have been funded by the FLOW II programme to do this work. These projects are not explicitly included in our annual reports or statutes. Can we include other materials to fulfil these criteria such as project reports and evaluations?

8. On page 14 of the policy brief, it states that annual reports should be used to demonstrate threshold criteria D.3 and D.4, using annual reports that cover the three years before 1 January 2019 (in other words the period: 1 January 2016 – 31 December 2018). Our organisation's financial year is from April to May. The 2018-2019 annual report was published in June 2020 and contains important information about our work in 2019. Are we allowed to make reference to this annual report for criteria to demonstrate D3 and D4? / Under point B. Assessment and selection procedure and criteria, paragraph 3.1 Track Record it is asked (first bullet point) to show demonstrable results achieved in the area of lobbying and advocacy or capacity strengthening for that same theme in the years 2016-2018. In our current Strategic Partnership Dialogue & Dissent we have booked many results in 2019 and our question is to extent the period of results, so we can also include results from 2019 in our Track Record.
9. D.4: With regard to the objectives indicated under D.3, the lead party has at least the preceding three years' experience in capacity strengthening of CSOs in the areas of lobbying and advocacy, in at least three of the in the application proposed countries as of 1 January 2019. Explanatory note: This must be demonstrated by the statutes and/or annual reports of the lead party. Please specify the passage and/or page number you are referring to. Are other sources than statutes or annual reports acceptable? Our organisation works in many countries and examples provided in annual reports are exemplary, not representative.
10. Threshold criterion D4: Can this only be demonstrated through statutes and/or annual reports or are other documents also allowed? Sometimes lobby/advocacy is not a priority of an organisation, yet a lot of work is carried out and tools are developed for this, because it is a precondition for other goals (that are described in the statutes/annual plans). So there are activities and results and tools and budget for lobby and advocacy, but it is not (extensively) explicitly described in statutes and annual plans. With the instruction for describing the track record on the basis of two cases, this space to use other documents does seem to be there.
11. D.4. It is stated that: "*This must be demonstrated by the statutes and/or annual reports...*" – How detailed do these references need to be? Annual reports often give a broad overview of the complex multi - layered operations that an organisations is running. Would it be possible to provide an annexe with track records and/or project briefs/reports and/or other materials which specifically outline activities that reflect the work as to how the capacity was strengthened?
6-11: As published in the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society, statutes and/or annual reports are requested. Annual reports need to be official documents, either organisational annual reports or annual reports submitted to donors (for instance, project specific annual reports). Other documents are not allowed. If an organisation has another financial year than the calendar year, it is allowed to provide information that also covers partly 2019, provided that the organisation is able to demonstrate that it has worked for the three preceding years before 2019 on the in D.3 and D.4 mentioned issues. D.4 applies only to the lead party.
12. Threshold criterion D.4: Are lead organisations (penvoerder) allowed to use relevant evidence from their country offices as well as their global organisation?
Allowed documents need to be statutes and/or annual reports of the lead party as a legal personality. Evidence from other entities not belonging to this legal personality will not be considered.
13. Salary threshold: does it apply to consortium and technical partner? / Do salary threshold criteria apply to technical (=implementing) partners?
Threshold criterion 6 applies to all consortium partners, who signed the partnership agreement.

14. The section on threshold criterion D.2 specifies that a partnership agreement must be submitted, which must be signed by all consortium partners. Will digital signatures be accepted?
A partnership agreement must be submitted digitally, signed by all consortium partners. The agreement must be signed handwritten by all consortium partners: a scanned signature meets the criteria.
15. Can the ministry confirm that capacity building of civil society on lobby and advocacy is NOT a threshold for alliance partners, but only for the lead applicant (penvoerder)?
Threshold criterion D.4 confirms this understanding.
16. Under threshold criterion D.5 it is indicated that applicants must demonstrate by means of annual accounts that they meet the criterion (less than 25% of income derived from Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Is it possible to indicate this in a different way if it is not broken down in this way in the annual accounts? It seems to us that most organisations do not break this down. Or how does the ministry get this information from the annual accounts?
In the application portal, there is room to elaborate on the distinction. Information must be demonstrated by the annual accounts.
17. Criterion D.5 states that the lead party must demonstrate that in the period of 1 January 2016 until 31 December 2018 annually at least 25% of the consortium's total annual income came from sources other than grants and/or contributions derived directly from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Is it possible take the average of the received income from sources other than the Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the mentioned period or does the assessment strictly take place on an annual basis?
Yes, strictly on an annual basis.
18. The 25% norm stated in criterion D.5 applies to the consortium as a whole. For organisations working in policy areas where only a limited amount of donors is willing to provide financing this often leads to a limited scope and diversification of annual income. This policy framework calls on southern partners in particular to have the opportunity to take a leading role in alliances. Because of criterion D.5 consortia are possibly unnecessarily forced to work together with larger organisations who can contribute to reaching the 25% goal. A) Does this criterion not unnecessarily stand in the way of partnerships with southern consortium partners and does it therefore stand in the way of inclusivity and innovation in partnerships? B) Is there a possibility for a softening of this criterion? C) Does criterion D.5 also apply if a southern partner is the lead party of a consortium?
A) Therefore, D.5 applies to the consortium as a whole. B) No. C) Yes.
19. Threshold criteria D.6 Remuneration. The framework asks for the remuneration of the individual management members. It also says that Dutch (co-)applicants may suffice with "a reference to the WNT-notification submitted digitally (...)". (page 16 English version). The WNT does only ask for the remuneration of individual management members if they are solely or jointly responsible for the (daily management of the) entire organisation. Dutch organisations reporting under WNT therefore report on the remuneration of the CEO or Managing Board (in case of a 2-tier governance structure). They do not report on other individual management team members because they are not solely or jointly responsible for the entire organisation (only for parts thereof and never ultimately responsible). Reporting under WNT therefore comprises less officials than the framework seems to include. Question: Can we use the WNT-definitions to determine which management team members (of non-Dutch organisations) must be reported on?
20. Regarding threshold criteria D.6 for the Power of women -- we must define the salaries of "individual management" (including CEOs) and board members – which positions should be included under the category of "individual management"? Does this mean managers of the proposed project or upper organisational management?
19-20: In order to meet this threshold, it is sufficient to report on the individual management team and board members who are solely or jointly responsible for the (daily management of the) entire organisation.
21. However, the formulation with respect to the maximum remuneration of individual management of consortium partners applies appears to be somewhat ambiguous (relevant sections copied below). Section 6.B in the Grant Instrument clearly states that this applies to

consortium partners established in other EU member states. However, Section D6.C, provides ceilings for US/Canada as well, suggesting that this would also apply to organisations established in these two countries.

D.6 implies a maximum remuneration for all consortium members:

- *For lead parties and other consortium partners from the Netherlands and other consortium partners (not the lead party) in the EU eurozone the maximum is 189.000 euro.*
- *For consortium partners (not the lead party) in EU member states outside the eurozone the maximum is the amount resulting from the conversion of 189.000 in local currency using the corporate rate index 2020;*
- *For consortium partners (not the lead party) in the high income countries mentioned under C the maxima are the amounts mentioned there per country;*
- *For lead parties and other consortium partners in other countries the maximum is not one fixed amount, please refer to part D of D.6.*

22. Does the following statement in the PoV grant instrument need to be mentioned in the statutes of the lead and all consortium partners? "both the lead party and all the other consortium partners work to achieve structural poverty reduction and inclusive development in low-income, lower-middle-income and/or upper-middle-income countries in cooperation with CSOs established in these countries."

23. D.3 and D.4: How literal do the words "structural poverty reduction and inclusive development / capacity strengthening in the areas of lobbying and advocacy" have to come back in the statutes or annual reports, and can organisations also make it clear in other ways that their activities contribute significantly to this and that they therefore have enough experience and expertise in these areas?

22-23: Yes, it has to be mentioned in the statutes and/or annual reports; a phrase in line with this statement is also allowed.

Budget

24. Do we only need to state an amount in terms of budget, or should it also include a substantiation or a rough, slightly elaborated budget? If elaboration of the budget is required, what are the requirements?

25. What is meant by justification of the requested budget amount on page 17? To what extent should the budget be substantiated at stage 1-2?

26. What are eligible costs? / Is it possible for MoFA to make an overview/directive of eligible costs/allowable overhead/etc. available? / Will MFA publish guidelines on the eligible costs (incl. allowed hourly rates, allowed percentage of overhead) for the first stage of the application?

24-26: Stating an amount with a brief justification is sufficient in the first stage. After the selection phase, more information will be shared on the eligible costs and budget format with the potential selected partners.

27. Stage 3. Financial Resources, page 20: "Grants will be allocated on the basis of the quality of the application and the consortium's revenues over the past three years." Does this mean that the larger a consortium, the more they will be rewarded? Is it possible to give an indication of how this will be applied in practice?

Specific details on the budget distribution will be published with the budget distribution itself. The definitive total grant ceiling and the allocation of resources over the different consortia will be announced within a month of selection of the potential strategic partners.

28. With regard to the amount of the grant - on page 20 it says that grants will be given on the basis of the quality of the application and the consortium's revenues over the past three years. Does the Ministry also look at the revenues over the past three years of the lead applicant or only at the revenues of the consortium?

We look at the consortium as a whole.

29. In case an organisation is selected for more than one grant, is there a ceiling on how much an organisation can receive? Does the total amount in any way affect the Ministry's decision?

There is no separate ceiling in how much budget an organisation can receive on the four different instruments.

30. *Stage 3 process after selection and development of program proposal – financial resources:*
The revenue of the alliance of the past three years will play a role in the distribution of the resources. What is the reference date for this? Is this also 1-1-2019, as with the track records? *Specific details on the budget distribution will be published with the budget distribution itself. The definitive total grant ceiling and the allocation of resources over the different consortia will be announced within a month of selection of the potential strategic partners.*

31. Concerning criterion D.7 Is there a minimum financial capacity requirement for the lead agency in terms of turnover?
Please see criterion D.7.

32. What should the minimum yearly turnover of the lead agency be when it is a southern partner?
Please see criterion D.7.

Assessment

33. How will the selection committee ensure that the proposals are assessed objectively, in particular if, views in the proposal go against Dutch policy that is made by the same thematic departments as those who sit on the committee?
The selection committee will consist of various members with various backgrounds and expertise. The committee as a whole is responsible for the objective assessment of the proposals, in line with the criteria published in the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society.

34. Are only the components of the Theory of Change, Vision on Cooperation and Track Record judged that are described as numbered requirements?
Yes, please see 1) Theory of change, article 1.2 criteria, 2) Vision consortium on working with local organisations, article 2.2 criteria and 3) Track record and article 3.2 criteria.

35. We assume the word maximum for the Theory of Change and track records excludes the graphics and references to possible verifiable sources (in notes)? Is this correct? / In order to assess the quality of the Theory of Change, the lead party and the other consortium partner(s) must draw up a Theory of Change, consisting of a graphic representation and a narrative of no more than 4,000 words (in Verdana 9 font and single line spacing). Does this limit include foot/end notes, visuals etc?
The word count of the Track Record and Theory of Change includes text used in graphics and text used in foot/end notes.

36. Is it allowed to include reference material/background information in annexes to the application form?
It is not possible to submit any other information than requested in the policy framework. In case other information is submitted, this information will not be assessed. However, in the Track Record you have to cite verifiable sources where possible.

37. Did the ministry consider letting consortia to submit the threshold criteria first and thus separating stage 1 of the assessment from the other two stages? This way a consortium can be certain that the lead agency is eligible without investing large amounts of valuable resources in the development of a ToC.
No, this is not considered as an option.

38. Applications by consortia of CSOs seeking to enter into a strategic partnership with the Minister must (sufficiently) satisfy (minimum of 650 points) the following criteria [...] Is a division of the points available per each criterion?
No, this is not made public nor available in this phase.

Corporate rates

39. The section on Threshold criterion D.5 specifies that a brief statement about the annual budgets of each consortium partner must be submitted in Euro's.
a. Does the guidance in Annexe 4 with regard to the calculation of exchange rates apply to this section as well?

- b. Are consortia allowed to answer this question in other currencies, e.g. the currency used by the lead applicant?

A) Yes, you can use Annexe 4 to convert to EUR. B) No, this is not allowed, EUR is obligatory.

40. Can a lead organisation propose a budget ceiling per year for our proposal that is more than our annual budget, provided we meet the criteria that at least 25% of the consortiums' total budget amount comes from sources other than grants and /or contributions derived directly from the Dutch MoFA? What is the ministry's assessment criteria vs the lead organisations/consortium's annual revenues, if any.

Yes, that is why the consortium's budget as a whole is assessed. Specific criteria on financial capacity are assessed in the ORIA/ISO 9001.

41. Regarding threshold criteria D.6 -- does the maximum remuneration cap of USD 205,350 apply to US-based organisations, regardless of whether they are the lead organisation or consortia partners?

This criterion applies to the organisations other than the lead party, that are established in the US and are part of a consortium. Except for Power of Women, where US-based organisations can be the lead party.

Track Record

42. For all applications one has to submit a Track Record, which counts strongly towards the assessment. It is asked here to describe two cases and for each case a long list of elements is required. We are wondering if we can use 2500 words for the Track Record in total, or 2500 per case? / In our opinion the balance between the requested content and the maximum word count is not realistic, both in the case of 2500 per case description as in the case of 2500 for the whole track record. To be able to give seriously qualitatively good descriptions regarding all requested elements, more space is needed. Is there a possible to double this word count? / Does the space limit for the Track Record (maximum of 2500 words) include the two cases or is the limit 2500 words per case in the Track Record? / Section 3.B/Stage2/ Track record: Is it correct that, given the limited word count, not all criteria listed need to be addressed, but a prioritization can be made? If not, can the Ministry indicate a priority in criteria?

The maximum number of words is changed to 3,500 in total. All criteria listed should be addressed in each of the cases.

43. Concerning the Track record: The call stipulates "The Track Record must briefly set out two case studies...". Does this imply 2 case studies for the whole consortium? Or 2 case studies per each individual consortium partner?

In total, two cases have to be submitted, drawn from the experience of individual consortium partners, the consortium as a whole or parts of the consortium.

44. Under point A. paragraph *Parties that may be eligible for a strategic partnership* a list of three types of organisations that can be an consortium partner is included: CSOS in low-income, lower-middle-income or upper-middle-income countries, Dutch CSOs and INGOs. Independent of the type of organisation it is the case that these organisations have "proven quality and an established Track Record on capacity strengthening of CSOs in the area of lobbying and advocacy". When we compare this text with the threshold criterion mentioned under point B., it seems here that having this type of Track Record is only necessary for the lead party (D.4). Can you clarify this (apparent) discrepancy?

For the lead party, this is the case in assessing the threshold criteria. However, in the Track Record, cases should be submitted regarding the experience of individual consortium partners, the consortium as a whole or parts of the consortium.

45. Concerning the Track record: We assume that the 2 case studies mentioned here, are separate from and additional to the 3-5 cases required by the ORIA. Is this assumption correct?

Yes, the cases presented and required by the ORIA are only assessed with regard to threshold criterion 7.

46. Concerning the Track record: Track records should be based on "...demonstrable results achieved in the area of lobbying and advocacy and of (mutual) capacity strengthening for lobbying and advocacy over the past three years (reference date 1 January 2019)". Is it possible to refer to demonstrable results that have been achieved in and during 2019, due to actions conducted over the past 3 years? / 'The Track Record must briefly set out two case

studies, citing verifiable sources where possible, from the three years preceding 1 January 2019, drawn from the experience of different individual consortium partners, the consortium as a whole or parts of the consortium.' Does this mean that no track records from year 2019 can be included? / What is the justification of limiting the use of evidences that were generated up to 1 January 2019?

No, only a Track Record covering the period 2016-2018 is allowed.

47. The Track Record must briefly set out two case studies, citing verifiable sources where possible, from the three years preceding 1 January 2019, drawn from the experience of different individual consortium partners, the consortium as a whole or parts of the consortium.
- How should the verifiable sources be provided: as a reference to a document online or can it be also done in the form of an annexe?
 - To which extent does the Track Record need to be a "consortium Track Record", rather than a collection of separate "organisational Track Records"?
 - What is the relation between the track records as part of the ORIA and the track record for stage 2 qualitative criteria? Are we correct to assume that both of these may be complementary to each other? As in no repetition necessary?

A) Only in text references are allowed, for example via a footnote or an endnote. B) See par. 3.1. C) There is no relation between these two track records. The cases presented and required by the ORIA are only assessed with regard to threshold criterion 7.

48. Is there flexibility to add more track record cases to allow applicants to respond to the many criteria set under the track record component?

It is only possible to submit two cases. The word count is exceeded to 3,500 words in total for two cases.

49. Why is the Ministry requiring that track records examples precede 1 January 2019?

Because the publication of the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society is in 2019, and at the time of submission, organisations' annual reports are often not yet available.

50. Can the ministry change this date limit to include relevant example of track records/results on advocacy efforts from 2019?

No.

51. In terms of track records and the two cases to be submitted under the Power of Voices partnerships, the SRHR partnerships and the Power of Women grant instruments it is stated what each case study must include to draw up a track record. Should the track record (so the two case studies) cover all countries applying for? / 'The quality of the track record is assessed on the basis of the following criteria: 3. The extent to which the consortium and/or individual consortium partners were focused on learning and on exchanging knowledge and experience with the actors involved'. Can the track records include our work in countries beyond those included in the proposal? And is it mandatory for the 2 cases to cover (at least) all countries included in the proposal?

It is not required to cover all countries included in the proposal. This is up to the consortium, please see 3.2, criteria 2.

52. Can track records of technical partners be included in the consortium track records?

No, only track records of consortium partners are allowed.

53. Is it allowed as lead organisation to include the track records of our field offices which are, just as we are, part of our international federation, and which countries will be included in our proposal to meet the threshold criteria under D.4? We are part of the same family organisation. If so, will then the annual reports of the different field offices needs to demonstrate this?

Only annual reports (or statutes) of the legal personality of the lead party will be considered. Evidence from other entities not belonging to these legal personalities will not be considered.

54. Regarding the track records, can we please receive more guidance on what it is meant by the term 'case study'? For example, does a case study refer to presenting one specific project, or can we also present a thematic case study in which we highlight the work in one thematic area but in multiple projects?

This is up to the consortium to decide on. Both project or thematic case studies are possible.

Theory of Change

55. Theory of Change: The Minister takes process type of ToC as reference (flow of changes within one or limited number of actors). To what extent is MoFA open to consider other types of ToC, e.g. an actor-based ToC, directed at changes with multiple actors in a programme?

Theories of Change can vary based on the type of problem they address, including the number of actors. They should however always consist of the main elements as described in the grant instrument (i.e. pathways of change, underlying assumptions, etc.).

56. The Theory of Change should be based on the core components elaborated in chapter 2 and include: 'a limited number of quantitative indicators for process, outcome and impact and/or qualitative descriptions'. How does the Minister define 'process indicators'?

Process indicators are indicators which describe the several steps in the capacity strengthening and advocacy process.

57. To what extent is it necessary to separately identify a vision on cooperation with the ministry and the embassies?

This is not required at this stage.

58. The Theory of Change should be based on the core components elaborated in chapter 2 and include: 'an analysis of the main partners, organisations and groups that are relevant to the programme'. Does this refer to implementing partners or (broader) stakeholders? Stakeholders do not have a direct role in implementation but can be influenced (as target) or influence the programme

This does refer to both groups: implementing partners and/or broader stakeholders.

59. Theory of Change: This has to be summarized in a narrative of 4,000 words + a graphic visualization. Because the online application schedule is not known yet, we assume that this graphic visualization can be uploaded separately. Is there a limitation in terms of MB for this?

The textual part has to be submitted in Word with a maximum of 20 MB. The visual has to be submitted in PDF with a maximum of 20 MB. The total word count of both documents is 4,000.

60. Theory of Change: Because there will be applications for multi-country programs, this word count limit will make it difficult to give enough attention to the relationship between the problem analysis and the civic space analysis (seeing as contexts between countries can be very different), and in certain cases work is done regionally and internationally. What is your advice in this case? How are different elements of the ToC judged and weighted?

This is up to the consortium. Details on the weighing of the criteria will not be shared or made available in this phase.

61. Can the safety and security management of the local partner be included in criterion 1.2? Can Security management be added to the list of criterion 2.2? Can this be added to criterion 3.1: The way the lead party and/or consortium partners include security management as an integral part of the programmes?

Safety and security management can be included up to the consortia's own consideration if relevant for the context and programme.

62. Can we submit more than one Theory of Change visual, reflecting country level Theory of Change?

No, it is only possible to submit one visual of one Theory of Change.

63. Will development of knowledge (research) also be eligible for financing? / Are research initiatives that build the evidence-base for advocacy by CSOS eligible for inclusion under the project?

This is eligible under the proposal, as long as it serves the objective of capacity strengthening for lobbying and advocacy.

64. Can we submit Annexes to the Theory of Change section (e.g. context analysis, power mapping etc)? And will these annexes be excluded from the word count?

It is not possible to add annexes to the Theory of Change. All information submitted under the Theory of Change should not exceed 4,000 words.

65. One of the criteria of the Theory of Change narrative is that it should address how the alliances will create awareness among Dutch audiences. Do these strategies need to be integrated in the ToC?

For Power of Voices Partnerships and SRHR Partnership Fund: Yes.

66. What is the expectation of the Ministry regarding demonstrating the link with the Dutch society? Do all Dutch alliance partners need to demonstrate this?

For Power of Voices Partnerships/SRHR Partnership Fund: Yes, this criteria applies to all Dutch consortium partners.

67. How is "joint capacity strengthening" (or in Dutch: wederkerige capaciteitsversterking) defined?

Please see chapter 2.3 core components sub G "mutual capacity strengthening".

68. What is expected of a cross-cutting gender and inclusion strategy? Does it need to be integrated in the Theory of Change?

Please see Theory of Change, paragraph 1.2. sub 8.

ORIA

69. In Annex 2A ORIA assessment form it is asked under paragraph 2.3 to deliver a track record with 3 to 5 cases, without mention a maximum word count. How does this requirement relate to the description of the Track Record in the policy framework? Does this not lead to an uneven playing field if organisations are allowed to deliver a track record, while others who meet the Partos ISO-9001 standard do not get that space?

The Track Record asked for in annexe 2a will only be assessed in order to meet the requirements of threshold criterion 7 and will not be assessed during the qualitative assessment.

70. The appendix 2b results in an assessment score of A B C and D. A and B are acceptable, C and D are non-eligible. Could you please clarify what the criteria are for the different letters?

A and B are only applicable to the parts related to the integrity assessment, as some integrity does not exist. For all the other parts of the ORIA the scores A, B, C and D are applicable. In case of a C or D score it is possible that certain extra measurements will be taken.

71. Regarding D.7.a: Could you please confirm that we understand it correctly that for (Dutch) organisations that are in the possession of a PARTOS ISO-9001, they do not have to submit neither a Positively approved ORIA, nor Positively approved COCA + annex 2c, nor a fully completed ORIA (annex 2a)?

*When Dutch organisations have a PARTOS ISO-9001:2015 **version 2018** the certificate should be submitted. In case they have a PARTOS ISO-9001:2015 **version 2015** the Integrity update form should be submitted additional to this certificate.*

72. Our understanding is that the COCA form is no longer needed, and instead, for organisations with a positively assessed COCA prior to April 1st, 2017, only the ORIA form has to be presented?

Yes. The ORIA is the present organisational assessment tool used by the Ministry.

73. In the case of a lead that is submitting an ORIA form, how should it proceed with regard to the integrity assessment? Should the integrity update be submitted when the ORIA is being assessed?

There are two situations:

- 1. The organisation has a valid ORIA. No integrity update form is needed for the application.*
- 2. The organisation has a valid COCA. An integrity update form is needed for the application.*

74. Is there word limit for the threshold check regarding the ORIA form?

There is no word limit for the ORIA form.

75. Can you elaborate more on the ORIA obligatory attachment "Report regarding social behavior in the organisation like a social report"? What type of report is this? Is this an external product?

This is an external annual social report. For guidance please consult the internet. Reference to external reports should be made via an internet link/reference in the ORIA-form or upload if a link is not possible.

76. Given the requirement for at least one alliance member from a low-income, lower-middle-income or upper-middle-income country, we would like further clarification on how this works in practice- for them meeting criteria D.7a and D.7b:
- Most likely they will have to go for the option of completing Annexe 2a (Full ORIA). They can complete part A and B themselves (or where necessary with the help of the lead applicant (penvoerder), but it is unclear for us who will fill in part C? Can you please clarify?
 - And do all parts (so including part C&D, or only A and B) of annexe 2a have to be completed by the submission date of March 12?
 - The requirement is only for a *completed* ORIA, not an *approved* one, is this correct? Could you please explain the difference?
 - The requirement in the ORIA are achievable for most Dutch Organisations, but might be new for organisations in LMIC. If they score lower on certain sections of the ORIA, will they be allowed a "grace period" to implement improvements, or provide additional documents. And if yes, how long will this grace period be? Can be built in as a capacity building component by the Penvoerder, or the other alliance members?
 - On section 2.3 Track Record of the ORIA it states "*Add a track record demonstrating the experience of the organisation in reaching their goals and desired impact, especially in for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs relevant areas.*" We assume this to be all areas relevant for the MFA, not only of the Power of Voices financial instrument. Could you please confirm?

A) We need the ORIA or ISO certificate of the lead party for 7a; for 7b at least the Integrity Update Form is needed for all consortium partners. B) Yes. C) A completed ORIA will be assessed by the ministry and then it is determined whether it has been approved. D) We need the ORIA or ISO certificate of the lead party for 7a; for 7b at least the Integrity Update Form is needed for all consortium partners. E) Yes, confirmed.

77. Are we correct in understanding that only the lead organisation has to have, or submit an ORIA? And that *consortium* other consortium partners (including the member from the low-, lower-middle- and upper-middle-income countries) must only submit the Integrity Update Form?

Yes, this is correct.

78. Do all the consortium partners need to submit an Integrity Form, in case there is no previously approved ORIA available for the lead organisation?

Yes, all consortium partners need to submit an Integrity Form.

79. Who would be the potential external evaluators for the ORIA assessment: accounting firms, auditors, the Dutch Ministry?

For these instruments: the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

80. Currently the ORIA form does not specify any word limit. What is the expectation of the Ministry regarding the information to be provided in this form in terms of length and details required?

Please fill out the form according to the questions provided in the form.

81. With regard to threshold criteria the lead organisations can submit a fully completed ORIA (Annex 2a). Could you please clarify: Should the lead organisation complete all sections of the Annex 2a /ORIA form? Or only A and B?

Only part A and B.

82. The ORIA document also indicates that "If the organisation itself will be invited to fill in this form, only parts A and B can be provided. If an external assessor will be hired, parts A, B and C can be provided." Can you clarify: What 'will be invited' entails and how to determine that a lead organisation falls in this category? When does an organisation need to involve an external assessor to complete the Oria form?

Every organisation that does not have a valid ORIA or COCA with update form has to fill out this form. This is according to the guidelines that are given in the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society. It is up to the lead party to consider the need of involving an external assessor.

83. In threshold criterion D.7.b. about integrity policy it states that this policy has to be demonstrated with a ORIA declaration or a filled out form. Integrity is however also part of the Partos ISO 9001 certification. Is this certification also enough to meet the D.7.b. requirement? If not, why not?

No, please follow the criteria in the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society.

84. Annex 2A on page 1 states: "Assessment executed by a third party Budgetholders can opt to hire external expertise (such as an auditor or management consulting firm, etc.) to carry out the organisational capacity assessment. However, the ORIA should always be approved by an authorized representative of the Ministry's budgetholder." Can you clarify:

What is the definition of a 'third party Budgetholder'? B) What is the definition of 'authorized representative Ministry's budget holder'? C) Does the Ministry representative budget holder have to sign the Oria form before submission of the proposal by the lead applicant?

A) An external consultancy firm. B) In this case, a member of the selection committee who will assess the threshold criteria. C) No.

85. Threshold criteria D.7.b. What are the criteria for the assessment of the ORIA integrity update form, for example are the 6 questions listed in part C Assessment all of equal weight? If not, which elements are the most important?

These details are not provide. It is not a math exercise, but a risk assessment.

86. Annex 2. All applicants are required to fill in an ORIA integrity update form. The form inter alia asks about integrity advisers and social reports. These are typically instruments that Southern-based CSO's may have put less efforts in, for example because of their limited capacity, and also because their structure and type of work is different from that of a larger Northern-based CSO. Will the different background and history of organisations be taken into account while assessing their integrity framework? If so, how?

These details are not provided, because this is a risk assessment based on the nature of the organisation and the context it operates in.

87. Do all the consortium partners need to submit an Integrity Form, in case there is no previously approved ORIA available for the lead organisation?

Yes, see criterion D.7.b.

88. Regarding the integrity requirements, the set-up designated by the Ministry in this framework may be in conflict with national laws. In such a case, and when a CSO from a country with conflicting laws is include in the consortium, how would the Ministry propose to resolve those conflicts?

The criteria in the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society are leading.

89. D.7.a: The lead party must be capable of proper financial management and its expertise must ensure effective and efficient implementation of activities like those for which grant funding is sought. [...] D.7.b: The lead party demonstrates that it and all other consortium partners have an integrity policy and procedures for implementing that policy. A) Is it correct that only the lead party should demonstrate its capability of proper financial management etc. through a Partos certificate or an ORIA etc., but not the other consortium partners? B) Is it correct that these other consortium partners only have to submit the ORIA Integrity form (annex 2b)? C) And in case a consortium partner cannot hand in an official integrity policy, would it be sufficient it commits itself (e.g. in the consortium agreement) to produce one over time?

A) Yes. B) Yes. C) No, all consortium partners should fill out this Integrity Update form.

90. D.7.a concerns the degree of adequate financial management and efficient implementation of activities. How does the ministry assess the ORIA, which criteria determine "adequate" and "efficient"?

The Ministry will not elaborate further on how this assessment will be done in this phase.

Country list (except Women, Peace and Security)

91. The Theory of Change should be based on the core components elaborated in chapter 2 and include: 'the region, countries or areas chosen on the basis of the problem analysis (at least three countries per application)'. Is it required to name all the countries a consortium will be

working in? Involvement of some countries for specific smaller activities that are deemed necessary to achieve a specific goal may occur in the course of the program implementation. *Yes, all countries a consortium is planning to work in should be listed and included in the Theory of Change.*

92. If we focus on the mentioned focus regions, but within that region want to involve a strategic partner from a country that is not on the list, to play a regional role, what impact does this have on the allocation of points based on the countries?

The allocation of points will be based on the countries listed in the proposal where the program intends to work in. Working with an organisation based in another country does influence this allocation. However, if you will work regionally, all countries within that specific region should be listed separately in the proposal.

93. With regard to the region West Africa/ Sahel: does the countries like Liberia, The Gambia, Sierra Leone, Guinea and Ivory Coast also fall under this region or only countries in West Africa which are part of the Sahel?

See for a full list of countries the footnote on page 4 of the policy framework. Liberia, The Gambia, Sierra Leone, Guinea and Ivory Coast are not part of the country list, but are still eligible to work in.

94. Do points get deducted if a consortium decides to work on countries outside the focus countries specified in the Ministry's policy framework? / Are organisations allowed to work in a country outside the focus regions and countries?

No, no points get deducted. It is possible to work outside the focus regions and countries.

95. Why is Pakistan no longer part of the country list?

Because Pakistan is not listed in the BHOS policy note, but it is a country an organisation can work in, see annexe 3.

96. Hong Kong is not separately mentioned on the Annex 3 list, but China is. Is it correct that we can assume that organisations that are based in Hong Kong are eligible, as it is part of China (although it has a separate status within China)?

According to the OECD, Hong Kong falls under the higher income countries and an organisation based in Hong Kong is therefore eligible as consortium member.

97. Is India an eligible country for the funds under Power of Voices and Power of Women under the newly announced Policy Framework Strengthening Civil Society grants?

Please see annexe 3 to the grant instruments. India is eligible to work in.

98. Eastern DRC is a region of interest within the BHOS policy document but not listed in the as priority country. Does this mean the listed countries are priorities but Eastern DRC is not, for the purpose of this fund?

Please see annexe 3 to the grant instruments. DRC is eligible to work in.

99. Is there a difference in scoring between focus countries and the countries listed in the BHOS policy note? / P.10: Points will be assigned pro rata to the extent to which an application focuses on countries in the focus regions and the other countries mentioned in the BHOS policy note that have a development cooperation relation with the Netherlands. Are all countries in footnote 18 equally rated? Or is there a difference relating to the extent to which the ministry has a broad SDG relationship versus a narrower focus? E.g. the difference between Niger and Mali on the one hand, Nigeria, and Ghana on the other.

No, there is no different scoring between these countries.

100. What is the flexibility regarding applications in non-focus countries? What is the score of the threshold check when an application does not target one of the focus countries?

Country selection is not part of the threshold criteria. They will be rated during the qualitative criteria check.

101. It is clear how many points you are able to get for quality of the submission, but thereafter 'pro rata' points will be given for the choice of (focus) countries. What this concretely entails / how many points this can be is not mentioned. This can however have important consequences for the score of a submission – because how does this score then relate to the

score on quality? Can it be indicated how many points are allocated for choice of country and region? And what is in this context meant with 'pro rata'?

102. P.10: How many points in total can be obtained for the country selection? What is the weight of the country selection compared to the points that can be obtained with the other three elements? Will the number of points for country selection be proportionally attributed on the basis of the share of countries in the application that are included in footnote 18?
103. In the SRHR partnerships, the Power of Voices partnerships and the Power of Women grant instrument points will be assigned to the deployment in countries in the focus regions and the other countries mentioned in the BHOS policy note that have a development cooperation relationship with the Netherlands.
- 23 What is the weight of these extra points, compared to the maximum of 1000 points that proposals can receive on the first 3 main criteria?
- 24 Are these "extra" points added to the points scored on the first 3 main criteria to make a first & final ranking? Or is there first a ranking based on the 3 main criteria, and are the best ranked proposals then re-ranked based on the "extra points"?
- 25 Within the Power of Voices Partnerships: How will the proposals on themes 3-7 be compared to the proposals on themes 1-2, that are not getting extra points?
104. Track record. B Assessment and selection procedure and criteria, page 12: " In order to be eligible as a strategic partner a consortium must attain at least satisfactory scores ...etc"
- a. If the minimum qualifying score for quality of the proposal is 650, and maximum 1000, what is the maximum score for focus countries?
- b. How will the focus country points be allocated? Will it be based on activities, budget, and/or what other criteria?
105. Please elaborate further on what "limited extent" to work in non-focus countries and regions means. Can you provide a maximum percentage of the overall application budget that can be applied to non-focus regions and countries? Is this percent different under Power of Women and Power of Voices? Will an application be at risk of not passing the Threshold Check if it works in both focus and non-focus countries and regions?
106. Power of Voices: It is unclear what role themes will play in the selection process. Track record. *Stage 1 B. Assessment and selection procedure and criteria, page 12: " In order to be eligible as a strategic partner a consortium must attain at least satisfactory scores ...etc"* The consortia working on themes 3-7 will receive extra points related to their country choice: a focus on NL MFA's focus countries will be rewarded by extra points. What is the weight of these extra points, compared to the maximum of 1000 points that proposals can receive on the first 3 main criteria? And are these "extra" points added to the points scored on the first 3 main criteria to make a first & final ranking? Or is there first a ranking based on the 3 main criteria, and are the best ranked proposals then re-ranked based on the "extra points"? How will these proposals on themes 3-7 be compared to the proposals on themes 1-2, that are not getting extra points?
107. Power of Voices: For applications under theme 3-7 that have obtained at least 650 points in the qualitative assessment, points will be assigned to the deployment in countries in the focus regions and the other countries mentioned in the BHOS policy note that have a development cooperation relation with the Netherlands. Points will be assigned pro rata to the extent to which an application focuses on countries in the focus regions and the other countries mentioned in the BHOS policy note that have a development cooperation relation with the Netherlands. What is the weight of the extra points that the consortia working on themes 3-7 will receive based on their country choice, compared to the maximum of 1000 points that proposals can receive on the first 3 main criteria? And are these "extra" points added to the points scored on the first 3 main criteria to make a first & final ranking? Or is there first a ranking based on the 3 main criteria, and are the best ranked proposals then re-ranked based on the "extra points"? How will these proposals on themes 3-7 be compared to the proposals on themes 1-2, that are not receiving extra points?
108. Power of Voices: If you receive extra points for focusing on focus countries with proposals on theme 3-7, how will the selection committee compare them to the global theme (1-2) proposals that cannot get extra points for this? On what considerations will this be based?

101-108: First of all, all proposals are assessed on the basis of the threshold criteria. At that stage, the country allocation in the proposal does not play a role. After passing the threshold criteria, the proposals are assessed on the basis of the qualitative criteria as stated in the grant instruments. Only proposals with a minimum of 650 points are eligible. Subsequently, after the initial qualitative assessment, these proposals will be awarded with additional points regarding the in the proposal stated countries.

These additional points, 200 points maximum, will be rewarded according to the following calculation. Percentage of focus countries and/or countries listed in the BHOS policy note (see footnote 8, page 4, Chapter 2 Policy Framework) compared to the total list of countries as presented in the proposal.

0-25%: 50 additional points
26-50%: 100 additional points
51-75%: 175 additional points
76-100%: 200 additional points

As the Power of Voices Partnerships theme 1-2 have a broader geographical scope, they will not be awarded additional points after the qualitative selection of minimum 650 points. However, the ranking of proposals under theme 1-2 will be done in such a way that, although they do not receive additional points regarding geographical scope, this does not have an effect on their final ranking.

109. Concerning the Multi-annual Country Strategies: As a country selection should be indicated, is it possible to request the Multiannual Country Strategies earlier, in the period before March 12? / The Multi-annual Country Strategies (MACS) are of course essential for the design of the strategic partnerships. Can these already be made available in their entirety in phase 1?

The Multi-annual Country Strategies are shared with the potential selected partners after the selection phase and before developing the full program proposals.

110. The section on criteria for evaluation of the ToC (1.1 on page 17) refers to 'the region, countries or areas (respect. regio-, landen- of gebiedskeuze in Dutch) chosen on the basis of the problem analysis (at least three countries per application).'

- a. What is the definition of 'areas' here?
- b. Do transboundary areas (affected by a single problem issue) qualify as well (e.g.)?
- c. And if so, do transboundary areas count as one "country" or as multiple ones?

A) An area within a country. B) Yes, if all countries concerned are listed separately. C) See B.

Consortium

111. Each consortium partner must have legal personality – please could you define what this means. What documents or attributes would an entity need to be considered as having a "legal personality"?

A legal personality is a non-human legal entity, in other words any organisation that is not a single natural person but is authorized by law with duties and rights and is recognized as a legal person and is having a distinct identity. The legal personality must be shown by statutes by which the organisation has been constituted.

112. On page 11 it is stated that only alliances can become strategic partners. An alliance consists out of one lead applicant and at least one alliance partner. Minimum one alliance partner should be based in the Netherlands and minimum one alliance partner should be based in a low, lower middle or higher middle-income country. Can you confirm that an alliance of two (or more) organisations – that are part of the same international "NGO family" - qualifies, when the organisations are independent organisations, with each its own registration, by laws, board, activities, budgeting etc. and where at least one of the organisations is based in the Netherlands and one in a low, lower middle or higher middle-income country?

Yes, however, it is up to the organisation to decide whether or not such a composition reflects the policy principles and core components of the policy framework regarding more local ownership.

113. What are the measures taken to allow the expert Diaspora Women's Organisations to participate (effective participation and joining in) without exclusion?

Diaspora women's organisations can apply as a consortium partner under all four instruments if they meet the threshold criteria of the particular grant instruments.

114. The policy framework refers to 'consortiums'. I would like to know the characteristics and limits of the various consortiums that may participate in these instruments?
For all four grant instruments, all consortia consist of two or more consortium partners. There is no limit to the number of consortium partners, however, the added value and effectiveness and efficiency of a consortium are issues to take into account while establishing a consortium. See for all the other criteria the published policy frameworks.
115. The framework is clear about the threshold criteria for consortia members. However, there is no mention regarding criteria (if any) for technical partners- who will play a specific role but won't be signatories in the consortium. Is there any criteria that technical partners must comply to and how is their expertise and added value to be presented in the proposal?
No. The added value of subcontractors can be described in the stakeholder analysis in the Theory of Change and/or in the consortium's vision on working with local organisations.
116. Technical partners: How many technical partners should we include? Can we use track record of technical partners? What are the rules and regulations for sub-contracting of technical partners?
There are no rules and regulations for subcontractors, nor a rule for a certain number of such partners. As for the Track Record, only if this partner is a consortium partner, you can include its track record.
117. Is sub-contracting by consortia permitted? If so, are there any restrictions? If so, which ones? / Are organisations (southern, Dutch and INGO) in any way limited in the number of technical (=subcontracting) partnerships they can form across the different funding mechanisms?
Yes, it is possible to subcontract. There are no special restrictions.
118. Do subgrantees have to meet the same threshold criteria as consortium partners?
No.
119. On page 10 of the policy brief, it states, "Only consortia of civil society organisations (CSOs) are eligible to become the Minister's strategic partners". At the same time, the policy framework states on page 9 that "Innovation may also result from new relationships with companies, or more informal groups, movements and organisations that are often left out of the picture. Experimentation with new ways of working will be encouraged in this situation, so that lessons can be learned from them." Does the above mean that innovative relationships with for example universities and/or private sector players can only be formalised in the role of a technical partnership?
Yes.
120. Can (local) universities also be regarded a consortium partner?
A university is not seen as a civil society organisation. However, they can be contracted as a subcontractor in a program.
121. P.14: Does criteria D6 apply only to the lead party and the consortium partners, or also to all other potential partners in the programme, such as implementing partners or technical partners?
No, only to the lead party and the consortium partners.
122. Is there a clear distinction between technical partners and co-applicants? If yes, can an organisation apply as a technical partner to proposals in addition to the 2 applications as co-applicant?
A) Yes, consortium partners need to meet the threshold criteria. B) No, that is not possible: a technical partner does not apply, but is part of an application by one or more of the partners.
123. Next to consortium partners, we will involve other organisations (national and international) in the implementation of the proposed program. We are now assuming that no maximum is set for the amount of applications that these organisations can be involved with. Is this correct?
If these organisations are not part of the consortium, there are no restrictions on the number of applications these organisations are involved in.

124. Under the policy objective, the following is mentioned: "For this purpose it is essential for civil society organisations to work together, for example through networks. This framework helps foster an environment in which civil society can work more effectively at local, national, regional and international level, with – importantly – a link between the different levels." We would like to gain clarity as to:

- how the Dutch MFA defines regional networks?
- if part of the budget could be dedicated to regional and cross- regional network activities?

We will not define the concept regional networks. It is up to the organisations to define what they understand to be a regional network.

Yes, it is possible to dedicate part of the budget to such activities if it meets the criteria of the policy framework.

125. If an organisation does not meet the threshold criteria, how can an organisation participate?

If the organisation does not meet the criteria, it is not possible to participate as a consortium partner. However, it can play a role as a subcontractor.

126. Can local offices of INGOs that are independently registered in low and middle income countries apply as consortium partner?

If these organisations are registered in a low, lower middle or upper middle income country and are established under that country's prevailing laws, and meet all relevant criteria: yes.

127. P9, G., "If local partners cannot meet any or all of the requirements for financial accountability and reporting, a good alternative must be sought, which must be agreed with the Minister.": to what extent are members of the women's movement and informal (women and youth) networks eligible for partnerships? Are there specific criteria that they need must meet?

For criteria on consortium partners, please see the four grant instruments. Local partners who are not eligible to participate as lead party or consortium partner can cooperate with the consortium as subcontractor.

128. How do you define local partners as stated in the framework?

Please see annexe 1 to the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society.

129. Would an organisation that has its main operating office network in a lower/lower-middle/or upper-middle income country, but whose legal identity (registration) is in a high income country be eligible to apply as a lead party?

For Power of Voices Partnerships, the SRHR Partnership Fund and Women, Peace and Security: No, except if the organisation is registered in the Netherlands. For Power of Women: yes. The legal identity/registration is an element which will be taken into account during the assessment of threshold criterion 1.

130. Would a consortium partner that is a global network with a rotating secretariat based in a member organisation of the network in a lower/lower-middle/or upper-middle income country (that meets the threshold criteria), but which as network (legal entity) is registered in the North, qualify as a lower/lower-middle/or upper-middle income country based partner?

131. If an organisation is registered in one of the countries listed in annex 3 and has its actual office there, but has a linked legal entity (but no actual office) in the UK for legal purposes related to restrictive legislation and funds are received through this legal entity in Europe because of legal restrictions around receiving and disbursing foreign funds, can this organisation be considered "an organisation established in a low-income, lower-middle-income or upper-middle-income country"? Would the ministry be willing to provide advice in individual cases on this requirement upfront to avoid any risk?

132. Concerning consortium partners from low-, lower-middle- and upper-middle-income countries: If a network (organisation) is registered or has its headquarters in a northern country, (the majority) of its board and/or its network members are based in the low-, lower-middle- and upper-middle-income countries, is this network then eligible as a consortium partner from a low-income, lower-middle-income or upper-middle-income country (even when it is registered elsewhere)?

130-132: No. The legal identity/registration is an element which will be taken into account during the assessment of threshold criterion 1.

133. Do sub-grantees have to meet the same threshold criteria as consortium partners?
No.

134. To what extent is it possible that southern organisations act as lead party for an alliance or submission?

Please read the criteria regarding consortium composition for every grant instrument.

135. In the Power of Voices framework on p.11 it is stated: 'Acting as lead party or consortium partner for an application in a strategic partnership under the Power of Voices Partnerships however does not preclude involvement of these CSOs in consortia, both as lead party or as consortium partner, under the other grant instruments within the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society provided that the applicable requirements under these grant instruments are met.' Does this mean that organisations can participate in total in more than two consortia in the case they are submitted for different Grant Instruments? For example in the case an organisation submits two proposals for Power of Voices and one for the SRHR Partnerships Instrument?

Yes, there is no restriction between the different grant instruments. Only within a grant instrument there are restrictions on the number of proposals.

136. Minister Kaag mentioned during the debate in parliament that an organisation can join 'limitless consortia' within the Power of Voices Partnerships, the framework seems to limit that to two consortia. We plea to adjust that criteria as organisations have logically been preparing based on the ministers announcement and cooperation between NGOs should be further improved.

The policy framework as published in the Staatscourant is leading.

137. How many consortiums can an organisation be part of across the grant instruments? It is clear that an organisation can only lead one consortium across each of the grant instruments but is it not clear how many consortiums an organisation can be part of in a sub role across each of grant instruments? (Particularly in the case Power of Women (POW) and Power of Voices (POV) and SRHR).

There is no restriction between the grant instruments, only within the grant instruments itself.

138. Can we include an organisation that does not operate in any of the focus regions or countries in our consortium (POV or POW grant instruments)? If we do, will we lose points for this? / Can diaspora and organisations that are registered in non-focus countries, but that do work in the focus-countries, be regarded as an alliance partner and/or southern/local partner?
Yes, that is possible. And no, this is not something that will be assessed separately.

139. Would this also imply that threshold criteria will only apply to the locally registered office of the INGO?

If the local office is a separate consortium partner and the INGO head office is not: yes.

140. If an independently registered local office of an INGO can apply independently as consortium partner, will the salary threshold criteria apply only to that local office and not to the INGO with which it is affiliated?

The remuneration threshold criterion applies to all consortium partners that need to have their own legal personality in a consortium.

141. In the Power of Voices partnerships threshold criterion D.4 it is stated that "the lead party has at least the preceding three years' experience in capacity strengthening of CSOs in the areas of lobbying and advocacy, in at least three of the in the application proposed countries as of 1 January 2019". D.4 is similar in all four grant instruments. Can this threshold criteria in all four grant instruments be covered by the alliance as a whole in order to stimulate organisations from low and middle income countries to apply as lead of a consortium?

No.

142. Is the composition of the consortia fixed for the full five years or can the composition (following required expertise etc.) also be changed during the duration of the program?

As a general principle changing of a consortium after entering into a strategic partnership with the Minister and the awarding of a grant is not possible. Only in very exceptional circumstances an exception might be possible, if this change meets all requirements of the policy framework.

143. Our NGO is an independent entity with its own Board of Trustees, registered in the UK. It is a subsidiary and affiliate of an INGO, headquartered in the US. Our country offices, which are our core implementers for projects, are consolidated entities under our US-HQ. Would the locally-registered country offices of an INGO with this structure qualify as having legal personality and be eligible as individual consortium partners?

Please see the other questions regarding the definition of legal personality. Every consortium partner needs to fit this requirement. Please see question 119.

144. Can proposals be submitted under multiple calls if the organisation is not in the lead? *The same proposal (which is read to be a full proposal) cannot be submitted under multiple calls. A proposal is by definition submitted by a consortium through a lead organisation.*

Sanction lists

145. Section 2.1 Strengthening Civil Society/ Policy Objective: The framework explains that organisations and/or individuals are not allowed to be listed in international sanctions regulations. To which international sanctions regulations does the Ministry refer to? And what are the consequences?

These lists concern in any case organisations, persons and other entities included in the sanction lists of UN and EU, which can be found via:

- <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/un-sc-consolidated-list>
- <https://data.europa.eu/euodp/nl/data/dataset/consolidated-list-of-persons-groups-and-entities-subject-to-eu-financial-sanctions>

How the obligation to be attached to the grant decisions on this issue will be determined and what will be expected from grantees in order to comply with this, will be part of stage 3 of the selection process.

Questions not related the policy framework

146. It is important MoFa communicates early and consistently on its approach to reporting. *Further information will be shared with the selected potential strategic partners after the selection, and before developing the full program proposal.*

147. What are the intentions of the MoFA to make more use of the qualitative data provided by the consortium partners, in addition to the analysis of the quantitative data. When can we expect more information?

This will not be answered at this stage as being irrelevant.

148. In the letter of the Minister to parliament in November there was mention of a separate provision for monitoring and evaluation as part of the new subsidy framework. When can we expect more information about this provision?

These details will be shared after the selection with the selected potential strategic partners and before the conclusion of the partnership agreement.

149. Will there be extra conditions with regard to finances, PME or otherwise? And if so, what and when?

These details will be shared after the selection with the selected potential strategic partners.

150. Which support does the Ministry offer to our organisation and consortium to submit good and qualitative applications?

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs does not offer support for writing proposals.

151. What are the expectations in engaging with the Dutch embassies?

Engagement with the Dutch embassies concerned is foreseen after the selection, before developing the full program proposal.

152. Currently less than 2% of the total Dutch ODA budget is spent on programs that either support the empowerment of organisations of people with a disability or that pay attention for inclusion of people with a disability through mainstreaming within a broader theme. It is gratifying that core principle D of the policy framework at least mentions disabilities. It is however unclear in what way the ministry will review proposals and monitor the extent to

which (organisations of) people with disabilities receive structural support. Is the Minister willing to commit to the OEACD DAC disability marker? If not, what alternative form of monitoring does the minister propose?

This question is of a general nature, not specifically related to this policy framework, and is therefore not relevant to answer.

Questions Power of Voices

Themes

153. Do proposals only compete within the 'own theme' in which they are submitted or do they compete with all submitted proposals, as points are compared across all applications, and only in the last phase is the distribution over the 7 themes examined?

Proposals compete with all submitted proposals.

154. How much space will be left for SRHR within Power of Voices compared to the SRHR Partnership Fund?

SRHR is not a theme under Power of Voices Partnerships.

155. In the letter to Parliament of 4 November 2019 'Beleidskader Versterking Maatschappelijk Middenveld', Minister Kaag announced that submissions for the theme SRHR only can be done under the SRHR Partnership Fund and not under Power of Voices Partnerships. However the Staatscourant publication of 3 December on the Power of Voices Partnerships does not contain a policy non-eligibility criteria to this effect, nor related criteria in the 'qualitative test Phase 2', which seems inconsistent. How should we understand this; does the absence of a policy criteria in the 3 December document mean that SRHR-related submissions are still welcome under PoV themes?

Only proposals working on one of the seven themes are eligible under the Power of Voices framework. SRHR is not a theme under the Power of Voices Partnerships.

156. Is it therefore possible that for example none are honored within a theme, or is there a fixed amount of partnership that will be financed per theme?

There is no fixed amount of partnerships per theme. The quality of proposals is leading in the selection, taking into account the need for a balanced distribution of different themes.

157. Can there be more clarity on if one is allowed to submit a proposal for one or for multiple themes? Initially it was communicated that one could submit a proposal for solely one theme. The motion that was adopted on this subject seemed to create space for submission on more themes. The phrasing in the current policy framework seems to that restrict that space to an extent, and we read it as: submission on only one theme, but elements from other themes can definitely be present. Please give more clarity on this.

A proposal should be submitted for one of the themes mentioned in the policy framework Strengthening Civil Society. Within this theme, linkages can be made to other themes.

158. Linked to earlier question: Is it the case that it is strategically clever to submit a proposal with a focus on one theme, but at the same time also focus on e.g. two other themes, so that if Article 8, third paragraph, sub c of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree must enter into force (attn. balanced distribution), because there are (too) many submissions on one of the 7 themes, the submission of a consortium that has focused on one main goal and for example two 'side goals' has more chance to stay 'in the race'? Because such a submission is then moved to another theme by MoFA?

It is up to the organisation to decide under which theme it submits a proposal.

159. Concerning the theme "Trade and making value chains more sustainable": Is it possible to work (also) on local value chains and local economic development within this theme?

The Ministry does not elaborate on the specific themes.

160. Partnerships will be 'evenly' distributed among the themes. 1) Can this lead to being rejected despite having a higher score? 2) Does this concretely then also mean that there are 3-4 partnerships per theme allocated? 3) What does this mean for the 'combined' theme freedom of speech and freedom of religion?

161. Both within the SRHR partnerships and the Power of Voices partnerships it is stated that there will be a balanced distribution of the different themes/result areas. For Power of Voices it reads for example: "Taking into consideration Article 8, third paragraph, sub c of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree, account will be taken of the need for a balanced distribution of the different themes in selecting potential strategic partners."

- a. How does this balance in distribution of the different themes/result areas match with the fact that quality will be leading?
- b. How will this balancing be done, will there be a point system or division over the different themes and/or focus areas?

162. In relation to the interpretation of Article 8 third paragraph, sub c of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree that account will be taken of the need for a balanced distribution of the different themes in selecting potential strategic partnerships the following: will this be interpreted as a more or less equal number of strategic partnership per theme and/or will the budget distribution among the themes also play a role?

160-162: Only proposals that meet the threshold criteria and the qualitative criteria are eligible for selection on the basis of their scores, taking into account the need for a balanced distribution. This means that proposals with a higher score can be rejected due to the need for balanced distribution of themes. The combined theme freedom of speech and freedom of religion will be treated as one theme. Budget does not play a role in this distribution.

163. P.14: In our organisational DNA is that sharing knowledge is the key to creating change and fighting poverty. The focus of our organisational activities is therefore on knowledge exchange and capacity-building, which allows individuals, health providers, government agencies to set the agenda together on what is needed to create positive and sustainable change. Creating change from within has led to lobby and advocacy for education and gender equality at community, regional and national levels, but we are very implicit to use the term lobby and advocacy, because they create the agenda, not our organisation. In our reports, we refer to this as 'capaciteitsopbouw'. We prefer to provide pieces of training and capacity building of actors. Criteria D4 seems to exclude organisations that aim to achieve system change from within and focus on silent diplomacy. Can we refer to capacity building when it relates to lobby, advocacy and leadership development for criteria D4?

No, a distinction is made between capacity strengthening and lobbying and advocacy.

164. The Staatscourant publication states that 'connecting the main theme with other thematic areas is possible'. At the same time, it also states that a proposal should focus 'on a maximum of one theme'. However, certain social problems that are urgent to lobby about in the countries specified in the BHOS policy including gender-based violence, menstrual equity and nutrition amongst others span across and may overlap with multiple themes of SRHR, WASH, Women's rights, health and food security. Due to the cross-thematic nature of these type of topics, would a proposal on the same still be eligible under the Power of Voices Fund?

It is up to the consortium to consider this. The Ministry will not elaborate on this at this stage.

165. It is stated in the policy framework that "Applicants can approach the theme from their own perspective, taking into account policy coherence, whereby connecting the main theme with other thematic areas is possible." Will the ministry also look at coherence between programs, especially where organisations are participating in multiple alliances?

No, every proposal is assessed on its own merits.

166. In the 3 December Staatscourant publication on the Power of Voices Partnerships, section 3.B states that when selecting submissions, the 20 highest-scoring submissions (or less, if there are less submissions that qualify (=pass all tests)) will be selected; yet at the same time, the Ministry will take into consideration a 'balanced spread' of the selected submissions across the PoV themes. Can you explain how these 2 criteria (score and balanced spread) will be combined in practice? If 2 submissions A and B both qualify, does the lower-scoring submission A stand a higher chance of being selected than the higher-scoring submission B, if A addresses a theme for which there are fewer qualifying submissions while B addresses a theme with a higher number of qualifying submissions?

Yes, that is correct. Only if there is a substantive unequal distribution among the different themes, a balanced spread of selected submissions can play a role.

167. In the policy note 'Investeren in Perspectief' (Investing in Perspective) four focus areas for the goal 'Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women and Girls' are mentioned. Question:

Can proposals for Power of Voices under theme D "Gender Equality and Inclusion" cover any of these focus areas in the policy document?

This is up to the consortium to decide.

168. 2.3. Core Components, D. Gender equality and inclusion: " Gender equality and inclusion are integral components of this policy framework and should as such be addressed in the application." (page 7) For the Power of Voices Partnerships, Women's' rights and gender equality theme, how will you assess this?

This will be assessed via the criteria for assessing the quality of the Theory of Change and Track Record.

Service delivery

169. Page 10: "Service delivery activities are not eligible for grants under this instrument."

What exactly is meant with this sentence? Considerations:

- a. Especially in countries with very limited civic space can service delivery be a very good vehicle to create trust and a basis for cooperation, precisely to increase civic space. Especially when it concerns improving cooperation between (local) governance and CSOs.
- b. It seems to contradict theme 3, namely food security, sustainable water management and/or WASH. The scope of the policy framework is clear, but not financing service delivery at all seems to be a break with already ongoing strategic partnerships. We would like to have more explanation and interpretation of this sentence on page 10.

Service delivery activities are not eligible for grants under Power of Voices Partnerships as this instrument focuses solely on capacity strengthening for lobbying and advocacy. This is also the case under the current strategic partnerships for Dialogue and Dissent. However, there are many donors, including the Netherlands, who finance service delivery activities through other grant instruments.

170. Can we include an organisation from Latin America that has developed a model on gender-based violence for service delivery as a resource partner in our consortium? If yes, will this work count towards and qualify as service delivery?

If the organisation meets the threshold criteria, it is possible to add a partner from Latin America as consortium partner. Service delivery activities are not eligible under Power of Voices Partnerships. For the definition of service delivery under Power of Women, please see annexe 1.

171. The RFPs for both POV and POW state: This entails influencing decision-makers' agendas, social and political debate, decision-making procedures, policy and legislation, norms and values, and existing practice with a view to bringing about social change. In this way, civil society plays a political role. How civil society works on lobby and advocacy is strongly dependent on the type of organisation, the local, national, regional and/or global context, and the space available to influence policy and work with other actors. More clarity on what service delivery entails in the linkage to lobbying and advocacy. There is a clear distinction between lobbying and advocacy and service delivery related to the advocacy goals. Can you kindly clarify how to classify the role of capacity building in terms of enhancing advocacy skills? Or similarly, the support provided to networks that protect the ability of marginalized groups to undertake effective advocacy? Would this type of activity be considered lobbying and advocacy, or service delivery?

These considerations are up to the consortium. For a definition of service delivery, please see annexe 1.

172. On page 10 the framework reads, "Service delivery activities are not eligible for grants under this instrument." Can the Ministry provide some examples of service delivery activities that are ineligible?

No, it is not possible to provide this information, as it is impossible to provide an exhaustive list.

Consortium

173. Related to threshold criterion D.1.c: Each CSO may participate in no more than two consortia on behalf of which applications for a strategic partnership with the Minister under the Power of Voices Partnerships are submitted, and may act as lead party in only one of the two consortium. Are the organisations in an international federation (all separate judicial entities registered in different countries) treated as separate CSOs that 'in theory' can all join Power of Voices Partnerships in a maximum of two consortia? Or is a whole international federation treated as one CSO? For example one Power of Voices Partnership in which a Dutch federation

member joins (role lead) and one Power of Voices Partnership in which a Southern federation member joins?

For all criteria: please read the policy framework as well as the four respective grant instruments. See also other questions and answers regarding legal personality.

174. Multiple times in the policy framework the 'market/business/private sector' is explicitly mentioned as a third actor in the field next to governance and civil society. Does this mean that partnerships where this third actor is present receives more points or is that for example mainly the case for proposals submitted under theme 2?

The Ministry does not further elaborate on this item.

175. Are you willing to open up the grant instruments for non-CSO's to work in partnership with other civil society organisations to improve the social contract between citizens and the government?

No. See the threshold criteria concerning consortium partners and definition in annexe 1. However, organisations that do not meet the threshold criteria can be subcontracted for specific activities.

176. Page 14 D4: How do we have to interpret 'experience in capacity strengthening of CSOs in the areas of lobbying and advocacy': does this also refer to the broad definition of mutual capacity building under G, which means that this also includes facilitating and strengthening CSOs access to other actors (such as companies) enabling CSOs to muscle a seat at the table and making their voice heard?

The Ministry does not elaborate on this.

177. Innovation: How this will be scored as it only appeared in the track record evaluation criteria?

The Ministry does not elaborate on this.

178. Is capacity building related to governments eligible if they are connected with promoting inclusion, responsiveness and accountability?

The Ministry does not elaborate on this.

Questions Power of Women

179. Power of Women: "Under Power of Voices a women's rights organisation is only eligible for one strategic partnership". [in the English version it actually states 'Power of Women', so question 21a does not apply there]

- a. Is this a typo or is this really about Power of Voices?
- b. How often is a women's rights organisation who submits for Power of Women eligible for Power of Voices?

This has been corrected in the policy framework of grant instrument Power of Women, please consult the updated version. A women's rights organisation is only eligible for one strategic partnership under Power of Women. See also threshold criterion D.1.c.

180. 'The final score is determined by the sum of the score on the qualitative assessment and the points for the geographical deployment if applicable. No more than 7 applications that meet the quality criteria may be selected for stage 3. However, if fewer than 7 applications meet the quality criteria, fewer than 20 will go on to this stage. If more than 7 applications meet the quality criteria, the 7 applications with the highest scores in the qualitative check will go on to stage 3.' There must be a mistake in the second sentence. Also, it may mean the top 7 proposals will not be all selected if there isn't an even spread across the themes. How exactly will 'ensuring a proper spread' work? Is it thinkable that more than one proposal working on a particular topic (e.g. key populations, child marriage) will be awarded a grant?

This has been corrected in the policy framework, please consult the updated version. If fewer than 7 applications meet the quality criteria, fewer than 7 will go on to stage 3. For Power of Women, no measures will be taken to ensure a balanced distribution between the themes.

For the Power of Voices Partnerships and the SRHR Partnership Fund account will be taken of the need for a balanced distribution of the different themes in selecting potential strategic partners. There is no fixed amount of partnerships per theme. The quality of the applications is leading in the selection, taking into account the need for a balanced distribution of the different themes.

181. There are concerns about the eligibility of organisations based on the Threshold Check in Power of Women. Should each partner be a women organisation? There is the concern that a

lot of organisations will be excluded because in their statutes women's rights or gender equality are not mentioned as most important goals. Source on page 13 PoW, D.1.a: A 'women's rights organisation' means: a CSO whose statutes mentions women's rights and gender equality as its most important goal, and that has worked over the last three years (2016, 2017, 2018) to promote women's rights and gender equality as its most important goal. More than 70% of its actual activities work towards this goal.

Every consortium partner must be a women's rights organisation (criterion D.1.b) and meet the definition as set out in criterion D.1.a.

182. A general correction is needed in the grant Power of Women . On 3A page 10 Dutch version: Een vrouwenrechtenorganisatie komt maximaal éénmaal in aanmerking voor een strategisch partnerschap Power of Voices partnerschappen, hetzij als penvoerder, hetzij als alliantiepartner (niet zijnde een penvoerder). It should be Power of Women instead of Power of Voices. The English version seems correct.

Thank you very much for this remark. This omission has already been corrected in the policy rules, please consult the updated version. A women's rights organisation is only eligible for one strategic partnership under Power of Women. See also criterion D.1.c.

183. That stated, why can't PoW-organisations apply in more alliances, just as the other frameworks.

This is to ensure that a diverse array of women's rights organisations receives funding under Power of Women.

184. Does the requirement that at the moment of application and the past three years (2016, 2017, 2018) the CEO is a woman and that the management consists for a minimum of 80% out of women also count for organisations that are co-applicants (consortium partners that are not a lead), or only for the lead party? / Threshold D.1.b requires consortium partners to prove their eligibility through statutes and annual reports. However, it does not provide a definition of who is eligible: Does the definition of women's rights organisation listed under Threshold D.1.a apply to consortium partners as well?

This definition applies both for the lead part (criterion D.1.a) and for other consortium partners (criterion D.1.b)

185. Does an organisation with a woman as deputy CEO during the past three years (2016, 2017, 2018) and a management of 80% women meet the requirement that at the moment of application and the past three years (2016, 2017, 2018) the CEO is a woman and that the management consists for a minimum of 80% out of women.

Don't think so.

186. In a case where thresholds D.1.a and D.1.b are met (a consortium comprises a women's rights organisation as a lead and one as a partner in both a high income and low income country), can other additional organisation(s) be involved as full consortium partners who do not fit the strict definition of women's rights organisations?

No, see criterion D.1.b.

187. Can civil society organisations Whose CEO is not a woman, who don't have 80% of women in management, BUT 70% of their work or more promote women's rights and gender equality, be a consortium partner ?

No.

188. What are the rules to sub-contracting? Can civil society organisations, whose CEO is not a woman, who don't have 80% of women in management, BUT 70% of their work or more promote women's rights and gender equality, be sub-contractors?

The definition mentioned in criterion D.1.a. applies only to consortium partners. The added value of subcontractors can be described in the stakeholder analysis in the Theory of Change and the consortium's vision on working with local organisations.

189. What are the rules for technical partners? Can civil society organisations, whose CEO is not a woman, who don't have 80% of women in management, BUT 70% of their work or more promote women's rights and gender equality, be technical partners?

The definition mentioned in criterion D.1.a. applies only to consortium partners. The added value of subcontractors can be described in the stakeholder analysis in the Theory of Change and the consortium's vision on working with local organisations.

190. For the POW grant instrument - does an organisation with a women's rights programme for the last 3-5 years qualify to be a women's rights organisation? If yes, what type of documents need to be submitted as proof/evidence of this?

Please see the definition of women's rights organisation in criterion D.1.a.

191. Do organisations with 'human rights' in their statutes qualify to be women's rights organisation? If yes- will including such organisations in a consortium applying for the POW grant instrument have any impact on your points system?

Please see the definition of women's rights organisation in criterion D.1.a. Every consortium partner has to meet this definition. The added value of other partners and subcontractors that are not part of the consortium (and do not have to meet the definition under criterion D.1.a.) can be described in the stakeholder analysis in the Theory of Change and the consortium's vision on working with local organisations.

192. The POW grant instrument specifies points for service delivery components in footnotes 20, 21 and 22. Is there a calculation of points based on compensating service delivery or not. *If an application includes a service delivery component, 50 additional points can be obtained in total. A calculation method will be used to compensate for the difference in the maximum number of points that can be obtained between applications with and without a service delivery component. The Ministry will not elaborate further on this in this phase.*

193. Threshold check D.1.b requires consortium partners to demonstrate being a women's rights organisation by providing (1) statutes and (2) annual reports for 2016, 2017 and 2018. Can consortium partners in low-income, lower-middle-income and upper-middle-income countries demonstrate this through other alternative reports or documentation (i.e. of previous projects)?

No, this is not possible for consortium partners.

194. Are child marriage, female genital mutilation and other harmful practices considered part of Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV)?

These areas are no priorities on women's rights and gender equality of the Netherlands. Therefore, for Power of Women, proposals that focus on these issues are not eligible for funding. Please refer to threshold criterion D.8 for the eligible objectives of Power of Women.

195. Are human trafficking and other forms of economic abuse and exploitation considered part of SGBV?

These areas are no policy priorities on women's rights and gender equality of the Netherlands. Therefore, for Power of Women, proposals that focus on these issues are not eligible for funding. Strengthening women's economic empowerment and improving the economic climate for women is one of the three main objectives of Power of Women.

196. Regarding Power of Women: In stage 2, the quality of the theory of change will be assessed according to criteria listed in section 1.2. Criterion 11 mentions a Dutch consortium partner, which is not a threshold criterion under D.1.a or D.1.b. Please, clarify this inconsistency. / In stage 2, the quality of the theory of change will be assessed according to criteria listed in section 1.2. Criterion 11 mentions a Dutch consortium partner. How does this criterion 11 apply to consortia that do not include a Dutch women's rights organisation as consortium partner? / Does a Power of Women consortium application require a Dutch partner? / Is cooperation with a Dutch organisation obligatory under the Theory of Change? *This inconsistency has been removed from the document, please consult the updated version on the website of the policy framework. A consortium under Power of Women does not have to include a Dutch organisation.*

197. The new 'Strengthening Civil Society' framework represents a further evolution of the Dutch government's focus on lobbying and advocacy to tackle poverty, and away from direct service delivery. We note that the Theory of Change mentions influencing norms and decision-making as one of the major outcomes. Could you provide some more detail as to the measurable outcomes that you are hoping to achieve under this framework, with particular reference to the Power of Women grant framework

Power of Women aims to strengthen the capacity of women's rights organisations in the area of lobbying and advocacy. In turn, these women's rights organisations can foster social, economic and/or political transformation in order to achieve equal rights and opportunities for women and

girls. A more detailed monitoring and evaluation framework, including measurable outcomes, is part of stage 3 (see page 2).

198. What kinds of organisations are you interested in supporting under this framework, with particular reference to the Power of Women grant framework?

All consortium partners have to be women's rights organisations. Power of Women aims to strengthen the capacity of women's rights organisations in the area of lobbying and advocacy.

199. The Power of Women of instruments qualify a preference for lobbying and advocacy initiatives over service delivery. Can you qualify further what activities you would consider to be service delivery? Would the delivery of leadership and advocacy training programmes to women so that they can become advocates qualify as service delivery?

Please see annexe 1 for the definition of service delivery. The specific example of leadership and advocacy training programmes qualifies as activities under lobbying and advocacy, as long as they serve the overall focus of the proposal on lobbying and advocacy.

200. Are all these threshold criteria applicable to the lead party and all the co-applicants or are all these threshold criteria only applicable to the lead women right's organisation and not to the co-applicants?

- a CSO whose statutes mentions women's rights and gender quality as its most important goal
- the CSO must demonstrate in its annual reports of 2016, 2017, 2018 that it has worked over the last three years (2016, 2017, 2018) to promote women's rights and gender equality as its most important goal
- More than 70% of its activities work towards women rights promotion and gender equality
- At the time of application and three years before (2016, 2017, 2018), the CEO must be a woman
- At the time of application and three years before (2016, 2017, 2018), 80% of its management must consist of women.

All these criteria are applicable to all consortium partners.

201. Regarding criteria that 80% of its management must consist of women. Our management consists of 3 women and 1 men (75% women). Is this sufficient to be approved as lead? How is it weighed when you fulfill to 4 criteria instead of 5, will you lose points in the scoring or are you declared ineligible? / When we count the FTE of the management then we get to 79,3% women in the management. Can we calculate the % in this way by adding up the nr of FTE divided by the number of men and women in the management? And: Is 79,3% women sufficient to act as lead of the consortium? Again: how is this scored? Will we be defined ineligible or will we lose point and how much?

This calculation method does not qualify under Power of Women. 79.3% is not sufficient to meet the requirement (including for the lead party) under Power of Women.

202. We comply with Astrea's feminist funding principles, are led by women's rights activists AND more than 40% of our grantee partners are women-led women's rights organisations.

Could we fit in the definition of a Women's Rights Organisation?

Every consortium partner under Power of Women needs to fit the definition of women's rights organisation as set out in criterion D.1.a.

203. If a women's rights organisation is not in the lead but supports women's rights work through an intersectional lens can it join a women's rights consortium?

Every consortium partner under Power of Women needs to fit the definition of women's rights organisation as set out in criterion D.1.a.

Question Women, Peace and Security

204. The new 'Strengthening Civil Society' framework represents a further evolution of the Dutch government's focus on lobbying and advocacy to tackle poverty, and away from direct service delivery. We note that the Theory of Change mentions influencing norms and decision-making as one of the major outcomes. Could you provide some more detail as to the measurable outcomes that you are hoping to achieve under this framework, with particular reference to the Women, Peace and Security grant framework?

With regard to the Women, Peace and Security grant instrument, a policy document (annexe 7) is attached to elaborate more on the specific objectives of the grant instrument. A more detailed M&E Framework, including measurable outcomes, is part of stage 3 of the application process.

205. What kinds of organisations are you interested in supporting under this framework, with particular reference to the Women, Peace and Security grant framework?

Please see annexe 1: List of Terms for the definition of civil society and types of organisations that the Ministry aims to strengthen.

206. To what extent is capacity building allowed for individual women, and can this capacity building have a broader focus than solely lobbying and advocacy?

Please see annexe 7: Capacity building is one of the three approaches in the policy document Women, Peace and Security. Capacity building at individual level is possible as long as it connects to the higher objective of lobbying and advocacy and/or changing the enabling environment.

207. In a conflict situation psychosocial support is often needed before one can start with empowerment and capacity building of women. To what extent is psychosocial support allowed within a program submitted to this instrument?

Please see annexe 7: Psychosocial support interventions in the programs on Women, Peace and Security are allowed, provided that it contributes to at least one of the three sub objectives of the Women, Peace and Security grant instrument.

208. P14, 2e alinea: "...evenwichtige spreiding van het aantal geselecteerde aanvragen over de landen..." Hoe wordt de overweging 'kwaliteit voorstel' vs. 'geografische spreiding' gemaakt? Is er sprake van een bepaalde waardering van het een t.o.v. het ander? "*balanced distribution of the Women, Peace and Security-countries in selecting the applications*" How is the consideration 'quality of proposal' vs. 'geographical distribution' made? Is there a certain valuation of one compared to the other? / In the Women Peace and Security grant instrument it is stated on page 13: "Taking into consideration Article 8, third paragraph, sub c of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree, account will be taken of the need for a balanced distribution of the Women, Peace and Security-countries in selecting the applications." How does this balance in distribution of the different countries match with the fact that quality will be leading? How will this balancing be done, will there be a point system or division over the different countries?

Applications need to meet the threshold check and attain at least 650 points in the qualitative assessment to be eligible. If after the quality check there is a substantive unequal distribution among the different Women, Peace and Security countries, the Ministry can decide to select a lower scoring application (but with 650 points as a minimum) that will contribute to a more balanced distribution among Women, Peace and Security countries.

Questions SRHR Partnership Fund

209. How strict is the provision that the "lead party has at least the preceding three years' experience in capacity strengthening of CSOs in the areas of lobbying and advocacy, in at least three of the in the application proposed countries, as of 1 January 2019". Would it not be logical instead to specify that the consortium includes a member that in the preceding 3 years has been involved in the area of capacity strengthening of CSOs in the areas of lobbying and advocacy?

The lead party needs to have at least the preceding three years experience in capacity strengthening of CSOs in the area of lobby and advocacy as of 1 January 2019. This cannot be compensated by another consortium partner.

210. In the framework of the SRHR Partnership Fund the 4 result areas of the Theory of Change are described. Result area 1 is: "Greater freedom of choice for young people about their sexuality". The framework also describes service delivery (e.g. p. 10-11). We are aware of the given definition of service delivery. Are interventions with the goal of increasing knowledge of sexuality for young people (result area 1) considered service delivery?

No, see also annexe 8 Theory of Change SRHR.

211. How does the calculation method work that is mentioned in footnote 26, 27 and 28? *If an application includes a service delivery component, 50 additional points can be obtained in total. A calculation method will be used to compensate for the difference in the maximum number of points that can be obtained between applications with and without a service delivery component. The Ministry will not elaborate further on this in this phase.*

212. Threshold criterion 1.C: Each CSO may participate in no more than two consortia.

Is an organisation allowed to participate in multiple proposals/partnerships as technical partner, even if this organisation is already part of two alliances

Threshold criterion 3 only sees to the number of times an organisation can participate as a consortium partner.

213. Theory of Change (page 18): The Theory of Change includes: an analysis of the available civic space for the proposed programme and the way in which this space will be safeguarded and/or expanded, taking account of: political/social/economic factors, including risk factors or conflict sensitivity. Can the Ministry explain what is meant by 'conflict sensitivity' in this section?
It is up to the organisation to illustrate how to their proposal is conflict sensitive.

214. If more than seven applications meet the quality criteria, the seven applications with the highest scores in the qualitative check will go on to stage 3. Taking into consideration Article 8, third paragraph, sub c of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree, account will be taken of the need for a balanced distribution of the different result areas in selecting projects. In which way is the balanced distribution concretely taken into account? Is it possible that a proposal is still rejected to achieve a better distribution? Or is it taken into account in the amount of funds allocated, as with the SRHR Partnership Fund 2016-2020?

The maximum amount of partnerships is 7, also after the balanced distribution according to Article 8, third paragraph, sub c of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Grants Decree. It is therefore possible that an application is rejected although it has a higher score to achieve a balanced distribution of themes.

215. Threshold criterion D.3 states that all partners show through statutes/annual reports that they have access to SRHR as their goal. This goes against the idea of complementarity within a partnership and core principle E: certain expertise of an organisation can be very relevant for advocating for SRHR, while the organisation does not have SRHR as their core goal according to statutes or annual reports. The suggestion is to let alliances free in the composition of the partnership and to let alliances explain why the partnership on the basis of accumulated experience and expertise is able to achieve SRHR goals.

Please see criterion D.3. Criteria cannot be changed.

216. The adopted amendment by Mr Voordewind and Mr Kuik (tabled at the adoption of the budget statement of Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation (XVII) for the year 2020) states that: "This amendment therefore aims at the new SRHR - framework to pay structural attention to the direct fight against child prostitution by allocating 5 million euros annually from 2020 for this. Coverage is found within article 3 Social Progress in the not yet compulsory part of the contributions to some international organisations.

- How will the minister implement this amendment?
- What are the consequences for the amount of selected partnerships within the SRHR Partnership Fund, currently 7, and for the total available budget for this fund?

The decision on how to implement this amendment for 2020 has not yet been made at the time of writing.

217. In the results, 'people' and 'youth' are included, does this exclude people under 15 years?
No.

218. How exactly will 'ensuring a proper spread' work? Is it thinkable that more than one proposal working on a particular topic (e.g. key populations, child marriage) will be awarded a subsidy?

Yes, this is possible, but depends on the total amount of selected proposals and the different topics. If there is an unequal distribution of different themes within the SRHR Partnership Fund after the qualitative assessment, the Ministry can decide to select a lower scoring proposal to achieve a balanced distribution of themes.

219. The requirements for the consortium state the following (page 11); "Dutch CSOs, with proven quality and an established track Record in the area of SRHR and/or lobbying and advocacy on SRHR, Such a CSO may take the role of lead part or consortium partners"
Whereas the Threshold Criteria D4 (page14) only refers to: "Capacity strengthening of CSOs in the areas of lobby and advocacy"

- a. The threshold criteria seems to be stricter than the consortium criteria as it omits SRHR aspect as such - Kindly clarify which of two criteria hold true?
- b. Kindly clarify the scope of the term "advocacy and lobbying"

A) *Threshold criterion 4 refers to the objectives as mentioned in threshold criterion 3 ("universal access to SRHR"). B) Please see Chapter 2, paragraph 2.3 core components sub B.*

Service delivery under SRHR framework

220. On page 12 in the SRHR Partnership call it is explained: "If the application includes a service delivery component, 30 additional points can be obtained under the Theory of Change part. A calculation method will be used to compensate for the difference in the maximum number of points that can be obtained between applications with and without a service delivery component." Could you explain this calculation method?

No, the calculation method cannot be shared in this phase.

221. What is the definition of service delivery in the SRHR framework and how does service delivery include community based mobilization and advocacy?

Please see annexe 1 List of Terms and annexe 8 Theory of Change SRHR.

222. Are there restrictions to how large of a portion of the budget can be reserved for service-delivery (that is in support of lobby and advocacy activities)?

Yes there are, but no absolute figures. SRHR-partnerships fund is focusing on lobby & advocacy. Service delivery is possible, but only supportive to the main objective of the framework.

223. Service Delivery: Could you kindly specify the scope of Service Delivery activities that would quality under the framework of the call? i.e. Would capacity strengthening of health workers who already operate within the national health care systems to address the needs of GBV survivors be seen as a component of enhancing service delivery?

Please see annexe 1 List of Terms and annexe 8 Theory of Change SRHR.

224. We would like a little more explanation about how broadly advocacy and influence are seen in this policy framework. Is it important, for example, that the proposal meets all these conditions, or can there be a clear choice and focus?

Please see Chapter 2.3 core components sub B and annexe 8 Theory of Change SRHR.

225. Is "empowerment of young people so that they are able to make healthy choices in their sexual and reproductive life (CSE)" also covered by advocacy and influence or is this seen as a service?

Please see annexe 1 List of Terms and annexe 8 Theory of Change SRHR.

226. "The service delivery activities should serve the lobbying and advocacy activities on SRHR and contribute to the long term objective; it cannot be a stand-alone activity." Can the ministry explain what it intends with this? What would be the allowed scope of service delivery activities in terms of to support lobby and advocacy?

Please see annexe 1 List of Terms and annexe 8 Theory of Change SRHR.