Spørgsmål og svar til Q&A møde vedr. Strategiske Partnerskaber 2022-2025

Eigtveds Pakhus 11 oktober 2021

Spørgsmål og svar er anonymiseret og besvaret på det sprog de er stillet.

Spørgsmål/kommentarer	Svar
20% loft i Danmark	
I forbindelse med at HQ betaler for varer/services, der helt eller delvist benyttes af de regionale kontorer, er det da et krav, (1) at der laves interne fakturaer og bankoverførsler, for at de regionale kontorers andel tæller med som Non-HQ, eller kan man (2) lave en omkostningsfordeling i regnskabet. Det kan fx være IT-softwarelicenser, som HQ betaler for, men hvor de fleste licenser benyttes på de regionale kontorer. Det sidste vil være klart at foretrække, da intern debitering lægger et yderligere lag af administration, regnskab og revision på en allerede tung administration.	Man kan ved hjælp af dimensioner i organisationens bogføringssystem lave en rimelig omkostnings-fordeling i regnskabet. Der bør i den forbindelse overvejes dels i hvilken grad omkostningen vedrører HQ og non-HQ samt dels hhv. SPA og øvrige projekter (jf. princippet om fair share).
Hvordan skal non-HQ-omkostninger til IPE registreres i regnskabet, så det ikke indgår i beregningen af omkostningsloftet på 20 % for HQ? Fx en lokal fotograf.	Budgetformatet vil blive opdateret så der gives mulighed for at opdele omkostninger til IPE på hhv HQ og non-HQ.
Could a field-based communication person be covered by the IPE[1]-costs if the employee is <u>not</u> based in Denmark but contributing directly to IPE activities in Denmark?	Yes.
Hvordan skal non-HQ-omkostninger finansieret af administration fee registreres i regnskab, så det ikke indgår i beregningen af omkostningsloftet på 20 % for HQ? Fx omkostninger på lokale kontorer der ikke kan registreres på A1-A7.	Administrationsbidraget udspecificeres ikke. Hele administrationsbidraget indgår fuldt og helt i HQ omkostninger. Omkostninger på lokale kontorer antages indeholdt i A1 og A3 i det omfang de dækkes af det strategiske partnerskab (jf. princippet om fair share).
The term "headquarter level in Denmark" is used several places in the information note. In Annex 2E the term "related to HQ level (i.e in Denmark)" is used. Kindly clarify how to interpret this requirement. When is a cost considered "non-HQ"?	The terms "*headquarter level in Denmark*" and "*related to HQ level (i.e. in Denmark)"* refers to the same. Refer to Annex 2E for definition of non-HQ.

[1] Information and Public Engagement

Is it correctly understood that the 20% HQ level include IPE, admin, audit, HO activity and hours, and that travel costs and HO hrs to travel are now exempt?	Yes, IPE at HQ level, admin, audit, HQ activity and hours are included under the 20% HQ level. Annex 2 will be updated to allow to differentiate costs to IPE between HQ and non-HQ. It is confirmed that travel costs and time during travel is exempted from 20% HQ level. Other exceptions include purchase of assets, items or services for implementation in the field as well as costs for local partners' participation in training and seminars in Denmark. Der henvises til Annex 2E for yderligere præcisering.
Opgørelsen af de 20%, omfatter de audit?	Ja. IPE på HQ niveau, (A.5.a), administration (B.1), revision i Danmark (A.7), HQ aktiviteter og and support omkostninger og timer (A.1.a. og A.3.a) skal inkluderes indenfor de 20% på HQ i Danmark.
Can costs be split between the HQ and global budget lines?	Costs may be split between HQ and non-HQ cost, i.e. if the expense for this activity is in Denmark it falls under HQ (that is in Denmark); if the expense is outside of Denmark it falls outside HQ. Global activities shall as far as possible be included as regional costs and split between Africa/regional and 'other regions/regional (not country-specific'). If this is not possible it must be included as 'other regions/regional (not country-specific)'. All activities must live up to the DAC-criteria. It is important to make a distinction between ODA and 'global goods', which are not ODA.
When hosting global training programmes such as HEAT and similar courses that target a wider audience (incl. other international organizations, partners, and donors) with 50% or more international attendance, will the costs be incurred in Denmark or can they be charged to global budget lines?	Costs for participation (of local partners or regional/country offices) in trainings and seminars held in Denmark which are included in and covered by local activity budgets (of local partners or regional/country offices) can be charged as non-HQ cost (A.1.b, A.2 or A.3.b). C.f. Annex 2E.

Section 4 – Strategic relevance (Annexes) We note that *'A plan (max 1 page) for living up to the maximum ceiling of 20% for expenditure at headquarter level in Denmark'* has been deleted from the requirements, is it correct that we do not have to submit a separate annex indicating the compliance with the 20% HO level from 2023. The budget will of course still capture this development over the four years of the strategic partnership period.	Correct. The plan has been taken out and should be reflected in the budget.
Anses en rådgiver, der sidder i Berlin eller London som en del af HQ i Danmark?	Denne udgift betragtes ikke som værende indenfor de 20% i Danmark.
Adgang til yderligere funding	
As a strategic partner, we can currently apply for thematic calls, which follow the guidelines for single projects. When new calls come out from 2022, explained in the two modalities (during the coming SPA phase), will they follow the guidelines for single projects as well or be included in the future SPA agreement?	It is relevant to make a distinction between additional top up grants, which will be included in the SPA agreements, and separate thematic calls, which will be, managed separately applying the guidelines for single projects.
Local leadership	
In terms of the local leadership strategy, we would like you to elaborate further on at what level we are setting ambitious objectives for our local leadership. Are we setting measurable objectives with specific targets for the period of 2022 to 2025 or are we more along the lines of objectives who are more overall/qualitative for the entire period and thus can be detailed further on an annual basis? Or something entirely different? Kindly elaborate further.	This is a matter for the partner to assess. The strategy should give as precise (but only as specific as possible) a picture of how to work on strengthening local leadership on the basis of the five elements. Providing overall/qualitative targets for the period, which can be specified on an annual basis, fully meets expectations.
This is referred to in Annex 1 as: *"Attach a local leadership strategy (max 3 pages) for the Strategic Partnership period with reference to the five core elements."* In Annex 1b it is referred to as: *"partnership strategy"*. Please confirm if this is the same strategy and if it is a "partnership" or "local leadership" strategy.	It is a local leadership strategy. Annex 1B will be updated accordingly.
Fleksible midler	
Seeing how the flexible unallocated funds are essentially combining two separate funding types from the current Strategic Partnership, each with different administrative procedures and flexibility, could you please provide an indication on the flexibility level of the funds, e.g. in terms of	Unallocated flexible funds (SPA 2022-25) followadministrative procedures very much like those covering Lot HUM flexible funds of SPA 2018-2021. (i.e. similar audit requirements and requirements for pre-approval and/or communication).

audit requirements, approvals and/or communication required before allocating the funds? This is important to the Information Note and application, as it will influence the final allocation between country and thematic programmes, as well as humanitarian action.	The draft administrative guidelines will be shared before year end.
Are we allowed to use unallocated funds for HQ time registration?	Yes**,** unallocated flexible funds may be used as other funds and with the same requirements and ceilings applied. Only difference is that they are unallocated (i.e. it is undecided where and what activities they will be allocated for.
In understanding the 33% flexfunds and the 10% unallocated, have we understood correctly, that the 10% unallocated, is outside of the 33% flexfunds, so what is 'leftover' once all the country allocation, and flexfund allocations have been made?	33% er uallokerede fleksible midler, der skal udmøntes gennem partnerskabet. Disse skal leve op til krav og bindinger (skrøbelighed og HUM) i budgetteringen. 10% er midler der IKKE skal programmes i specifikke lande men kan bruges til for eksempel globale programmer. De er ikke relateret til uallokerede fleksible midler.
Egenfinansiering	
Are we allowed to count both HUM and CIV activities as part of own financing?	Yes, all types of activities in the partnership can count towards own-financing.
Annex 1	
I annex 1b står der, at sektionerne 5.1-5.9 vil blive bedømt på baggrund af organisationens "approach to and track record of" det pågældende emne. Vil track record primært blive bedømt på baggrund af cases, eller vil det både blive bedømt på baggrund af cases og selve ansøgningsteksten? Dette er særligt vigtigt for organisationer, der i forbindelse med SPA-ansøgningen også gerne vil beskrive nye tiltag indenfor visse områder af den programmatiske tilgang.	Både cases og ansøgningstekst vil lægge til grund for vurderingen.
I de 3 indledende linjer står der at "Strategic partnerships are expected to be developed against and aligned to the strategic priorities in the information note". Informations-noten gør det klart at der er 3 strategic priorities (Democractic Value and HR; Fragile Context and Displacement; Climate and green Solutions). I teksten til afsnit 4.1. står det beskrevet at "Describe the overall ToC for the entire strategic partnership including overall objective(s) and links to the strategic priorities". Som vi læser og forstår denne beskrivelse skal den ToC vi præsenterer for vores partnerskab, have fokus på de tre	Hvis der her menes, om overall TOC skal indeholde overall objective for IPE, så er dette ikke tilfældet. Dette beskrives i 5.9. Overall TOC skal linkes til de strategiske prioriteter.

thematic priority areas, og dermed ikke inkludere overall objective for vores danske engagements arbejde. Målet for vores engagements arbejde og de tilhørende 3 targets skal beskrive under 5.9 Er dette korrekt?	
I ansøgningsformularen samt annex 1b fremgår det, at fokus i sektion 5 (”Overall programme approach”) skal være på tilgange/elementer ud over de prioriterede programmatiske tilgange, som er beskrevet i ansøgningen, og som skal beskrives i sektionerne 5.1-5.9. I spørgsmål og svar til høringen af ansøgningsmaterialet står der imidlertid, at ”*Overall programme approach er en samlet beskrivelse af organisationens programmatiske tilgang, med mulighed for at beskrive det i en helhed samt uddybe yderligere forhold, som evt. ikke dækkes af kriterierne efterfølgende. Det er forventeligt, at der vil være overlap*”. Der lader til at være en vis forskel på de to udlægninger. Eftersom der fortsat står i ansøgningsformularen og annex 1b, at fokus skal være på andre elementer end dem, der beskrives i sektion 5.1-5.9, går vi ud fra, at overlap så vidt muligt bør undgås?	Det vil være forskelligt fra organisation til organisation, hvordan dette afsnit omfatter væsentligt mere eller mindre ud over punkterne 5.1-5.9. For nogle vil der være en del overlap, for andre vil det være en mulighed for at beskrive det særegne ved den tilgang, de har som organisation.
Annex 1 states *“for each main (above DKK 1 million) country-level, thematic, regional or global programme”* Where a regional programme is being represented by a regional ToC, should individual country ToCs be presented for the countries within that region?	If the regional programme covers actions in each country, a ToC should not also be created at country level.
Af Annex 1A fremgår det, at ansøger selv kan bestemme antallet af cases, så længe de ikke overskrider 15 sider. I høringssvar af ansøgningsmaterialet fremgår det dog, at antallet af cases ændres til én per område. Vil det stadig være muligt at indsende det antal cases, som først blev anført i ansøgningsmaterialet, dvs. i visse sektioner op til 2 cases?	Der kan henvises til én case per sektion. Men om der henvises til den samme case under flere sektioner er op til den enkelte ansøger at afgøre. Deraf formuleringen i Annex 1A, at det er op til ansøgeren at afgøre det totale antal cases (dog maks. én per sektion). Én case kan i princippet indeholde flere eksempler på erfaringer inden for området. Fx hvis casen er et regionalt program, hvor der er arbejdet med et område på forskellige måder i forskellige lande.
Er det maks. 10 sider eller 15 side for cases?	Det er maks. 15 sider.

In terms of illustrating relevant track record, can reference be made to multiple cases?	No only one case per section but one case can contain multiple examples.
Vedr. Ansøgningsskemaet (Annex 1): Den overordnede TOC skal beskrives under afsnittet med Strategic Relevance, inklusive overall objectives samt link til strategiske prioriteter. Er det her vi kan udfolde hele vores TOC inklusiv intervention logic? Eller er det kun top line objectives og strategisk relevans, der ønskes her? I sidstnævnte tilfælde virker det som meget med 10 sider (også selvom der er andre underpunkter at adressere), samtidig med at man mangler et sted at beskrive hele SPA engagementet på en sammenhængende måde. Hvis førstnævnte er tilfældet, kan der til gengæld risikere at komme overlap mellem en god beskrivelse af TOC og så overall programme approach, som dog skal skrives i det efterfølgende afsnit og inden for en ramme af to sider. Det kunne være fint med endnu mere tydelighed om, hvad der ønskes i de to afsnit. Til sammenligning var der i SPA I ansøgningsskemaet en ti-siders sektion, hvor man skulle beskrive ens ”Proposed Partnership Engagement” – inklusiv bl.a. de punkter, som i SPA II ansøgningsskemaet ligger under overskriften ”Strategic Relevance”. Det er nok denne sektion, vi savner. Både i underpunkt 4.1 og 4.2 bedes man beskrive links / bidrag til de strategiske prioriteter. Er der en hensigt med at spørge om den information to gange? Det er ikke tydeligt, hvad fokus skal være i de to besvar	Ja, det er i dette afsnit, at den overordnede ToC skal beskrives og udfoldes, herunder evt. intervention logic. Det forventes, at dette afsnit beskriver det samlede SPA engagement med den præmis, at der kan forekomme gentagelser efterfølgende. Hvor 4.1 beskriver den overordnede ToC med link til strategiske prioriteter er 4.2 en udfoldelse af, hvordan partnerskabet vil bidrage til de strategiske prioriteter.
Annex 1, Application form (p. 12) Does the diagram illustrating ToCs that can be attached (optional) - count as part of the total pages permitted for each country level/thematic ToC or can it be attached on top of the designated pages.	The diagram(s) of ToC(s) is on top of the application and does not count as part of the total pages.
While it is clear that engagements in countries on the ‘Fragile context – host communities’-list that directly target displacement, refugees, or host communties’ ability to cope with an influx of refugees fall under the category ‘fragile contexts’ there might be cases where part of the country	It is possible if the strategic partner is able to report on this.

programme in that country do not fall under this type of engagement. Is it possible to have country programmes that count partly towards the 'fragile contexts' and partly towards 'non-fragile contexts', similar to the distinction between HUM and DEV engagements? We understand that such distinction – if possible - should be duly described and justified, and up to the strategic partner to report on in a clear way.	
Questions around the scope of the Summary Results Framework to be submitted with the SP application were raised in the hearing process, but we find that some clarity is still needed. Therefore, please confirm whether Danida expects the Summary Results Framework to cover the entire organization or the SP only. Does Danida expect targets to be included in the Summary Results Framework?	In the Summary Results Framework it should be very clear what is covered by the strategic partnership if it covers more than this. Targets should be included as far as possible but may be revised following the application process. Organisations are expected to engage with partners in more detailed programing if they enter into a Strategic Partnership and update their RF in that process.
Forventer UM, at der skal være targets ift. indikatorerne i Summary Results Framework ved indsendelsen d. 11/11? Eller kan disse etableres efterfølgende, når bevillingen er godkendt?	Targets skal inkluderes, men kan efterfølgende opdateres.
We understand that we need to use the narrative template provided by the MFA, but can we still do our own layout provided that we follow the structure of the template, as we would like to include some graphics and maybe photos?	Please use the template provided and adhere to number of pages asked for. If it is possible to include graphics/ photos within the template and page limit it is acceptable.
HRBA	
Regarding the section on HRBA, kindly elaborate further in terms of at what level and in what direction you see our HRBA described – considering that we have already described our overall HRBA in the EOI and we therefore foresee a certain overlap in terms of what is already written there and then unfolding a bit further how we see our HRBA operationalized/ applied within the SP 2022-2025.	Applicants are requested to respond to all questions despite overlaps or repetition. Responses from the EOI will not be taken into consideration in the full proposal so can be repeated. Cases can also be reused.
Parnerskabstype	
If an organisation applies for a thematic partnership, will it be considered an added value if the organisation addresses other	The SPA 2022-2025 encourages focus on several strategic priorities also in thematic partnerships but in the scoring

strategic priorities (e.g. a thematic partnership on HR, working in fragile contexts)?	there will not be extra points for more strategic priorities. This is up to the individual applicant to decide, what is relevant to focus on.
CHS	
a) Kindly confirm that organisations working with nexus oriented and/or nexus complementary programming, without being a humanitarian actor/receiving humanitarian funding, are covered by the second part of the formulation in part 6.5 on CHS requirements? b) Could you please explain what the term nexus engagement covers as compared to nexus sensitivity?	a) This is confirmed. Organisations working with nexus oriented and/or nexus complementary programming, without being a humanitarian actor/receiving humanitarian funding, are encouraged to undertake CHS self-assessment. b) All partners are expected to work in a nexus sensitive approach finding long-term and sustainable solutions, but also be ready to respond quickly in the face of new and changing challenges and needs. If relevant partners can work with a double or triple nexus approach.
Annex 2	
Vedr. Budgetformatet (Annex 2): Blandt Udenrigsministeriets svar på de spørgsmål, der indkom i forbindelse med den nylige høringsrunde, står der nederst på side 9 følgende: "*Ansøgere skal i deres budget indikere fordelingen af midler i forhold til hvor meget forventes anvendt i Afrika, Syrien og Afghanistan samt i skrøbelige kontekster. Dette gælder også uallokerede fleksible midler.*" Men mens det i Annex 2C skal estimeres, hvor stor en andel af de uallokerede fleksible midler, der forventes anvendt i skrøbelige kontekster, og mens det i Annex 2A skal estimeres, hvor stor en andel af disse midler, der forventes anvendt på hhv. HUM og DEV, er det ikke umiddelbart tydeligt, hvordan det skal anføres, om de fleksible midler forventes anvendt i "Africa and specific geografies" eller i "Other regions". Vi beder derfor om en afklaring af, hvorvidt – og i så fald hvordan – dette skal anføres i budgettet	Det er korrekt observeret. Det er i budgetformatet ikke lagt op til at de uallokerede midler fordeles på region før end de faktisk allokeres. Svaret skulle have lydt: *Ansøgere skal i deres budget indikere fordelingen af midler mellem HUM og DEV samt i forhold til hvor meget forventes anvendt i Afrika, Syrien og Afghanistan samt i skrøbelige kontekster. Dette gælder til dels også uallokerede fleksible midler*. *Ansøgere skal i deres budget indikere fordelingen af uallokerede fleksible midler mellem HUM og DEV samt i forhold til hvor meget forventes anvendt i skrøbelige kontekster.*" Beklager den uklarhed. I compliance data tabellen beregnes derfor hvor stor en andel af de midler som er geografisk fordelt benyttes i Afrika samt Syrien og Afghanistan. Det er op til organisatinen selv at sikre at der i den løbende allokering af uallokerede fleksible midler til hhv 'Afrika, Syrien og Afghanistan' og 'andre regioner' ikke sker en allokering der kan give udfordringer ift. kravet om at 50% af midlerne skal bruges i Afrika, Syrien og Afghanistan.
"Allocation of funds under programmes must be geographically specified at country level". How shall this be operationalised for sub-regional programmes? For instance a regional programme	Sub Regional programmes must as far as possible be split to indicate the individual country focus. Sahel is a region and will not count as a country.

covering several countries in Asia or if a programme is working in the border areas of Sahel are they still to be budgeted as three separate countries or would Sahel be acceptable as "geographically specified"?	If a Sahel programme cannot be allocated to the individual country level, it shall be included as a regional activity in Africa (and specific geographies), but then it will also be included in the non country allocated activities (which cannot exceed 10% of PPA).
Apart from the requirements of min. 50 pct. of the programme and project activities must be implemented in Africa and specific geographies. Would there in addition to fulfilling this requirement in the scoring of our application be emphasis on our selection of countries and how they correspond with Danish foreign priorities?	No, not in the scoring - only if you apply for a partnership with a fragility focus. There will be portfolio targets to meet across the SPA-engagements and on this basis there might be a need to adjust funding levels so these are met.
With the MFA acknowledging an inception phase and further programmatic details to be developed, it would be good to understand the rationale for the detailed budgeting process at this juncture. It is challenging to develop such detailed budgets, while also ensuring adherence to Danida's 'Adaptive Management and Doing Development Differently' Approach. Can it therefore be assumed that the budget can be submitted as indicative at this stage? How detailed should the budget split be on country and non-country specific allocations? Example 1 - In a regional programme where the activities target SPA priority countries and beyond i.e. advocacy activities with AU, can we make a fair share allocation to all countries covered in the region (living up to the SPA guidelines but going beyond SPA countries with specific country programmes). Would that live up to the 90% country-based criteria? This would mean a larger amount of budget lines as it is beyond the SPA priority countries. Example 2 – support for regional partner network that has a regional reach. To remain true to the principles of local leadership approach and not dictate the allocations on behalf of the regional partner networks for the entirety of the partnership period, would it be acceptable to budget with a 'grouping of countries'	The budget can be submitted as indicative at this point but it is the responsibility of the applicant to adhere to the geographical and thematically targets that are set even if the budget is revised. Responses to examples: 1. Yes you can do a fair share for each of the countries in the region. This is the preferred option. 2. Yes itis possible to include the estimated cost of activities in fragile contexts in Annex 2 C. Preferably, at budgeting stage it is estimated which countries will receive the funds (within the requirements) and then at reporting stage this can be adjusted to actual expenditure. Funds for regional networks can be included as 'regional' or 'unallocated' until a clear country allocation can be made. 3. As answer 2. If they all live up to geographical and HUM targets this can be adjusted. Alternatively it must be adjusted with full set of engagements. It is preferred to have only one budget line per country.

listing the fragile countries on a single line, demonstrating adherence to the geographical requirements (50% in Africa, Syria or Afghanistan and neighbouring countries to the crises in Syria and Afghanistan and if relevant 60% in fragile contexts)? At financial reporting the expenses will be specifically allocated to respective country. Example 3 – The global thematic programmes e.g the education cluster do not know in advance which country is in need of support on the onset or deterioration of an emergency, or according to needs, gaps and opportunities that arise within humanitarian responses over the whole SPA period. Would it be acceptable to budget with a ´grouping of countries´ on a single line in the budget phase and be specific on country-level when submitting the financial and narrative reporting? The activities themselves will be country-specific, but due to the nature of humanitarian responses, the needs of local partners as they arise, and the evolving nature of coordination mechanisms at local and national levels, it’s not possible to identify each target country at the start of the programme.	
When operating in complex settings (such as Yemen, Afghanistan or Myanmar), there are tasks that must be carried out in e.g. neighbouring and non-fragile countries) such as Djibouti, Dubai or Thailand) for example due to a cap on the number of employees imposed by national authorities or due to evacuation. DRC assume that these costs can be covered by the country programme budget and would kindly ask for recognition of this.	Yes the costs related to the country programme but incurring in neighbouring countries can be covered by the country programme budget
What is the definition of a global entity in Denmark? Kindly unfold the definition of global entity and what is covered by this term noting that funding for a global entity cannot be used for project and programme support under the strategic partnership?	The criteria for global entities are listed in annex 2F. There is no single definition. There are no ceilings for funding for global entities but it will be part of the full budget.

Kindly indicate the possible ceilings for funding of a global entity and how to go about this in the process of budgeting.	
Can specific outcomes of programmes meet the criteria of a global entity and hereby be considered above the 20% ceiling in Denmark, i.e. the education cluster outcome of a global thematic programme on education in emergencies? Do the exemption interventions have to meet the requirement to be geographically specified at country level?	Global entities may take different forms but must all live up to the criteria in Annex 2F for possible approval. Global entities do not require geographical specification (c.f. Budget template Annex 2) and will not count towards meeting the overall geographical requirements of the partnership.
Er der mulighed for at etablere en global enhed senere i partnerskabet? Kan man vente med at søge om globale enhed ind til man ved, hvor stor et tilsagn, man får?	Der vil være et midtvejs review af modaliteten efter partnerskabets første to år. I denne forbindelse vil behovet for evt. nye globale enheder vurderes. Hvis der ønskes finansiering af en global enhed skal dette indgå i ansøgningen. Det strategiske partnerskab skal kunne implementeres uden finansiering af global enhed.
Vurderingsproces og tidslinje	
Kan UM sige mere om processen efter ansøgningen? For eksempel hvor lang tid de strategiske partnere vil få til at kommentere på vurdering og scoring? Og om der vil blive tale om en eventuel bro-fase, hvis processen varer længere end til den 31. december 2021?	Det vil være en meget komprimeret proces, hvor partnerne kun vil få nogle få dage til at kommentere på vurdering og scoring. Processen skal afsluttes i 2021 og nye bevillinger starte i 2022.
Whereas the timeline up till the deadline is now confirmed, we would appreciate more clarity of the timeline after the submission. The process plan on the website is still reflecting the original schedule https://um.dk/da/danida/samarbejspartnere/civ-org/stoetteform/ny-runde---strategiske-partnerskaber-2022-2025/ Our question is therefore: What is the expected timeline for approval and elaboration of detailed programmes following the deadline 11 November? Does Danida still expect new partnership engagements to start by 1 January 2022?	Partnerships will be approved before year end and engagements will begin 1 january 2022.
Bliver der en periode for udarbejdelse af det endelig bevillingsgrundlag? Er denne periode også inkluderet i den proces, som afsluttes i år?	Godkendte ansøgninger modtager tilsagn i 2021. Partnerne får mulighed for at revidere programdokumenter og budgetter og indsende opdateret versioner i første halvdel af 2022.

Når vi modtager jeres vurdering, får vi også en ramme for det finansielle?	Nej. Den finansielle ramme meldes ud med endelige vurderingsnoter.
Hvad kan vi love vores partnere ude? Skal de fyres eller hvordan gør vi?	Det nuværende partnerskab udløber med udgangen af 2021 og det er muligt at ansøge om at overføre 5% af midlerne fra 2021 til 2022.
When would the administrative guidelines be available?	Draft administrative guidelines will be shared when partnerships are approved. These will be revised in Q1 with the partners.
Hvordan vil UM sikre transparens i vurderingen af ansøgningerne og rimelighed i fordelingen af midler imellem de strategiske partnere? Herunder – hvorledes vil scoringen af hhv. EoI og ansøgningen blive anvendt til at fastlægge bevillingsstørrelsen?	Alle ansøgninger vurderes ud fra samme parametre (Annex 1B). EoI udgør 20% af scoren og den fulde ansøgning 80%. I tilfælde af at det samlede ansøgte beløb er højere end rammen vil der anvendes en beregningsmodel der ud fra et ligebehandlingsprincip kan justere bevillingsniveauer og tage højde for ministeriets målsætninger for de strategiske partnerskaber og sørge for at disse nås.