

Resource Allocation Model (RAM)

Resource Allocation to Danish Framework Organisations

1 Introduction

The Finance Act has in recent years stated that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) will undertake regular reviews and capacity assessments of the framework organisations and their activities at country level with a view to, among other aspects, determine the level of the annual funding pledges for the individual organisations. The increasing number of framework organisations has accentuated the need for harmonising assessment frameworks as well as to developing an instrument to create transparency around allocation of resources. Such an instrument in the form of a Resource Allocation Model (RAM) has been developed in 2013 in consultation with a Strategic and a Technical Reference Group with members appointed by the NGO FORUM. In the development of the RAM the MFA has drawn on external consultancy assistance from Networking Consultants.

The drafting of the RAM has been followed by a consultation process during which the framework organisations through the NGO FORUM commented on the RAM. In October 2013, the Council for Development Policy was informed on the RAM and in November the RAM was on the agenda of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Danish Parliament.

The present Note describes the final RAM terms of basic principles, gearing of the funding structure, funding adjustment, performance assessment areas, standards, etc.

2 Gains of the Resource Allocation Model

The RAM has been designed to foster the following gains:

- Create transparency around allocation of financial appropriations to frame organisations;
- Reward high performance;
- Improve documentation of results;
- Enhance predictability and longterm planning.

Clarity on what the RAM intends to incentivize – as well as what it does not wish to incentivize – is of highest importance.

The RAM seeks to incentivize:

- Wise planning, management and monitoring for development results;
- Reliable reporting on achievements and weaknesses accompanied by highly professional risk management;
- Continuous learning from the past and innovative adjustment to the future.

The RAM has explicitly been designed to assess performance and has not been set up to create avenues for growth for individual organisations.

The RAM serves to apportion the total annual frame appropriation on the Finance Act among the frame organisations. Because there is a set total annual appropriation, which may vary between fiscal years, the RAM concept is based on a proportional funding distribution, where an organisation can only gain at the expense of other organisations.

3 The Resource Allocation Model

3.1 The RAM Cycle

Every fourth year, the framework organisations will be assessed according to the RAM. The first RAM assessment will take place in the autumn of 2014, and will cover the six old and the five new framework organisations, which have received framework funding from January 2013. The second RAM assessment will take place in 2018, and is expected to cover a total of up to 17 framework organisations.

The 2014-RAM assessment will impact on the funding to the organisations through the Finance Act for 2016 prepared in 2015, and the following three Finance Acts. The benefit of this in-built delay from performance assessment to implementation of new allocation caused by the Finance Act preparation time is that the organisations get an early warning of possible allocation adjustments.

After a RAM assessment, the proportional funding level to each organisation of the total frame will be calculated and fixed for a period of four years. Hence, the RAM assessment in 2014 will fix the proportional funding level per organisation for 2016-2019; in 2018, the proportional funding level will be fixed for 2020-2023.

3.2 The structure of the RAM

The RAM comprises three levels of assessment (See Table 1 for a schematic overview):

3.2.1 Eligibility:

This component is about the organisations' eligibility to receive funding in general, and it defines a number of basic criteria to be fulfilled.

In order to receive support for development activities, an organisation must:

- be private and have a legal registered office and activities in Denmark. The chairman and the majority of the members of the board must be Danish citizens or foreign nationals with permanent Danish residence permits,
- have existed for at least one year,
- have at least 50 contributing members or support persons,
- have approved articles of association, and
- its accounts must have undergone an audit.

Aspiring organisations are assessed on a set of:

1.1.	General Principles	Legitimacy, governance, track record
------	--------------------	--------------------------------------

All present and aspiring framework organisations have passed these eligibility criteria.

3.2.2 Base-funding

The General Principles state the following:

“Framework agreements are a possibility for large organisations that have, over a longer period of time, displayed the necessary professional and administrative capacity to implement and administer major programmes. Under such agreements framework organisations will have increased flexibility in their planning as well as the possibility for long-term programming.”¹

In the RAM, this is assessed as part of the Base-funding component through an external Capacity Assessment, which comprises elements that all relate to the framework organisations' 'Being', meaning that the focus here is on strategy, systems, and capacity. The Capacity Assessment evaluates the organisation on:

¹ P.5, General Principles

2.1	Strategic alignment with overall Danida policies and principles	Relevance is a basic criterion, where framework organisations are assessed on their own strategy, niche and uniqueness, including the popular foundation. This is intended to incentivize diversity among the organisations.
2.2	Organisational capacity	Capacity to create results
2.3	Management, financial and administrative systems	Due diligence test; building on assessments carried out under the auspices of other systems (certification) in order to increase efficiency of reviews and assessments

The Capacity Assessment aims to establish a prudent level of funding, which matches the organisation's capacity, its programme portfolio financed by MFA and its track record on results.

All 11 frame organisations taking part in the 2014-RAM have been assessed and approved for Base-funding.

As part of the RAM-cycle, an external review will be undertaken every fourth year, which will revisit and re-assess the frame organisations on the criteria related to Base-funding (more details on the external review is provided below).

If at any time there is reason to believe that the capacity and performance of an organisation fall below acceptable standards, the MFA may apply discretionary sanctions and eventually in a worst case situation – an exit strategy from framework funding.

For the first RAM assessment in 2014, an organisation's Base-funding component will be calculated as 60 per cent of the 2013 funding level. The Base-funding will not be adjusted as part of the 2014-RAM: It is only the Performance-based funding – the remaining 40 per cent - that will be adjusted (see next section). In the 2018 and consecutive RAM-assessments the 60 per cent Base-funding will be calculated on the adjusted budget levels resulting from the previous RAM-assessments.

3.2.3 Performance-based funding

The Performance-based funding component is at the heart of the RAM: It is the capability of the organisations to effect real changes through their programmes that will be assessed and serve as the basis for adjusting their funding.

An organisation's performance is assessed through the RAM scoring tool with the following four assessment areas: (See Table 1 for an overview):

3.1	Strategic focus and goals / Logic of intervention	Strategic planning
3.2	Evidence of change	Results reporting
3.3	Strategic financing for sustainability	Value for money, partner funding and own financial sustainability
3.4	Role as Danish civil society organisation	Integrity as a civil society actor: Development education, policy influence and global engagement

3.3 The RAM Scoring Tool

3.3.1 *The Standards*

The Performance-based funding component consists of four assessment areas as outlined above. These assessment areas are broken down into a total of 24 standards.

All the organisations will be assessed on all standards. This implies that all the standards be phrased in a manner so as to embrace activities of all framework organisations, and not give preferential treatment to certain activity areas.²

The standards have been composed in a format conducive to instigate what the RAM intends to incentivize as stated in section 2 above.

A combination of effect and process standards will accommodate the particular challenges of reporting an organisation's contribution to development in political/societal processes.

It is important to note that the set of standards does not constitute a format for the organisations' plans and reports, but should rather be seen as a filter or a set of lenses for assessing the organisation's plans, results reports, and other documents to be submitted as part of the RAM-assessment.

3.3.2 *The Descriptors*

The standards will be scored by applying an adapted version of a World Bank inspired rating scale: The 'LEADS' descriptors (allocating scores from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent)). Hence, the minimum an organisation can score is 1, equivalent to 20 per cent; and the maximum is 5, equivalent to 100 per cent.

LEADS stand for:

1. L (Little action/evidence)
2. E (Some Evidence)
3. A (Action taken)
4. D (Developed)
5. S (Sustainable)

The LEADS descriptor has been adapted into a generic format suitable for scoring on the RAM standards.

Score	Descriptor
The score '5' is given, when there is:	Comprehensive indication of implementation and/or indication of an established approach/system in supporting the standard
The score '4' is given, when there is:	Solid indication that supports the standard
The score '3' is given, when there is:	Indication that supports the standard
The score '2' is given, when there is:	Some indication that supports the standard
The score '1' is given, when there is:	Weak indication that supports the standard

² An example is that there will be no specific standard on operating in fragile situations, and the performance in this area will be measured in terms of e.g. context analysis, risk management.

3.4 The Information Base for the RAM Assessment

The RAM assessment is comparable with a desk review: The organisations will be assessed based on the documents submitted.

It is an explicit principle of the RAM that the whole system builds on existing tools and procedures. The organisations will be assessed based on their own strategic plans and reports; the RAM will not introduce a new application regime and no specific formats will be required. It should also be emphasised that the RAM cycle does not imply that the organisations follow a four-year planning cycle.

The documents, which will form the basis for the RAM-assessment, are already familiar to the organisations:

- Strategic plan
- Results report
- Plans and achievements in popular foundation and development education

A change from current practice will be that the four-year cycle will operate with strategic plans and results reports in three versions:

3.4.1 Strategic plan

The organisation's strategic plan will be submitted and assessed every fourth year as part of the RAM assessment; in the interim years, only a minor update on the plan will be submitted. The organisation's own planning cycle will be respected, and the organisations are not required to submit particular 'Danida-plans'. It is, at any time, the requirements in the administrative guidelines that are applicable for the strategic plan.

3.4.2 Results report

A major and thorough results report will be required every fourth year, where a results report covering the previous three-four years will be expected to document change at outcome level for longer-term objectives and processes, supported with extensive evidence. In the interim years, a minor results report is required, focussing on reporting progress on annual targets (outputs, outcomes and processes). The distinction between major and minor results reports intends to ease the reporting burden on the organisations as compared to the present reporting requirements. The organisations may use their own formats for results reporting. Organisations are free to submit a global report on its activities. For organisations forming part of a larger international cooperation/alliance, the required results reporting may be constituted by the overall reporting at the international level.

It is, at any time, the requirements in the administrative guidelines that are applicable for the results report.

3.4.3 Plans and achievements in popular foundation and development education

The organisation's strategy for popular foundation and plans for development education should be submitted every fourth year together with reporting on progress and achievements in the past 3-4 year period.

3.4.4 Reviews

Since the RAM assessment is performed as a desk assessment only, it is essential to include measures of field validation of performance and of reported results, which will be included in a review which all framework organisations will undergo every fourth year. The reviews will be spread over the four-year period.

The reviews will follow Standard Terms of Reference and assessment criteria and will primarily be retrospective. They will assess performance, validate reported results through random checks, as well as capacity and systems to perform, and will feed into the four-year RAM-scoring, both directly in the assessment of the performance-based funding and through the continued monitoring of action plans that will follow up on the conclusions of reviews.

The consultative and participative process around the reviews will follow the same practice as previously: close dialogue, engagement and exchange before, during and after the review.

3.5 Gearing of funding adjustments

The RAM scoring tool will allocate a score to each organisation, which translated into a percentage will determine the level of adjustment of each organisation's Performance-based funding.

The Base-funding of 60 per cent is set relatively high with the explicit purpose of serving as a stabilisation mechanism in the RAM: Funding should be adjusted in relation to results, but the adjustment should not threaten the organisation's funding predictability and reliability as a partner to drivers of change/civil society organisations in the partner countries.

In the 60/40 gearing of RAM, the weighting of the Performance aspect is relatively modest (40 per cent). For example, an adjustment of 10 per cent of an organisation's funding, in real terms will be calculated as 10 per cent of the 40 per cent.

In addition to this, a safe-guard is set on the range of adjustments: The maximum cut an organisation may experience in the Total Annual Funding is 10 per cent from one year to the other; similarly the maximum increase an organisation may achieve is 20 per cent from year-to-year; both calculated on the basis of the Frame Appropriation of the preceding year. If the scoring results in an adjustment exceeding the maximum 10 per cent drop or the 20 per cent increase, it will be spread over more than one year. The exception to the rule is that if the Total Frame Appropriation in the Finance Act decreases/increases, then the annual deviation in the allocation to any organisation may exceed the otherwise established limit of -10 per cent/+ 20 per cent.

The -10 per cent/+ 20 per cent limitation on adjustments serves to absorb sudden shock effects of the system, while still balancing the possibility for adjustments of significance. While a too modest range of adjustment of funding would not justify the whole RAM system in terms of costs (development and implementation costs) and benefits (incentivize performance improvement with the organisations), a too high percentage of adjustment might pose a risk to the sustainability of the organisations' development programmes.

As explained in section 2, the RAM serves to apportion the total annual frame appropriation on the Finance Act among the frame organisations. Each organisation's funding will be calculated as a proportional share of the total allocation to framework organisations in the Finance Act in a given year. Therefore, a positive or improved score to an organisation does not by itself guarantee increased funding: If other organisations are performing much better and have higher improved scores, an organisation may even face a cut in funding, despite high/ improved scores.

4 System /organisational requirements

The RAM-assessment will be undertaken by an internal assessment team of MFA-staff, drawing on a range of technical/professional expertise from various departments.

The team may acquire external assistance, but in order to foster both legitimacy and learning from the assessments, the lead responsibility will have to be taken up by MFA staff. Ownership has to be vested within the MFA. This indicates that the RAM assessment will be rather resource demanding on the MFA, both in 2014, and even more in 2018 with up to six more organisations to come.

In order to ensure fairness and objectivity, any one organisation shall be assessed by both a primary and a secondary assessor, who will prepare a consolidated assessment note and scoring marks.

Thorough training of the assessment teams will have to be carried out in advance of the real assessments in order to ensure an acceptable level of fairness in the scoring. The purpose is to establish a common inter-assessor perception and scoring of the standards in relation to the LEADS-descriptors: An organisation should be assessed the same way, no matter who the assessors are.

MFA may consider engaging a peer reviewer from a likeminded donor agency for quality assurance and reflection on the assessments done by the MFA assessors.

The RAM assessment itself will be carried out as an internal exercise in the MFA. In the period from the organisations' submission of the requisite documents until the scoring has been completed, no contact with the organisations as regards the RAM assessment will take place.

The RAM assessment of each organization will be documented thoroughly, both for documentation purposes, but also for learning purposes. Each organisation will receive an Assessment note with a commented score of the concerned organization on all standards.

The MFA will respect a grace period of one month from handing over the score and the Assessment note to the organisations. In that period, the organisations may use the option of filing a complaint about the allocated score. After the grace period or after processing possible complaints, the MFA will inform the organisations about the future proportional funding level as determined by the RAM scoring. The MFA will publish the overall scoring results per organisation, while feedback and information on own scoring will be shared with the individual organisation only.

The organisations will be invited to an individual dialogue meeting with the assessors with feedback and advice on the way forward.

Table 1: OVERVIEW OF THE DANISH RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL

ELIGIBILITY – TO ACCESS							
Purpose	Assessment areas	Details			Basis for assessment	Frequency	Assessor
1. Eligibility	1.1. General Principles	Legitimacy, governance, track record			New organisations: By invitation	Upon invitation	MFA
					Existing organisations: Performance Review	4-year	External
BASE-FUNDING – TO BE							
Purpose	Assessment areas	Details			Basis for assessment	Frequency	Assessor
2. BASE funding 60 %	2.1. Strategic alignment with overall development policies and principles	Relevance is a basic criterion, where frame organisations are assessed on their own strategy, niche and uniqueness in order to incentivize diversity among organisations.			Capacity assessment	Entry	External
					Review	4-year	External
	2.2. Organisational capacity	Capacity to create results			Capacity assessment	Entry	External
					Performance review	4-year	External
	2.3. Management, financial and admin systems	Due diligence test; building on other assessments (e.g. certification) in order to increase efficiency of reviews and assessments			System audit reports	Annual	Auditor
					Inspection visits	4-year	MFA
			Capacity assessment Review	Entry 4-year	External External		
PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING – TO DO							
Purpose	Assessment areas	Details	Standards	Weight	Basis for assessment	Frequency	Assessor
3. PERFORMANCE based funding 40 %	3.1. Strategic focus and goals / Logic of intervention	Prospective visioning and planning	8	30 %	Strategic plans, programme of work	4-year	MFA
					Plan update	Annual	MFA
	3.2. Evidence of change	Retrospective results reporting	10	50 %	Results report, major	4-year	MFA
					Results report, minor	Annual	MFA
	3.3. Strategic financing for sustainability	Value for money, partner funding and own financial sustainability (approach and transparency)	3	10 %	Plan	4-year	MFA
					Results report, major	4-year	MFA
					Results report, minor	Annual	MFA
	3.4. Role as Danish civil society organisation	Integrity as a civil society actor: Development education, policy influence and global engagement	3	10 %	Plan	4-year	MFA
					Results report, major	4-year	MFA
Results report, minor					Annual	MFA	
Total standards			24				

Table 2: RESOURCE ALLOCATION MODEL FOR FRAMEWORK ORGANISATIONS

STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE-BASED FUNDING

ASSESSMENT AREA 3.1	STRATEGIC PLANNING STRATEGIC FOCUS & GOALS / LOGIC OF INTERVENTION
No.	Standard
1.	<p>Context analysis</p> <p>The organisation illustrates that the submitted plan has been informed by context analyses</p> <p><i>Context analyses comprising:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>addressing the causes of poverty, rights violations, inequality and/or vulnerability, incl. the political, social, economic and security context in which the programmes will be implemented</i> • <i>identifying drivers of change as part of a stakeholder analysis</i> • <i>assessing risks (political, environmental, security etc.) and vulnerability, including , where appropriate, fragility and transition to rehabilitation and development.</i>
2.	<p>Strategic choice of intervention</p> <p>The organisation presents a clear strategic choice of intervention at portfolio level</p> <p><i>The choice of intervention including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a clear logic of intervention (theory of change or similar) with clear strategies for geographical/ thematic choices and targeting of rights holders (disaggregated groups), and appropriate to the general, specific and changing context (incl. fragility)</i> • <i>reference to the organisation’s strategy on advocacy and engagement of duty bearers</i> • <i>clear, coherent strategic objectives framed within the organisation’s strategic focus, scale and risk willingness</i>
3.	<p>Strategy development and planning</p> <p>The organisation accounts for its approach to strategy development and planning processes</p> <p><i>An approach illustrating:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>engagement of partners as equals in joint development interventions</i> • <i>ensuring alignment to partner organisations’ strategic focus</i> • <i>taking account of the views of other relevant stakeholders and drivers of change at international, national or local level (e.g. rights holders, duty bearers, civil society, government, private sector, etc.)</i>
4.	<p>Human rights based approach</p> <p>The organisation has mainstreamed a human rights based approach in the organisation’s strategic focus, goals and plans</p> <p><i>Mainstreaming of HRBA in the plan:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>being reflected in linking to human rights standards</i> • <i>integrating the PANT principles: Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination, Transparency</i> • <i>being explicit on HRBA capacity development of partners</i>
5.	<p>Innovation</p> <p>The organisation demonstrates a strategic approach to innovation</p>

	<p><i>The approach to innovation:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>addressing innovation in partnership relations, in organisation forms and/or at programme level</i> • <i>including strategies for management of risks and opportunities</i> • <i>being operationalized and measurable</i>
6.	<p>Partnership</p> <p>The organisation presents its planned choice of partners and partnership approach in relation to strategic goals and global context</p> <p><i>Choice of partners and partnership approach including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>strategic reflections on the risk willingness in and choice of civil society partners (e.g. drivers of change, types of partners, funded/non-funded relations, and other forms of collaboration)</i> • <i>elaborate on the organisation’s engagement in strategic partnerships with other partners than civil society</i> • <i>illustrate the approach to partnership development, e.g. efforts to promote the partners’ autonomy and/or greater equality in the partner relations</i>
7.	<p>Capacity development of partner organisations</p> <p>The organisation presents its approach to capacity development of partner organisations</p> <p><i>The approach to capacity development reflecting plans to develop:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>partner autonomy as an independent, legitimate driver of change</i> • <i>partner capacity to respond adequately to context</i> • <i>sustainability of outcome of capacity development at partnership level</i>
8.	<p>Added value in the context of mutual contributions</p> <p>The organisation’s intended added value to change processes, created in the context of mutuality with partners and allies.</p> <p><i>The presentation of the organisation’s added value:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>comprising a distinct and relevant strategic framing of the organisation’s added value to change processes</i> • <i>describing the intended causality of the added value and on which level the added value will be manifested</i> • <i>being operationalized and measurable</i>

ASSESSMENT AREA 3.2	RESULTS REPORTING EVIDENCE OF CHANGE
No.	Standard
9.	<p>Change at the level of rights holders and relations to duty bearers</p> <p>The organisation’s contribution together with partners to positive and significant changes at micro level</p>

	<p><i>Changes at micro level described in terms of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>goal achievement measured against own objectives/targets, with critical reflections on lessons learnt</i> • <i>empowerment of targeted rights holders (disaggregated groups) and engagement of duty bearers (if planned for), taking into account fragility issues, where relevant</i> • <i>use of appropriate risk monitoring and risk management interventions to minimize risks and adapt strategies, including efforts to ensure long-term sustainability</i>
10.	<p>Change at the level of policy processes</p> <p>The organisation's contribution together with partners to positive and significant changes in development processes/systems, policy processes or policy implementation at the meso/macro level as a result of advocacy efforts</p> <p><i>Changes at meso/macro level as a result of advocacy efforts in terms of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>goal achievement measured against own objectives/targets, with critical reflections on lessons learnt</i> • <i>spaces for civil society engagement and engagement in strategic alliances/coalitions, taking into account fragility issues, where relevant</i> • <i>use of appropriate risk monitoring and risk management interventions to minimize risks and adapt strategies, including efforts to ensure long-term sustainability</i>
11.	<p>Harmonisation and alignment</p> <p>The organisation documents effects of harmonisation and alignment efforts</p> <p><i>Effects illustrated by efforts to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>co-ordinate and/or harmonise with other civil society organisations, donors, etc.</i> • <i>align to partners' programme/implementation strategies, systems and/or procedures</i> • <i>lessen the financial and administrative burden of the partners within harmonised arrangements</i>
12.	<p>Human rights based approach</p> <p>The organisation's contribution to effects of applying a human rights based approach in the programmes</p> <p><i>Effects of applying a human rights based approach illustrated by::</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>goal achievement on HRBA efforts, with critical reflections on lessons learnt</i> • <i>linking to human rights standards</i> • <i>integration of the PANT principles: Participation, Accountability, Non-discrimination, Transparency</i>
13.	<p>Innovation</p> <p>The organisation documents developments in relation to innovation</p>

	<p><i>Developments through innovation as illustrated by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>goal achievement measured against own plan and milestones, with critical reflections on lessons learnt</i> • <i>planned and unplanned changes of innovation processes in partnership relations, in organisation forms, and/or at programme level</i> • <i>use of appropriate risk monitoring and risk management interventions to minimize risks and adapt strategies</i>
14.	<p>Partnership</p> <p>The organisation accounts for its choice of partners and partnership approach in relation to strategic goals and context</p>
	<p><i>Status illustrated by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>status in civil society partnership portfolio (e.g. drivers of change, types of partners, funded/non-funded relations, and other forms of collaboration), including use of risk monitoring</i> • <i>status in the organisation's engagement in strategic partnerships with other partners than civil society</i> • <i>changes from efforts to promote partner autonomy and/or greater equality in the partner relations</i>
15.	<p>Capacity development of partners</p> <p>The organisation's contribution to positive changes for the partner organisations as a result of capacity development</p>
	<p><i>Results in terms of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>goal achievement measured against own objectives/targets, with critical reflections on lessons learnt</i> • <i>partner autonomy as an independent, legitimate driver of change</i> • <i>partner capacity to respond adequately to context</i>
16.	<p>Mutual learning within partnerships</p> <p>The organisation describes how mutual learning within the partnership relation has taken place</p>
	<p><i>Mutual learning covering:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>co-creative structures and processes with partners, including how it has been unfolded in practice</i> • <i>mutual responsiveness towards emerging trends</i> • <i>mutual openness towards different perspectives in the partnerships (incl. use of self-assessment tools)</i>

17.	<p>Added value in the context of mutual contributions</p> <p>The organisation accounts for its contribution to change processes, derived from the organisation's added value and created in mutuality with partners and allies</p> <p><i>Developments in added value seen in relation to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>goal achievement measured against own indicators, with critical reflections on lessons learnt</i> • <i>the intended causality of the added value, i.e. bringing about change (micro/meso/macro level)</i> • <i>including the partners' view on the value added by the Danish organisation</i>
18.	<p>Mainstreaming of learning</p> <p>The organisation demonstrates that learning is mainstreamed into wider organisational learning (in work in Denmark and in partner countries)</p> <p><i>Mainstreaming of learning based on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>evidence-based learning generated from programme implementation, evaluation and research</i> • <i>putting into practice learning from failures/non-achievements</i> • <i>replication of good practice, where relevant</i>

ASSESSMENT AREA 3.3	STRATEGIC FINANCING FOR SUSTAINABILITY
No.	Standard
19.	<p>Value for money</p> <p>The organisation has established transparency around goal achievements vs. resources spent</p> <p><i>Transparency as illustrated by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>use of value for money considerations to inform financial decisions</i> • <i>critical reflections on methodology (including validity and reliability) of measurements</i> • <i>accounting on cost effectiveness, which is appropriate to strategic focus and programmes of the organisation</i>
20.	<p>Funding mechanisms with partners</p> <p>The organisation describes efforts to put in place funding mechanisms with the partners that promote risk willingness and partners' financial autonomy</p> <p><i>Funding mechanisms that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>accommodate the needs of different and new types of partners and/or partnership relations</i> • <i>promote partner driven financial decision-making and disbursement</i> • <i>promote innovative approaches to budget holding and/or contracting responsibilities in the partnership</i>

21.	<p>Framework organisations' own funding</p> <p>The organisation accounts for approaches to optimise the organisation's own financial base for autonomy and independence</p>
	<p><i>Autonomy and independence as illustrated through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>diversification of funding base</i> • <i>financial resourcing to operate at a strategic level</i> • <i>efforts to increase internal cost efficiency without compromising effectiveness</i>

ASSESSMENT AREA	ROLE AS DANISH CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANISATION
3.4	
No.	Standard
22.	<p>Development education and Popular foundation</p> <p>The organisation accounts for its plans and achievements in development education and popular foundation</p>
	<p><i>Plans and achievements relying on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>a communication and popular foundation strategy, including clearly differentiated target groups</i> • <i>objectives appropriate to scale and focus of the organisation</i> • <i>goal achievement measured against own objectives/targets, accompanied by reflections on lessons learnt</i>
23.	<p>Policy development and influence in Denmark</p> <p>The organisation accounts for its plans and achievements in relation to relevant policy development and policy influence in Denmark</p>
	<p><i>The organisation elaborates on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the strategic fit between the organisation's global agendas/campaigns and the organisation's policy engagement in Denmark</i> • <i>the relevance and validity of policy analyses and engagement in alliances/networks</i> • <i>goal achievement measured against own objectives/targets, accompanied by reflections on lessons learnt</i>
24.	<p>Global engagement beyond Denmark</p> <p>The organisation describes its contribution to global agenda setting and global engagement</p>
	<p><i>A coherent approach illustrated through:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>the linkage of the organisation's global agendas/campaigns to evidence-based relevance at national and local level in partner countries, including at partner level</i> • <i>the relevance and validity of policy analyses and own and partners' engagement in alliances/networks</i> • <i>goal achievement measured against own objectives/targets, accompanied by reflections on lessons learnt</i>

Table 3: Overview of corresponding standards (plans vs. results reports)

No.	Strategic focus and goals	No.	Evidence of change
1	Context analysis		
2	Strategic choice of intervention	9	Change at the level of rights holders and relations to duty bearers
		10	Change at the level of policy processes
3	Strategy development and planning		
		11	Harmonisation and alignment
4	Human rights based approach	12	Human rights based approach
5	Innovation	13	Innovation
6	Partnership	14	Partnership
7	Capacity development of partner organisations	15	Capacity development of partner organisations
		16	Mutual learning within partnerships
8	Added value in the context of mutual contributions	17	Added value in the context of mutual contributions
		18	Mainstreaming of learning

Other standards

No.	Strategic financing for sustainability
19	Value for money
20	Funding mechanisms with partners
21	Framework organisations' own funding
	Role as Danish CSO
22	Development education/information
23	Policy development and influence in Denmark
24	Global engagement beyond Denmark