



KINGDOM OF BELGIUM
Federal Public Service
**Foreign Affairs,
Foreign Trade and
Development Cooperation**

Non-governmental Cooperation

Format for submitting a programme

Royal Decree of 11 September 2016

Definitive version - November 2020

Table of contents

Preliminary information.....	5
Lexicon	7
I. General.....	11
A. Administrative information	11
1. Actor	11
2. Programme.....	11
B. Programme summary	11
1. General description.....	11
2. Global overview of outcomes.....	12
C. Programme budget	12
1. T1 – Budget overview	12
2. T2 – Aggregated management costs.....	13
4. T3 – Administration costs.....	14
4. T5 – Visual overview of the joint programme budget.....	15
5. Explanation of Coordination Costs.....	16
D. Subsidy and plan for co-financing the programme	17
1. Subsidy calculation.....	17
2. Own contribution – Sources of financing.....	17
3. Own contribution – Valuations.....	17
4. Own contribution – Complementary revenues	18
5. Potentially requested financial exemptions	18
II. Presentation of the programme per outcome	18
A. Contacts.....	18
1. Contact details for the outcome’s ANGC reference person in Belgium	18
2. Contact details for the outcome’s ANGC reference person or their representative in the field	19
B. Identification of the outcome	19
1. General.....	19
2. Geographic location of the outcome’s intervention zone.....	20
3. Outcome summary.....	20
4. Sensitive and confidential information.....	21
5. Categorization: Sustainable Development Goals	21
6. Categorization: Markers & Tags	22
7. Categorization: Positioning with regard to the objectives of Belgian Development Cooperation, as described in its strategy papers	23
8. Subsidy bonus allocation: priority themes and strategic priorities.....	24

C.	Description of the outcome, results and strategy	29
1.	Strategic targets to which the outcome contributes/General objective.....	29
2.	Description of the expected results.....	29
3.	Classification of activities	31
4.	Target groups and beneficiaries.....	31
5.	Theory of Change associated with the outcome	32
6.	Analysis of risks associated with the outcome	33
7.	Description of tasks among associate ANGCs	34
D.	Outcome budget	35
1.	T4 – Operational costs.....	35
2.	Explanation of the budget.....	36
3.	Distribution of budget per country	36
4.	Visual overview of the budget for the common outcome	37
E.	List of partnerships for the outcome	38
F.	List of collaborations for the outcome	38
G.	Presentation of the outcome and justification	39
1.	Description of the Relevance.....	39
2.	Description of Coherence	40
3.	Description of Effectiveness.....	41
4.	Description of Efficiency.....	41
5.	Description of the expected Impact	42
6.	Description of Sustainability	42
7.	Description of the Partnership Strategy.....	43
8.	Description of Synergies	44
9.	Description of how individual or collective recommendations and lessons are to be taken into account	45
III.	Mandatory annexes classified by outcome	46
1.	Theory of Change associated with the outcome.....	46
2.	Analysis of risks associated with the outcome	46
3.	Country map showing the location of the intervention zone.....	46
4.	Fact sheet per partner.....	46
5.	Draft Partnership Agreement.....	46
6.	Fact sheet per collaboration.....	48
7.	Draft Collaboration Agreement	48
8.	Non-JSF outcome: Contextual analysis.....	49
9.	Non-JSF outcome: Coherence with the organization’s Strategic Plan.....	49
10.	Description of the joint programme’s cooperation strategy	49

11. Structural Cooperation Agreement between the ANGC associates49

Preliminary information

Non-governmental cooperation programmes are specifically governed:

- By the Royal Decree (RD) of 11 September 2016 [concerning non-governmental cooperation](#);
- By the Royal Decree (RD) of 11 September 2016 [concerning the number of joint strategic frameworks of the non-governmental cooperation and their geographical or thematic coverage](#).

The presentation format set out below concerns the multiannual programmes 2022-2026 that will be submitted digitally through a portal, the functioning of which will be presented outside of this document. As it is a digital tool, the final layout may vary from what is described in this current document. The information highlighted in **yellow**, **blue** or **purple** illustrate the particular points linked to the digitalization of the chapter concerned.

The programme must allow a qualitative assessment of an outcome, based on the following criteria¹:

1. Relevance
2. Coherence
3. Effectiveness
4. Efficiency
5. Impact
6. Sustainability
7. Partnerships
8. Operational synergies
9. Taking into account the previous recommendations and lessons learned.

Moreover, for the outcomes that are not covered by a Joint Strategic Framework (JSF), the administration will also assess how coherent the proposal is with the updated Strategic Plan from the organization submitting the programme.

Furthermore, the degree of alignment of an outcome with regard to the priority themes and strategic priorities of the Belgian Development Cooperation shall be taken into account through the form of a subsidy bonus, for the outcomes considered to have the greatest alignment.

When analyzing the programmes, the administration will base its considerations on the following aspects:

- The provisions of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation, especially chapters 4 and 5;
- The aforementioned evaluation criteria defined by OECD-DAC;
- The Joint Strategic Frameworks developed by ANGCS (actors of non-governmental cooperation) and approved by the Minister for Development Cooperation.

Use of languages:

- **Part I = French or Dutch.**

¹ The definitions of the criteria Relevance, Coherence, Effectiveness, Efficiency, Sustainability and Impact have been revised to correspond to the definitions adapted by the OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), in 2019.

- **Part II and part III = French, Dutch, English or Spanish**, depending on which language is most relevant to the outcome (depending on the country concerned and in relation with the language of the partners). If a part II is written in Dutch or Spanish, the outcome summary **must** be written in French or English.

For part II, **there is no limit to the number of outcomes that an organization can submit. Nevertheless, it is strongly recommended to keep the number of outcomes to a reasonable amount for the programme as a whole.** This is why organizations are actively encouraged to plan for one single outcome, instead of several, when the distinctions between these outcomes depend upon “details”: distinctions of fundamentally identical outcomes by partner or even by geographical distribution within the same country, etc. are to be avoided. In general, unless the description of the strategy and Theory of Change justify it explicitly, it is better to limit the number of outcomes to one per country². Within this framework, the opportunity to merge or distinguish ~~between?~~ several outcomes may potentially be discussed during the assessment, if necessary.

As the programme’s essential points are to be submitted digitally, either by encoding or importing, **the maximum amount of information that can be provided shall no longer be determined by a number of pages, but rather by a number of characters, including spaces.** For comparison purposes, the number of characters, including spaces, for a full page written in Calibri size 11, single-spaced, without using spaces before or after is approximately 4,000 characters including spaces. This reference has been used to determine the maximum number of characters for the free narrative fields, especially those covering descriptions, such as:

- 4,000 characters, including spaces = 1 page
- 2,000 characters, including spaces = ½ page
- 1,000 characters, including spaces = ¼ page

Concerning the mandatory annexes identified in chapter III, it is useful to specify that the “annex” character is only linked to the method of entering information into the portal. **The quality of the information provided in these annexes shall therefore be assessed on the same level as the rest of the programme’s contents.**

² This recommendation does not apply to thematic outcomes that may be based on a regional approach.

Lexicon

1. **ANGC** – Actor of the Non-Governmental Cooperation: Informal term encompassing organizations that are accredited as a Civil Society Organization (CSO) and organizations accredited as an Institutional Actor (IA), as defined by the Law of 19 March 2013, article 1st:
 - 4° - CSO: *The non-state and not-for-profit entity in which people organize themselves to pursue common objectives or ideals.*
 - 6° - IA: *The organization which is founded by a public authority or by which it is controlled or managed directly or indirectly .*
2. **Beneficiaries**³: The individuals, groups or organizations benefiting from the development intervention, directly or not, intentionally or not.
3. **Complementarity**⁴: Basing an actor's interventions on its specificity and comparative advantages, avoiding overlaps with those of other actors as part of a clear division of labour with a view to contributing to the same general objective by overcoming individual limitations. Complementarity may be passive, it does not necessarily require a working relationship. For example: geographical complementarity and the sharing of tasks. Complementarity shall be examined using the assessment criteria for Coherence.
4. **Collaboration**: Relationship between two or more organizations, regardless of their geographical location, contributing towards the achievement of one or more objectives within a programme which contributes towards development cooperation objectives.
 - A collaborative relationship is based on targeted support and/or the provision of expertise with a precise and predetermined goal.
 - A collaborative relationship means that the party working with an accredited organization does not directly benefit from achieving the desired outcomes or results. It contributes to their achievements by its targeted support and/or the provision of expertise.
 - When there is a financial relationship between the parties, it is mandatory for the collaborative relationship to be based on a Collaboration Agreement or on a Memorandum of Understanding.
5. **Administration costs (A.C.):** *RD 2016, Art. 1, 13° and Art. 29, §1 and §3. The costs incurred by an accredited members' organization in order to, on behalf of its members, compose, formulate, submit, coordinate, monitor, justify and administrate the programme identified and implemented by its members and/or its members' partners and within which the accredited organization does not play an operational role of any kind.*
 - *When the subsidy comprises administration costs, it does not comprise support costs.*
 - *The administration costs are subsidized on the basis of a budget. The administration costs must be justified.*
6. **Direct costs (D.C.):** *RD 2016, Art.1, 14° - The operational costs and management costs of the intervention.*

³ OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, 2019, p. 7.

⁴ Groupe de Pilotage « DGD – ONG », *Note de consensus - Spécialisation, complémentarité et synergies*, 3 avril 2009, page 1.

- 7. Management costs (M.C.):** RD 2016, Art. 1, 11° and Art. 29, §4 - *The reportable costs only associated to management, guidance, coordination, monitoring, controls, evaluation or the financial audit and generated specifically through implementing the development intervention or the subsidy justification.*
- *The budget for management costs is capped at 10% of the total direct costs.*
 - *When a programme is submitted by several applicants, this standard ceiling is increased by the costs of coordinating the programme, by a percentage not exceeding the result of the formula of coordination costs level (CCL) and 4.5%. $CCL = 3 \cdot \sqrt{NO} - 3$, where NO stands for the number of accredited organizations that submitted the programme application.*
 - *A sum of at least 1% of the direct costs but not included in the normal ceiling for management costs is earmarked for evaluation or auditing costs.*
- 8. Operational costs (O.C.):** RD 2016, Art. 1, 10° - *The costs considered necessary and essential to achieving one or more results of the development's intervention. These costs shall disappear as soon as the intervention ceases or reaches an end.*
- 9. Structure costs (S.C.):** RD 2016, Art. 1, 12° and Art. 29, §1 - *The costs associated with achieving the social objective of a subsidized organization and, although they are influenced by the implementation of the development's intervention, cannot be linked or charged on the budget for this intervention. The subsidy for support costs is capped at 7% of the budget for direct costs.*
- *Whenever the subsidy comprises administration costs, it does not comprise support costs.*
- 10. Evaluation criteria of OECD-DAC:** the list of evaluation criteria, as well as their definitions, updated in 2019, is available in the [specific document supplied by OECD-DAC](#).
- Pp. 7-8: Relevance.
 - P. 9: Coherence.
 - P. 10: Effectivity.
 - P. 11: Efficiency.
 - P. 12: Impact.
 - P. 13: Viability / Sustainability
- 11. Target group⁵:** People or organizations for whose benefit the development action is being undertaken [target = intentional nature].
- 12. Intervention of development cooperation:** Law of 19 March, Art. 1, 8° - *The action, financed or co-financed by the Belgian Development Cooperation, which must contribute towards achieving one or several objectives of the Belgian Development Cooperation.*
- 13. Outcome:** RD 2016, Art. 1, 7° - *The direct effect that the intervention seeks to achieve in the short or medium term, in terms of direct, intermediary or final beneficiaries (specific objective).*
- Within this document, the term “outcome” is used as a central element in structuring the information that is being supplied. It specifies the objective that the organization submitting the programme is seeking to achieve in a well-identified context, together with a strategy for achieving it, a budget and all of the aspects required by the administration in order to judge the adequacy and quality of the proposal with regard to the criteria of OECD-DAC and other qualitative criteria.

⁵ <http://reflectlearn.org/fr/glossary/term/585>

- 14. Sustainable Development Goals:** the list of the 17 sustainable development goals and their descriptions are available on the [specific page on the United Nations' website](#).
- 15. Objectives of the Belgian Development Cooperation:** the list of the Belgian Development Cooperation's objectives is contained in the dedicated [Chapter 2 of the Law of 19 March 2013](#), in Articles 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.
- 16. Partnership:** Relationship between an accredited organization and an association representing civil society, an institution of public interest, a private stakeholder or a decentralized authority, influencing and/or reinforcing a programme that contributes towards development cooperation objectives.
- A partnership aims to mutually strengthen the parties and/or provide support from the accredited organization to its partner.
 - A partnership implies shared responsibility for the programme's implementation, or for part of the programme, from the viewpoint of attaining the desired outcome(s) and result(s).
 - A partnership does not necessarily involve a financial relationship between an accredited organization and its partner.
 - A partnership is always based on a Partnership Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding, for part of, the full length of or longer than the full length of the programme submitted.
 - When the partnership has its headquarters in a country of the "South", it responds to the definition of "Local Partner", as described in Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation.
- 17. Policy Markers of OECD-DAC:** The directives from OECD-DAC defining the Markers and their use are available [in the specific document supplied by the DAC](#) of the OECD (available only in English).
- Pages 34-50: Policy Markers (Gender, Environment, Good Governance, RMNCH, Trade development).
 - Pages 51-82: Rio Markers (Biodiversity, Climate, Desertification).
 - **N.B.:** In addition to the DAC directives relating to the Policy Markers, the conditions for using the Gender Marker are described in detail in the "Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker" on pages 10 and 11.
- 18. General budgetary headings: RD 2016, Art. 1, 17° -**
1° for operational costs and administration costs: (1) investments, (2) running costs and (3) staffing costs,
2° for management costs: (1) staffing costs, (2) evaluation and audit costs and (3) miscellaneous costs.
- 19. Synergy⁶:** Basing the interventions of several actors on their active collaboration as part of a clear division of labour with a view to obtaining the same outcome and generating added value beyond the cumulative individual efforts of each organization. There are 2 different types of synergy:

⁶ Groupe de Pilotage « DGD – ONG », *Note de consensus - Spécialisation, complémentarité et synergies*, 3 avril 2009, page 1.

- Operational synergies: Synergies at the level of carrying out the activities and/or results desired within a given programme, which benefit from the link to other stakeholders/programmes. *For example: the pooling of expertise, technical and methodological capacities, or the compilation of common intervention methods, or even the allocation of tasks so as to reinforce the capacities of a common partner.*
- Organizational and logistical synergies: Collaboration from several stakeholders with a view to increasing the efficiency of their respective interventions. *For example: the sharing of offices, logistics services, the pooling of human resources including the allocation of tasks and responsibilities.* These synergies are assessed as part of Efficiency.

I. General

A. Administrative information

1. Actor

Joint programme: individual information per ANGC

Name of accredited actor:	List: Name/acronym of accredited actor
Status of accredited actor:	List: Civil Society Organization/Institutional actor
Date of accreditation:	Field type "date" - DD-MM-YYYY
Bank account number (IBAN) ⁷ :	Free text – 50 characters, including spaces
Actor's IATI registration number:	List: IATI registration number per actor – <i>Already known</i>
Contact person ⁸ :	Free text – 50 characters, including spaces
Contact person's telephone:	Free text – 50 characters, including spaces
Contact person's email:	Free text – 50 characters, including spaces

2. Programme

Title of the programme:	Free text – 100 characters, including spaces
Programme start date:	Field type "date" - 01-01-2022
Programme end date:	Field type "date" - 31-12-2026
Programme's IATI number:	List: IATI registration number per programme – <i>To be determined</i>

B. Programme summary

1. General description

Free text – 2000 characters, including spaces (= ½ page)

A programme's general description ought to be a concise summary of the programme (which is made up of a range of outcomes taking place in one or several countries, and/or over one or several) themes and its ambitions, aimed at the public at large. The aim is to publish this general description by the different transparency tools on development cooperation: OpenAid.be, D-portal.org, ...

Therefore, a programme's general description must not contain any potentially confidential information.

⁷ Details of the account to which the subsidy should be paid if the programme is approved.

⁸ In the event of a change, the accredited actor will ensure that the administration is promptly informed.

2. Global overview of outcomes

Portal: Summary to be produced automatically - Example

Outcome title	Main sector	Country/Region	JSF/NON-JSF	Operational Costs
		D.R. Congo	Geographical	
		D.R. Congo	Decent Work	
		Rwanda	Geographical	
		Nicaragua	Decent work	
		Africa Region	Decent Work	
		Mali	Geographical	
		Vietnam	Geographical	
		Angola	Non-JSF	
		Central Africa	Non-JSF	

C. Programme budget

1. T1 – Budget overview

Joint programme: individual information per ANG C

Portal: Summary to be produced automatically

	TYPE	COUNTRY	SO	GENERAL HEADING	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	GRAND TOTAL	%		
O.C. - OPERATIONAL COSTS	JSF	REGION*/ COUNTRY NAME 1	OUTCOME 1	1. Investments						-			
				2. Operations						-			
				3. Staff							-		
				TOTAL JSF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	JSF	REGION*/ COUNTRY NAME 2	OUTCOME 2	1. Investments							-		
				2. Operations							-		
				3. Staff								-	
				Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	JSF	REGION*/ COUNTRY NAME 2	OUTCOME 3	1. Investments							-		
				2. Operations							-		
				3. Staff								-	
				Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	TOTAL CHAPTER JSF				-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!		
	NON-JSF	COUNTRY NAME 1	OUTCOME 4	1. Investments							-		
				2. Operations							-		
				3. Staff								-	
				TOTAL NON-CJSF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	NON-JSF	COUNTRY NAME 2	OUTCOME 5	1. Investments							-		
				2. Operations							-		
				3. Staff								-	
			Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
NON-JSF	COUNTRY NAME 2	OUTCOME 6	1. Investments							-			
			2. Operations							-			
			3. Staff								-		
			Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
TOTAL NON-JSF				-	-	-	-	-	-				
TOTAL CHAPTER NON-JSF				-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!			
O.C. TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS				-	-	-	-	-	-				
M.C. GLOBAL MANAGEMENT COSTS			1. Staff		-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!		
			2. Evaluation & Audit		-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!		
			3. Other costs		-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!		
			TOTAL		-	-	-	-	-	-	#DIV/0!		
D.C. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (D.C.=O.C. + M.C.)				-	-	-	-	-	-				

*RÉGION = Thematic outcomes only

N.B.: The **budget overview** of the programme (“T1”) is the **concise visualization** of detailed information in the body of the programme at the level of Aggregated management costs (“T2” – Chapter I, Part C, 2nd point) and Operational costs broken down by outcome (“T4” – Chapter II, Part D, 1st point).

2. T2 – Aggregated management costs

Joint programme: individual information per ANGC

Framework:

- The data relating to management costs that have to be entered directly into the portal must correspond with the level of information set out below.
- A standard format is used to enter information into the portal making it possible to encode it manually or import from an Excel/CSV file [to be confirmed].
- Note: A more detailed budget may be requested. If so, this budget must be provided through a dedicated annex.

Title of the reference annex:

Free text – 100 characters including spaces

HEADINGS	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
TOTAL MANAGEMENT COSTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
1. TOTAL STAFF	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.1 Headquarters salaries*						-
1.2 Expatriates' salaries*						-
1.3 Local staff salaries*						-
1.4 Other costs						-
2. TOTAL EVALUATION & AUDIT	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1 Audit costs						-
2.2 Evaluation costs						-
3. TOTAL OTHER MANAGEMENT COSTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1 Investments	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1.1 Purchase of vehicles						-
3.1.2 Furniture, ICT						-
3.1.3 Other						-
3.2 Operations	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.2.1 Travel						-
3.2.2 Field office						-
3.2.3 Other						-

¹ Staff salaries: gross amounts including social security charges and other related costs

Digital fields – Standard format – To be encoded manually/or imported from Excel/CSV

4. T3 – Administration costs

Joint programme: individual information per ANGCO

Framework:

- The data relating to administration costs that have to be entered directly into the portal must correspond with the level of information set out below.
- A standard/variable format is used to enter information into the portal making it possible to encode it manually or import from an Excel/CSV file [to be confirmed].
- Note: A more detailed budget may be requested. If so, this budget must be provided through a dedicated annex.

Title of the reference annex:

Free text – 100 characters including spaces

HEADINGS	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION COSTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
1. TOTAL INVESTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.1 Subsection 1						-
1.2 Subsection 2						-
1.x Subsection x						-
2. TOTAL OPERATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1 Subsection 1						-
2.2 Subsection 2						-
2.x Subsection x						-
3. TOTAL STAFF¹	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1 Subsection 1						-
3.2 Subsection 2						-
3.x Subsection x						-

¹ Staff salaries: gross amounts including social security charges and other related costs

Digital fields – standard/variable format – To be encoded manually/or imported from Excel/CSV

4. T5 – Visual overview of the joint programme budget

For joint programmes only

Portal: Summary to be produced automatically

			ACCREDITED ACTORS	2022	2023	2024	205	2026	GRAND TOTAL	%		
O.C. - OPERATIONAL COSTS	JSF	REGION* / COUNTRY NAME 1	OUTCOME 1	ANGC 1						-		
			ANGC 2						-			
			ANGC 3						-			
			ANGC 4						-			
			TOTAL JSF	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	JSF	REGION* / COUNTRY NAME 2	OUTCOME 2	ANGC 1							-	
				ANGC 2						-		
				ANGC 3						-		
			ANGC 4						-			
			Total	-	-	-	-	-	-			
			OUTCOME 3	ANGC 1								-
		ANGC 2								-		
		ANGC 3								-		
		ANGC 4							-			
		Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
		TOTAL JSF	ANGC 1								-	
			ANGC 2							-		
			ANGC 3							-		
	ANGC 4								-			
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	TOTAL CHAPTER JSF	ANGC 1								-	#DIV/0!	
		ANGC 2								-	#DIV/0!	
		ANGC 3								-	#DIV/0!	
		ANGC 4								-	#DIV/0!	
		Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-			
	NON-JSF	COUNTRY NAME 1	OUTCOME 4	ANGC 1							-	
				ANGC 2						-		
				ANGC 3						-		
ANGC 4									-			
TOTAL NON-JSF				-	-	-	-	-	-			
NON-JSF	COUNTRY NAME 2	OUTCOME 5	ANGC 1							-		
			ANGC 2						-			
			ANGC 3						-			
		ANGC 4						-				
		Total	-	-	-	-	-	-				
		OUTCOME 6	ANGC 1								-	
	ANGC 2								-			
	ANGC 3								-			
	ANGC 4							-				
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	TOTAL NON-JSF	ANGC 1								-		
		ANGC 2							-			
		ANGC 3							-			
ANGC 4								-				
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
TOTAL CHAPTER NON-JSF	ANGC 1								-	#DIV/0!		
	ANGC 2								-	#DIV/0!		
	ANGC 3								-	#DIV/0!		
	ANGC 4								-	#DIV/0!		
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
O.C. - TOTAL OPÉRATIONNEL COSTS	ANGC 1								-	#DIV/0!		
	ANGC 2								-	#DIV/0!		
	ANGC 3								-	#DIV/0!		
	ANGC 4								-	#DIV/0!		
	TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
M.C. GLOBAL MANAGEMENT COSTS	EVALUATION AUDIT	ANGC 1								-	#DIV/0!	
		ANGC 2							-	#DIV/0!		
		ANGC 3							-	#DIV/0!		
		ANGC 4							-	#DIV/0!		
		Total	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	STAFF & OTHER MANAGEMENT COSTS & COORDINATIC	ANGC 1								-	#DIV/0!	
		ANGC 2							-	#DIV/0!		
		ANGC 3							-	#DIV/0!		
		ANGC 4							-	#DIV/0!		
	Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				
	TOTAL M.C.	ANGC 1								-		
		ANGC 2								-		
		ANGC 3								-		
ANGC 4									-			
Total	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
D.C. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS (D.C.=O.C. + M.C.)	ANGC 1								-			
	ANGC 2								-			
	ANGC 3								-			
	ANGC 4								-			
	TOTAL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-				

*REGION = Thematic outcomes only

N.B.: The **visual overview of the common budget** (“T5”) is a recap of how the overall budget is broken down, for all accredited actors associated with the joint programme. It aggregates the information individually per stakeholder (“T2” – Chapter I, Part C, 2nd point which has been supplied at the level of Aggregated management costs and Operational costs (“T4” - Chapter II, Part D, 1st point) broken down by Outcome.

5. Explanation of Coordination Costs

For joint programmes only

RD 2016, Art. 29. (...) §4. *The subsidising of management costs is capped at a maximum of 10% of the total direct costs. Management costs do not come in a lump sum and must come with a justification provided.*

*When a programme is submitted by several applicants, the ceiling is increased by the programme’s coordination costs for a percentage that neither exceeds the result of the coordination cost level (CCL) formula nor 4.5%. [CCL= 3*VNO-3] where NO represents the number of accredited organizations that have submitted the programme application.*

Free text – 2000 characters, including spaces (= ½ page)

The explanation of the coordination costs must identify concisely:

- For illustrative purposes, the amount of the budget that would be earmarked for coordinating the joint programme;
- For illustrative purposes, the manner in which this amount is to be used for coordinating the joint programme.

D. Subsidy and plan for co-financing the programme

Joint programme: information supplied per ANGC

1. Subsidy calculation

	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	GRAND TOTAL
D.C. - TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
C.C. - CONTRIBUTION CSO / IA (20% - 0%)	20%	-	-	-	-	-
D.C. - CONTRIBUTION DGD (80% - 100%)	80%	-	-	-	-	-
S.C. - STRUCTURAL COSTS (7% of D.C.)	7%	-	-	-	-	-
A.C. - ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
GRANT AWARDED	-	-	-	-	-	-
	BRACKET 1	BRACKET 2	BRACKET 3	BRACKET 4	BRACKET 5	

Digital fields – Standard format – automatic calculation based on the type of stakeholder (CSO/IS) and the decision between structure costs and administration costs

2. Own contribution – Sources of financing

RD 2016, Art. 30. (...) Section 1. The own contribution is composed of sources that are exclusively from OECD countries or multilateral organizations, except for subsidies from the Belgian State charged to the budget for development cooperation.

Section 2. The own contribution corresponding to the part of the programme that does not contribute towards the carrying out of a JSF is made up of 100% of funds from natural or legal persons under private law.

Comment 1: Information is requested about planned sources of financing for transparency purposes. By its very nature, however, it remains indicative at the time of submitting the programme.

Comment 2: Does not apply for Institutional Actors (IA).

Planned public financing source(s):	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Planned private financing source(s):	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Additional explanations:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces

3. Own contribution – Valuations

RD 2016, Art. 30. (...) Section 4. The means that the organization supplies for valuation purposes must have been described in the subsidy application. Its calculation method must be based on an objective justification based on the cost incurred in the commercial supply of goods or services equivalent.

Comment 1: The information supplied is indicative in nature at the time of submitting the programme. It may be amended when the financing plan is updated for the years remaining of the programme.

Comment 2: Does not apply for Institutional Actors (IA).

Nature of the valuation(s):	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Estimated amount(s):	Free text – 1000 characters including spaces

4. Own contribution – Complementary revenues

RD 2016, Art. 31. (...) Section 2. Complementary revenues may account for up to 50% of own contributions to the programme if they are specifically provided for in the programme's financing plan.

Comment 1: The information supplied is indicative in nature at the time of submitting the programme. It may be amended when the financing plan is updated for the years remaining of the programme.

Type(s) of complementary revenues:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Estimated amount(s):	Free text – 1000 characters including spaces

5. Potentially requested financial exemptions

RD 2016, Art. 35. Expenditure may be charged to the subsidy as a direct cost if (and only if) it meets the full list of cumulative criteria as follows – (...) – 6° is not included on the list in annex 4 [Costs non-eligible for subsidies], unless the following three conditions are met:

- a) the expense or nature of the costs is necessary for achieving the programme's outcomes;
- b) it is demonstrated that there is a total absence of any fraudulent intentions
- c) the expense or nature of the expense has formed the subject of an explicit agreement in the subsidy decree or has been subject to a prior favorable opinion from the Director General of the Development Cooperation, for which a favorable opinion has been obtained from the Financial Inspectorate.

Comment: Requests for exemptions do not concern the requests relating to simplified costs described in Article 38 of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation. In accordance with Article 4 of the Ministerial Decree on 31 May 2017 relating to simplified costs, any demand of this nature must be sent to the administration by recorded delivery letter. An organization may submit this demand at the latest six months after the programme launch and, throughout its implementation, up to three months after the beginning of each year.

Nature of the exemption(s):	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Reason for the request:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces

II. Presentation of the programme per outcome

A. Contacts

Joint programme: information supplied per ANGC

1. Contact details for the outcome's ANGC reference person in Belgium

Name ⁹ :	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Telephone:	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Email:	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No

⁹ In the event of a change, the accredited actor will ensure that the administration is promptly informed.

2. Contact details for the outcome's ANGC reference person or their representative in the field

Organization ¹⁰ :	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Name ¹¹ :	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Telephone:	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Email:	Free text – 50 characters including spaces
Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No

B. Identification of the outcome

1. General

Title ¹² of the outcome – French or English (mandatory):	Free text – 100 characters including spaces		
Title of the outcome – Dutch/Spanish (optional) ¹³ :	Free text – 100 characters including spaces		
IATI activity identifier ¹⁴ :	Free text – 50 characters including spaces		
Outcome start date:	Field type “date” - 01-01-2022		
Outcome end date:	Field type “date” - 31-12-2026		
Strategic framework involved:	List: List of the JSFs or mention “Outside-JSF”.		
Country of intervention:	List: Country/Region ¹⁵		
Principal sector ¹⁶ :	List: Choice of sectors	Budget share ¹⁷ :	In %
Secondary sector 1:	List: Choice of sectors	Budget share:	In %
Secondary sector 2:	List: Choice of sectors	Budget share:	In %

¹⁰ If there is no ANGC reference person in the field, it is expected that the contact details of a person authorized to represent that ANGC (e.g. reference member of a local partner, etc.) will be communicated.

¹¹ In the event of a change, the accredited actor will ensure that the administration is promptly informed.

¹² The title of the outcome should be different from the formulation of the outcome itself, as stated in the Description of Outcomes. The title is intended to be very concise.

¹³ The appropriateness of providing the wording of the title also in Dutch or Spanish depends on the context of the intervention.

¹⁴ Joint programme: IATI activity identifier individualised per ANGC.

¹⁵ Region: (thematic JSF only).

¹⁶ 5-digit sectors. As defined by the OECD-DAC, the choice of sector should be based on the answer to the question: “in which particular areas of the economy or social structure of the recipient country will this transfer stimulate development?”

¹⁷ When an outcome involves interventions in several sectors simultaneously, the main sector and the secondary sector(s) must be selected. In this framework, an indicative and approximate estimate should also be given of the distribution of the share of the outcome budget dedicated to each sector. Each outcome should explicitly highlight a “main” sector.

Other CSOs/IAs involved: (When the outcome is common to several programmes)	Free text – 500 characters including spaces
--	---

2. Geographic location of the outcome's intervention zone

Framework:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The geographic location of the outcome aims to identify the intervention zone, i.e. the zone where the activities will be carried out, and not the location of the local partners' headquarters (for example); The geographic location may be supplied in two ways: by identifying the zone/s concerned on the basis of the DAC's standard list of administrative levels for the country concerned OR on the basis of GPS coordinates; Whenever an outcome aims to cover the full territory in scope, it will be possible to select only the administrative level "national"; For outcomes implemented in Belgium, the location will be carried out on the basis of the administrative level corresponding to the Belgian provinces; For outcomes of a thematic JSF, the location may be based on a "region"¹⁸. Unlike IATI, however, it will not be possible to select a region and to detail, <u>at this stage</u>, the countries concerned and indicate the percentages of associated budgets. The budget's breakdown per country shall be covered in Chapter II, Part D, 3rd point; Where applicable, it will be possible to state whether the geographic location must remain confidential. 	
Administrative location:	List: List of administrative levels Country + National + Region
GPS location:	Field type "GPS coordinates"
Confidentiality of location:	List: Yes/No
Map:	
Automatically generated map on the basis of encoded locations – technical constraints permitting.	

3. Outcome summary

Framework:	
<p>The outcome summary should be a concise description of the pursued aim, the intervention strategy and the main activities carried out (etc.) aimed at the public at large. This description ought to allow the uninitiated public to understand the activities that are to be carried out and what their purpose is. This description is for publication by the different transparency tools on development cooperation: OpenAid.be, D-portal.org. Therefore, in this chapter:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is mandatory for the description of the outcome, the wording of the outcome and the description of the target groups to be written in French OR in English; The description of the outcome and the description of the target groups must not contain any confidential information; The wording of the outcome must correspond to that provided in Chapter II, Part C, 2nd point "Description of expected results", translated if applicable. 	
Description of the outcome:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Wording of the outcome:	Free text – 500 characters including spaces
Target groups:	Free text – 500 characters including spaces

¹⁸ The appropriateness of providing for "personalized regions" will have to be examined in view of their relevance and the associated technical constraints. Otherwise, the relevant DAC/IATI standards will be applied.

4. Sensitive and confidential information

Confidentiality of the field:	Systematic
<p>Free text – 4000 characters including spaces (= 1 page)</p> <p>The programme presentation format makes it possible to identify the confidential nature (or not) of a series of specific fields:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> II.A.1: Identification of the contact person in Belgium. II.A.2: Identification of the contact person in the field. II.B.2: Geographical location of the intervention zone. II.B.7: Motivation for the positioning with regard to one or several strategic objectives of the DGD. II.B.8: Motivation for the positioning with regard to one or several objectives and priority themes for Belgian development cooperation. II.C.3: Classification of activities. II.C.4: Identification of target groups and beneficiaries. II.E: Identification of one or several partner(s). II.F: Identification of one or several collaboration partnership(s). <p>Also, it will be possible to state that one or more annexes must remain confidential. Each time that information is declared confidential, the reasons justifying this decision will have to be explained here.</p>	

5. Categorization: Sustainable Development Goals

<p>Framework:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In this section, the outcome has to be explicitly linked to the main Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) to which it is aiming to contribute. ● The main target that the outcome is aiming to contribute towards in association with this SDG also has to be identified here. ● Optionally, developing on the interactions and interlinkages with the first SDG identified, it shall also be possible to identify supplementary SDGs and one Target for each one of them. ● Finally, it is expected that the decision to link the outcome with these SDGs and Targets is explained in the Theory of Change (ToC – see Chapter II, Part C, 5th point). The aim is to be able to observe the considerations that resulted in the decision-making. 					
Type	Icon	SDG code	SDG name	Target code	Target description
Main (mandatory)	SDG	List	List	List	List
Secondary (optional)	SDG	List	List	List	List
Secondary (optional)	SDG	List	List	List	List
Secondary (optional)	SDG	List	List	List	List

6. Categorization: Markers & Tags

Markers	
<p>Framework: The directives of OECD-DAC explaining the use of markers are available here (in English only):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pp. 34-50: Policy Markers (Gender, Environment, Good Governance, RMNCH, Trade development). ● Pp. 51-82: Rio Markers (Biodiversity, Climate, Desertification). ● The markers on HIV and Children's Right are linked to Belgian objectives on the subjects. Like the OECD-DAC markers, they aim to identify whether the problem in question is the primary objective [2], a secondary objective [1] or is not targeted by the outcome [0]. ● N.B.: In addition to the DAC directives relating to the Policy Markers, the conditions for using the Gender Marker are described in detail in the "Handbook on the OECD-DAC Gender Equality Policy Marker" on pages 10 and 11. 	
1. Gender Equality	List: 0 – 1 – 2
2. Aid to Environment	List: 0 – 1 – 2
3. Participatory Development/Good Governance	List: 0 – 1 – 2
4. Trade development:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
5. Biodiversity:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
6. Climate Change – Mitigation:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
7. Climate Change – Adaptation:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
8. Desertification:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
9. RMNCH - Reproductive, Maternal, Newborn and Child Health:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
10. HIV/AIDS:	List: 0 – 1 – 2
11. Children's Rights:	List: 0 – 1 – 2

Tags	
<p>Framework: The sole purpose of the tags is to establish the link between the outcome and a problem identified by the Belgian Development Cooperation. Where there is no link, the word "no" must be written.</p>	
1. D4D – Better use of big data:	List: Yes/No
2. D4D – Digital for inclusive societies:	List: Yes/No
3. D4D – Digital for inclusive and sustainable economic growth:	List: Yes/No
4. Private Sector Development:	List: Yes/No
5. Health – Sexual and reproductive health:	List: Yes/No
6. Health – Quality medicines:	List: Yes/No
7. Health – Health financing and Universal Health Coverage:	List: Yes/No
8. Refugees:	List: Yes/No
9. Covid-19:	List: Yes/No

7. Categorization: Positioning with regard to the objectives of Belgian Development Cooperation, as described in its strategy papers

Framework:

- The Belgian Development Cooperation's strategy papers are available on the [website](#) of the FPS Foreign Affairs, External Trade and Development Cooperation.
- If the revision of one or more strategy papers is not complete at the time of submitting the programmes, the position shall be examined on the basis of the latest available version of existing strategy papers.
- The position of the outcome shall be examined on the basis of the following strategy papers:
 - Agriculture and Food Security;
 - Children's rights;
 - Education;
 - Development education;
 - Environment and climate change;
 - Gender;
 - Migration;
 - Digitalization – Digital for Development D4D;
 - Health;
 - Private sector.
- The position with regard to each strategy paper shall be examined in conformity with the format below, provided that the format of strategic papers has been revised before the programmes are submitted. Should this not be the case, the fields relating specifically to the objectives and domains of results are not applicable.

Strategy paper title ¹⁹	List: Alignment with one or several objectives – No alignment – Not applicable
List: Objective 1	List: Domains of result 1
	List: Domains of result 2
List: Objective 2	List: Domains of result 1
	List: Domains of result 2
List: Objective X	List: Domains of result Y
	List: Domains of result Z
Motivation for the position:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Confidentiality of the motivation:	List: Yes/No

¹⁹ **Note:** The Portal should allow to avoid displaying them when not applicable (NA) because the sector or theme of the outcome is not related to the strategic note concerned

8. Subsidy bonus allocation: priority themes and strategic priorities

Framework:

- This section highlights the position of an outcome with regard to certain priority themes and specific strategic priorities identified by the Belgian development cooperation.
- How aligned an outcome is with regard to the priority themes and strategic priorities of the Belgian Development Cooperation shall be taken into account in the form of a subsidy bonus, for the outcomes considered most closely aligned.
- The human rights approach, decent work, gender and the environment are priority themes that have been selected and identified on the basis of Article 11 from the Law of 19 March 2013 concerning the Belgian Development Cooperation.
- Aspects that are complementary with the activities of ENABEL, common outcomes as part of a joint programme, and common outcomes as part of separate programmes are “technical” priorities identified on the basis of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016.
- In this section, applicant organizations may provide a brief justification of their position with regard to each identified priority. However, it is up to the administration to assess the responses to central questions and determine which value from among A, B and C is to be granted to the outcome.
- The weighting of each criterion shall be determined when compiling the evaluation procedure. Particular attention shall be paid so that alignment with the priorities comes with an attractive bonus without being excessive with regard to the criteria resting on the quality of the proposal. The 2016 methodology shall remain a reference. As a reminder, it would mean that the maximum qualitative score = 100, the maximum “priorities” score = 20, with a total subsidy ceiling of 100% of the application.

Human rights-based approach:

- **Definition:** The ultimate aim of the human rights-based approach is for all people to have the opportunity and the ability to make political, economic and social decisions for themselves, and for governments to be willing and able to meet their obligations and guarantee their people’s fundamental rights and freedoms. The approach aims to bring more opportunities and resources to the poorest and most vulnerable people. It suggests that poverty and development should no longer be thought of in terms of needs, but rather by analyzing the causes of poverty from a human rights point of view to identify the major obstacles in sustainable development as well as what could be done to remove them. Finally, the human rights-based approach also aims to invest as much in investing in the capacity of those who have obligations to respect (duty bearers) as in the capacity of those seeking to exercise their human rights (rights holders).
- **Central question:** Does the outcome make reference to human rights? If yes, does the strategy linked to the outcome implement a human rights-based approach? In particular those of women and children?
- **Value A:** References to human rights are either missing altogether or are anecdotal.
- **Value B:** The strategy for implementing the outcome takes human rights into account, but the approach is not based on human rights.
- **Value C:** The strategy for implementing the outcome is an approach that is strategically based on rights, especially those of women and children.

Justification for the position:

Free text – 2000 characters including spaces

Confidentiality of the justification:

List: Yes/No

Decent and sustainable work:

- **Definition:** It means the possibility for every woman and every man to access productive work under conditions of freedom, equity, safety and dignity. It brings together various elements: the possibility to perform a job that is productive and adequately paid; safety in the workplace and social protection for workers and their families; improved prospects for personal development and social integration; the freedom for human beings to express their concerns, to organize and take part in making decisions that have an influence on their lives; equal opportunities and treatment for all women and men. The Agenda for Decent Work, as defined by the International Labour Organization (ILO), aims at four strategic objectives (pillars), with equality between men and women being a cross-cutting objective: creating jobs, guaranteeing employment rights, extending social protection and promoting social dialogue.
- **Central question:** Does the outcome contribute towards decent work for all, including towards universal social protection, through taking into account the four pillars of decent work? (Examples: job creation for all, strengthening universal social protection, support for social dialogue in favor of decent work, defense of workers' rights, contribution to the ratification and implementation of the international labour standards, contribution towards improving national regulatory and institutional frameworks with a view to promoting high quality jobs...)
- **Value A:** There is no specific/explicit strategy with regard to one or several pillars of decent work as part of implementing the outcome, both in terms of local employees of the CSO/IS, as well as local partners and target groups.
- **Value B:** The outcome contributes towards at least one of the four pillars of decent work for all, through an explicit strategy, by planning specific and/or targeted activities, to assist the local employees of the CSO/IS and/or local partners and/or target groups.
- **Value C:** At least one of the four pillars of decent work is structurally incorporated into the outcome. The implementation strategy aims specifically to take into account one or more pillars of decent work, both at the level of the local employees of the CSO/IS and at the levels of local partners and target groups. It is based, among other aspects, on a partnership strategy in which the selection of partners includes criteria that examine local partners' commitment to the subject. It is also underpinned by an explicit cooperation strategy with specialist stakeholders and trade unions to obtain their support and put the pillars into operation.

Justification for the position:

Free text – 2000 characters including spaces

Confidentiality of the justification:

List: Yes/No

Gender:

- Definition:** Gender is recognized as a priority subject area as gender equality is a fundamental human right and a question of social justice. Gender equality means that the rights and responsibilities of women and men as well as the possibilities offered to them and the dynamics within which they evolve do not depend on having been born as one sex or the other. Achieving this form of equality does not mean women and men becoming exact equals but rather that they benefit from the same values and the same choices and opportunities within society. With women making up a larger percentage of the world's poor, the least represented category at decision-making level and the first victims of violence, whether it is physical, economic or psychological, equality between the sexes and the empowerment of women is one of the keystones of growth and poverty reduction, sustainable development and the achievement of all Sustainable Development Goals.

As part of its gender strategy, the Belgian Development Cooperation has set itself 4 priorities: 1) Education and decision-making, 2) Health and sexual and reproductive rights, 3) Food security, access to natural resources and economic empowerment, and 4) Protection of rights and the eradication of gender-based violence, with a particular focus on LGBTI.

Belgium's commitments in this domain are based in particular on the law of 12 January 2007 relating to Gender Mainstreaming, on the law of 19 March 2013 relating to the Belgian Development Cooperation, and on the EU Gender Action Plan II.

Within this context, ensuring that there is no negative impact on gender equality and performing a sex-specific analysis when preparing an intervention are minimal conditions of gender mainstreaming which must be respected during any intervention.
- Central question:** Does the intervention contribute towards reducing gender inequalities by implementing one of the DGD's gender strategy priorities?
- Value A:** The intervention does not contribute towards reducing gender inequality but has no negative impact on gender equality.
- Value B:** The intervention contributes towards reducing gender inequality by paying specific attention to the gender equality dimension, but this reduction does not constitute a condition for the intervention's success as it is not its principal objective. Example: For a project aiming to ensure the supply of a district or locality with drinking water, specific attention could be paid to the setting up of a "water committee" for the management supply in which the participation of women and girls would be guaranteed (respect for parity). Specific needs are taken into account and women's participation is improved, but the reduction of inequality is a "secondary" consequence of the intervention.
- Value C:** The intervention contributes towards reducing gender inequality by achieving specific results in one or more of the 4 DGD's gender strategy priorities. Reducing gender inequality is an explicit condition for success in the intervention.

Justification for the position:

Free text – 2000 characters including spaces

Confidentiality of the justification:

List: Yes/No

Environment:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Definition: The Law of 19 March 2013 identifies the environment as an essential element in sustainable development which is the global objective of the Belgian Development Cooperation. This means that by law, the environment is a cross-cutting subject that must be integrated into all forms of intervention, by protecting the environment and natural resources, including the fight against climate change, drought and global deforestation. As such, interventions and activities with a beneficial effect for the environment and climate are encouraged. Across the board therefore, it is expected that any project or programme involves an analysis of its potential impact on the environment. In this context, the KLIMOS toolbox or the Environment Integration Tool (EIT) may be used for achieving better understanding of the expectations and paying structured attention to environmental problems. ● Central question: Has an analysis been carried out on the impact of the environment and climate on the outcome, and conversely, the outcome's impact on the environment and the climate? Have appropriate measures been taken to neutralise any potentially negative effects? ● Value A: The proposal includes an analysis of the potential impact of the environment and climate on the intervention and vice-versa, but no substantial action is foreseen for offsetting the potentially negative effects. ● Value B: The proposal carries out an analysis of the potential impact of the environment and climate on the intervention and vice versa, and includes an action plan for neutralising the potentially negative effects. ● Value C: The proposal carries out an analysis of the potential impact of the environment and the climate of the intervention and vice versa, it includes an action plan for neutralising the potentially negative effects and it also takes targeted measures which have a positive impact on the environment/climate. 	
Justification for the position:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Confidentiality of the justification:	List: Yes/No

Common outcome within a joint programme:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Definition: Joint programmes are a modality that was introduced by the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016. They make it possible for several accredited organizations to come together within the same programme and agree in varying ways about common approaches to a sector, a theme... in different JSF countries or non-JSF countries, or even a common intervention strategy with a view to attaining a common outcome. Whilst there is no precise standard defined on the subject, the DGD would nevertheless like to be able to favour outcomes which have taken the logic the furthest possible, up to the point of being common to the organizations submitting them together. ● Central question: To what extent is the outcome common to the accredited organizations submitting the joint programme? ● Value A: The outcome is not common to the accredited organizations submitting the joint programme. ● Value B: The internal coherence of the outcome is suitable, there are signs that the cooperation between the different parties may lead in time to an interesting dynamic. ● Value C: The common outcome is the result of an integrated programmatic approach, with strong internal coherence. What the different parties provide is mutually strengthening. 	
Justification for the position:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Confidentiality of the justification:	List: Yes/No

Common outcome between distinct programmes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Definition: Alongside having common outcomes within a joint programme (see previous criterion), it is possible to have common outcomes between distinct programmes. In keeping with Article 20, Section 1 of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 which stipulates that "(...) the part of a programme that is carried out in synergy with other programmes is identical to all of these programmes, with the exception of the budget relating to it which is specific to each programme", the common outcomes between distinct programmes constitute one of the other, most in-depth, forms of operational synergies. Specifically, this means that all or part of the outcome presented has been identified and formulated together, and is presented in an identical way between the different programmes concerned. In particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The common formulation of one or several results, or even the outcome. The distinction between organizations is then situated on the level of indicator targets, specific to each one. ○ The formulation of a ToC for the outcome, partially or wholly common to the parties. ○ For the wholly common outcomes, the presentation and justification of the outcome, which is identical between the different programmes. ● Central question: Is the outcome carried out in deep synergy with other non-governmental cooperation actors? Are the outcome or the results of the outcome common between several programmes? ● Value A: Neither the outcome nor its results are common to one or several other programmes. ● Value B: It is demonstrated that at least one of the results being sought is common to one or several other programmes. ● Value C: The outcome is carried out in total synergy with other non-governmental cooperation actors. It is demonstrated that the full outcome is common to one or several other programmes. 	
Justification for the position:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Confidentiality of the justification:	List: Yes/No

Areas of complementarity and synergy with the intervention of ENABEL:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Definition: Areas of complementarity and synergy with ENABEL may just as much concern the activities financed directly by the Belgian Development Cooperation as the activities financed and carried out on behalf of third parties, approved by the Belgian Minister for Development Cooperation. ● Central question: Is the outcome potentially complementary with an ENABEL intervention? Has this been sufficiently demonstrated? Is the link between the two interventions well described? Is there a preliminary analysis specifically covering the activities of ENABEL in a targeted context, and on the potential areas of complementarity and synergy which could be developed within this context? ● Value A: The drafting of the strategy for implementing the outcome does not make reference to ENABEL and does not include a preliminary analysis covering its activities in a targeted context, or ENABEL is not present in the context targeted by the outcome. ● Value B: The drafting of the strategy for implementing the outcome includes a preliminary analysis covering the activities of ENABEL in a targeted context, and it is demonstrated that the outcome is potentially complementary with ENABEL's activities in this context. The potential is described but the specific links between activities have not been elaborated upon and the cooperation with ENABEL is not organised. ● Value C: The drafting of the strategy for implementing the outcome includes a preliminary analysis covering the activities of ENABEL in a targeted context, and it is demonstrated that the outcome is directly complementary with the activities of ENABEL in this context. The links are described and cooperation is foreseen. 	
Justification for the position:	Free text – 2000 characters including spaces
Confidentiality of the justification:	List: Yes/No

C. Description of the outcome, results and strategy

1. Strategic targets to which the outcome contributes/General objective

Main Strategic Target:	List: Strategic targets in accordance with the previously selected Strategic Framework (see II.B.1)
Secondary Strategic Target:	List: Strategic targets in accordance with the previously selected Strategic Framework (see II.B.1)
Secondary Strategic Target:	List: Strategic targets in accordance with the previously selected Strategic Framework (see II.B.1)
General Objective(s):	Only if the outcome is non- JSF - Free text – 500 characters including spaces

2. Description of the expected results

Framework:

- There is no limit to the number of OVI (objectively verifiable indicators) and results that can be proposed for an outcome. It is, however, recommended to keep them to a reasonable number.
- Joint programme: When an outcome is common to several associated organizations, either the full formulation of the outcome, the results and indicators can be common, or it will be possible to have individual results and/or indicators per ANGC.
- Coherence with IATI format: For each indicator, the type has to be selected: “absolute value/unit”, “percentage”, “qualitative value”, “nominal value” or “ordinal value”. The “ascending” or “descending” character must also be identified.
- Integration of Gender: It is also compulsory to show how Gender has been incorporated into the indicators. This requirement means that in time it will become necessary to identify one or several indicators, baseline values and 3-5 year targets that are disaggregated by sex (when they are quantitative) or gendered (when they are qualitative). For the 2022-2026 programmes, this obligation translates as follows:
 - A quantitative indicator must be systematically disaggregated by sex, when it is possible and relevant with regard to how it is formulated (for example: the indicator relates to a target group).
 - A qualitative indicator must be gendered when it is possible and relevant with regard to how it is formulated. If there are plans to gender a qualitative indicator but it is not available at the time of formulating the programme, the reasons why will have to be explained in the chapter dedicated to describing Relevance (Chapter II, Part G, 1st point).
 - On a transitional basis, when there is no indicator that is possible or relevant to disaggregate by sex (quantitative) or to gender (qualitative) planned, a description will have to be given as to how one or several appropriate indicators shall be identified during the programme or in the following programme.

Narrative		Baseline	Target Year 3 – 31/12/2024	Target Year 5 – 31/12/2026			
Outcome:	Formulation of the outcome - Free text – 500 characters including spaces						
Indicator 1:	Description of the indicator–SMART format FT–500 char. incl. sp.	Baseline FT – 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 3 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 5 500 char. incl. sp.	Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No	
Indicator X:	Description of the indicator–SMART format FT–500 char. incl. sp.	Baseline FT – 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 3 500 char.incl.sp.	Target Year 5 500 char. incl. sp.	Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No	
Result 1:	Formulation of the result - Free text – 500 characters including spaces						
Indicator 1:	Description of the indicator–SMART format FT–500 char. incl. sp.	Baseline FT – 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 3 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 5 500 char. incl. sp.	Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No	
Indicator X:	Description of the indicator–SMART format FT–500 char. incl. sp.	Baseline FT – 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 3 500 char.incl.sp.	Target Year 5 500 char. incl. sp.	Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No	
Result X:	Formulation of the result - Free text – 500 characters including spaces						
Indicator 1:	Description of the indicator–SMART format FT–500 char. incl. sp.	Baseline FT – 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 3 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 5 500 char. incl. sp.	Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No	
Indicator X:	Description of the indicator–SMART format FT–500 char. incl. sp.	Baseline FT – 500 char. incl. sp.	Target Year 3 500 char.incl.sp.	Target Year 5 500 char. incl. sp.	Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No	

3. Classification of activities

Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No
Free text – 2000 characters including spaces (= ½ page)	
Explicit classification of planned activities to achieve the outcome and planned results.	

4. Target groups and beneficiaries

Framework:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both a qualitative (nature of groups affected by the action) and quantitative (number affected by the action) description must be given for the target groups and beneficiaries. • The quantitative descriptions must include the disaggregation by sex. 	
Target group(s) – Location of the intervention: Belgium only:	<p>List:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Education (type of education: preschool, primary, secondary, higher education) - Volunteers/affiliates/unpaid staff - Political decision-makers/public institution - Associated local partners - Diasporas - National and international platforms - Social and educational stakeholders (trade unions, mutual funds, personal assistance, youth movements...) - Cultural stakeholders - Financial stakeholders - Private and professional stakeholders - Media stakeholders - Other
Target group(s):	Free text – 500 characters including spaces
Beneficiaries:	Free text – 500 characters including spaces
Confidentiality:	List: Yes/No

5. Theory of Change associated with the outcome

Framework:

Preliminary remark: Theory of Change (ToC) shall comprise 1) a diagram and 2) an explanatory narrative text. This ToC may cover an outcome, a country or even a programme. Fully aware that an ANGC may propose one or several outcomes taking place in the same country, the decision is left to the ANGC to create a Theory of Change covering all of their outcomes in the country or, alternatively, to draft a Theory of Change per outcome if they are not linked.

For the outcomes that are part of the thematic JSF, it is expected that a ToC is submitted that is based on the thematic ToC of the thematic JSF, and which highlights the specific geographical dimension of the outcome's intervention zone (country or group of countries), so as to take into account the needs and priorities identified by the partners and the realities of each particular intervention zone (=contextualized).

Independently of this decision, each Theory of Change explains roughly how the results are expected to materialize, how these results are expected to contribute towards the principal SDG (see Chapter II, Part B, 5th point) and on which underlying hypothesis achieving the outcome is based.

A ToC must highlight all of the stakeholders concerned by realizing the beneficiaries' dream (or resolving the societal problems at the source of them) and the necessary changes concerning them. The paths of change or causal hypothesis justifying relations between the stakeholders must be documented in the narrative and illustrated on the diagram. The ToC must make the logic of the actor's intervention absolutely clear.

A Theory of Change (ToC):

- *reflects how an organization thinks about how change occurs in specific contexts and sectors;*
- *explicitly links the different phases of change and the expected impact;*
- *explains why the organization thinks that change occurs in a certain way (hypotheses on the relationships between cause and effect);*
- *states clearly the elements upon which these hypotheses are based (convictions, values, experiences, theories, scientific research, etc.);*
- *indicates which parts are involved in which changes;*
- *indicates the risks, connected to the hypotheses concerning the external factors, that may influence the changes;*
- *defines the limits of the sphere of control, the sphere of influence and the sphere of interest.*

The DGD expects organizations to clarify using a ToC how they think that the changes will occur in a specific context. The DGD does not prescribe a certain format in this respect but it expects organizations to:

- *reflect upon the different subjects in a ToC and at least on the paths of change in a certain context, with attention being paid to stakeholders present and by explicitly setting out hypothesis on causal relationships and possible risks;*
- *represent the discussion in a simple and self-explanatory manner in a diagram and explain it in a concise narrative statement;*
- *explain how they intend to use the ToC in the implementation and monitoring and evaluation of their programme;*
- *draw a direct link to the description of expected results provided by the outcome, for all of the outcomes in the country or region of the intervention.*

In addition to demonstrating what the outcome is intended to contribute towards the principal SDG, the DGD expects to see a demonstration of how the principles associated with the SDGs have been taken into consideration when compiling the ToC associated with the outcome:

- *Leave No-One Behind Principle: When identifying the beneficiaries of the action or the changes that the outcome is aspiring to contribute towards, has it been ensured that no vulnerable group has been unintentionally sidelined? When identifying the relevant most vulnerable groups that do not make up the main target groups, does the ToC include considerations about potential direct or indirect contributions towards positive changes? If the analyses (e.g. the risk analysis [see Chapter II, Part C, 6th point]) suggest the intervention may have potentially significant negative effects on relevant vulnerable groups or that there is a possibility of vulnerable groups being excluded even further, how does the ToC anticipate taking into account or mitigating these risks either directly or indirectly (e.g. by collaboration with other actors, etc.)?*
- *Principle of Interlinkages: Have the positive and negative potentially significant links been identified between the principal (and possibly, optional, as well as their target) SDGs associated with the intervention and other SDGs (and targets)? If so, how has the strategy been adapted so as to maximize the potentially positive links or to respond to the potentially negative links (directly or indirectly, e.g. by collaboration with other stakeholders,*

etc.)?

So as to grant the necessary room for maneuver for drafting and submitting the Theory of Change, it is expected in the form of a **PDF document appended to the programme**. On average, the ToC (per country) for programmes in 2017-2021 were between 7 and 8 pages in length (diagram and narrative included). This average is not provided as a minimum to be attained, but ToCs 2022-2026 are expected not to exceed 10 pages.

Title of the reference annex:

Free text – 100 characters including spaces

6. Analysis of risks associated with the outcome

Framework:

In conjunction with the Theory/Theories of Change, a list of risks per outcome is also expected, potentially listed per country, with an estimation of the probability of the risks occurring and an estimation of their impact, as well as the means implemented in order to limit, mitigate or adapt for these risks (management measures). The exercise here is to identify specific risks that are different from the risks in the analysis produced at JSF level. For the non-JSF countries, a full risk analysis must be produced.

In the framework of this risk analysis, attention must also be paid to the principles linked to the SDGs, especially the principles of Leave No-One Behind and Interlinkages. So as to ensure that implementing the outcome does not have a detrimental impact, the potentially negative impacts or exclusion effects of the action (especially at the level of vulnerable groups) have to be observed, as well as any negative interaction between certain SDGs (or targets) and, if applicable, a response is required so as to prevent or mitigate them.

So as to leave the necessary room for maneuver for drafting and submitting the risk analysis per outcome, it is expected in the form of a **PDF document appended to the programme**. An indicative risk analysis structure is supplied below.

Title of reference annex:

Free text – 100 characters including spaces

Risk analysis – Indicative structure										
Estimation of the risk					Risk management (for high levels and extremes)			Risk monitoring		
Source and nature of the risk	Probability	Effects	Risk level	Result impact	Person in charge	Treatment	Timing	Person in charge	When	
Risk 1: ...										
Risk: ...										
Risk X: ...										
Indicative structure – Explanations										
Probability	1	Unlikely	Effects	1	Negligible	Risk Level	1	Low	Result Impact <td rowspan="5">Identify which result(s) the risk would impact. Use the numbering system provided in the description of the results [Chapter II, Part C, 2nd point]</td>	Identify which result(s) the risk would impact. Use the numbering system provided in the description of the results [Chapter II, Part C, 2 nd point]
	2	Possible		2	Small		2	Medium		
	3	Likely		3	Medium		3	High		
	4	Almost certain		4	Large		4	Extreme		
				5	Serious					

7. Description of tasks among associate ANGCs

For joint programmes only

Free text – 2000 characters including spaces (= ½ page)

When the outcome is common to several ANGCs in the joint programme, a description must be provided of the planned interactions, as well as how the tasks are to be shared between associate ANGCs.

D. Outcome budget

1. T4 – Operational costs

Joint programme: individual information per ANGC

Framework:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The data relating to operational costs that have to be entered directly into the portal must correspond with the level of information set out below. • A standard format is used to enter information into the portal making it possible to encode it manually or import from an Excel/CSV file [to be confirmed]. • Note: A more detailed budget may be requested. If so, this budget must be provided through a dedicated annex. • Details of the breakdown of the outcome budget made available to a partner or a collaboration should be provided in Chapter II, Part(s) E and/or F. 	
Title of the reference annex:	Free text – 100 characters including spaces

HEADINGS	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
1. TOTAL PARTNERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
1.1 Investments						-
1.2 Operations						-
1.3 Staff ¹						-
2. TOTAL COLLABORATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
2.1 Investments						-
2.2 Operations						-
2.3 Staff ¹						-
3. TOTAL FIELD OFFICE	-	-	-	-	-	-
3.1 Investments						-
3.2 Operations						-
3.3 Staff ¹						-
4. TOTAL HEADQUARTERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.1 Investments						-
4.2 Operations						-
4.3 Staff ¹						-
TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE OUTCOME						
TOTAL INVESTMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-
A. Purchase of vehicles						-
B. Furniture, ICT						-
C. Other						-
TOTAL OPERATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
A. Travel						-
B. Field office						-
C. Other						-
TOTAL STAFF ¹	-	-	-	-	-	-
A. Headquarters salaries*						-
B. Expatriates' salaries*						-
C. Local staff salaries*						-
D. Other costs						-

¹ Staff salaries: gross amounts including social security charges and other related costs

Digital fields – Standard format – To be encoded manually/or imported from Excel/CSV

2. Explanation of the budget

Joint programme: individual information per ANGC

Free text – 2000 characters including spaces (= ½ page)

Explanations of the key trends to understand how the budget has been structured: what investments are planned, how many and what type of human resources, how are they to be spread over the 5 years, link with the activity classification...

Must not contain confidential information

3. Distribution of budget per country

Thematic outcome only

O.C. - OPERATIONAL COSTS PER THEMATIC OUTCOME - REGIONAL APPROACH: INDICATIVE BREAKDOWN BY COUNTRY

For thematic outcomes involving regional coverage, the operational costs of the outcome concerned should also be indicatively allocated by country. The part of the operational budget of this outcome that cannot be linked to a specific country (supranational activities,...) must also be identified.

TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE OUTCOME	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
SUPRANATIONAL ACTIVITIES	-	-	-	-	-	-
COUNTRY NAME 1						-
COUNTRY NAME 2						-
COUNTRY NAME 3						-
COUNTRY NAME 4						-
COUNTRY NAME X						-

Digital fields – Standard format – To be encoded manually/or imported from Excel/CSV

4. Visual overview of the budget for the common outcome

For joint programmes only - When the outcome is common to several ANGCs

Portal: Summary to be produced automatically

O.C. - OPERATIONAL COSTS PER COMMON OUTCOME, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF A COMMON PROGRAMME						
For outcomes common to several ANGCs in a common programme, the overview of the common budget makes it possible to observe the share of the budget of each ANGC dedicated to the implementation of the outcome.						
TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE OUTCOME	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
1. TOTAL PARTNERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 1						-
ANGC 2						-
ANGC 3						-
ANGC 4						-
2. TOTAL COLLABORATIONS	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 1						-
ANGC 2						-
ANGC 3						-
ANGC 4						-
3. TOTAL FIELD OFFICE	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 1						-
ANGC 2						-
ANGC 3						-
ANGC 4						-
4. TOTAL HEADQUARTERS	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 1						-
ANGC 2						-
ANGC 3						-
ANGC 4						-
TOTAL OPERATIONAL COSTS FOR THE OUTCOME	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL
	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 1	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 2	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 3	-	-	-	-	-	-
ANGC 4	-	-	-	-	-	-

E. List of partnerships for the outcome

Joint programme: individual information per ANGC

#	Acronym	Full name*				Confidentiality	
Partnership 1	FT-10 characters	Free text – 50 characters, incl. spaces.				List: Confidential - Public	
Budget available	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	
	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	
Partnership 2	FT-10 characters	Free text – 50 characters, incl. spaces.				List: Confidential - Public	
Budget available	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	
	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	
Partnership X	FT-10 characters	Free text – 50 characters, incl. spaces.				List: Confidential - Public	
Budget available	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	
	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	

* as contained within the organization's official statutes

F. List of collaborations for the outcome

Joint programme: individual information per ANGC

#	Acronym	Full name				Confidentiality	
Collaboration 1	FT-10 characters	Free text – 50 characters, incl. spaces.				List: Confidential - Public	
Budget available	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	
	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	
Collaboration 2	FT-10 characters	Free text – 50 characters, incl. spaces.				List: Confidential - Public	
Budget available	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	
	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	
Collaboration X	FT-10 characters	Free text – 50 characters, incl. spaces.				List: Confidential - Public	
Budget available	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	TOTAL	
	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	Digital field	

* as contained within the organization's official statutes

G. Presentation of the outcome and justification

1. Description of the Relevance

Relevance²⁰: Does the intervention address the problem?

- *Extent to which the objectives and design of the intervention correspond to the needs, policies and priorities of the beneficiaries, the country, the international community and the partners/institutions and remain relevant even if the context changes.*

Free text – 8000 characters, incl. spaces (= 2 pages)

Globally speaking, in this chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme is required to:

- Present, if applicable, how the outcome relates to local, regional, national or international policies;
- Establish the link between the Relevance of the outcome and the Theory of Change presented in Chapter II, Part C, 5th point;
- Demonstrate how it incorporates the cross-cutting theme of gender, which aims at empowerment of women and equality of men and women in society. In particular, considering that in the part dedicated to describing the expected results (Chapter II, Part C, 2nd point), over time, work will have to be done on identifying one or several outcomes and/or result indicators which are sensitive to gender/allow for sex-specific data to be produced, therefore;
 - If there are plans to gender a qualitative indicator but it is not yet available at the time of compiling the programme, the reasons for this must be stated here.
 - On a transitional basis, when there are no planned indicators that are possible or relevant to disaggregate by sex (quantitative) or to gender (qualitative), a description must be given as to how to identify one or more adequate indicators during the programme or for the following programme.
 - In the event that the organization submitting the programme decides voluntarily not to integrate Gender for this outcome (DAC Marker = 0), this decision must be accompanied by an explicit justification here.
- Demonstrate how the cross-cutting subject of protecting the environment and natural resources is integrated, including efforts to tackle climate change, drought and global deforestation;
- Present, where applicable, the educational approaches and/or teaching methods for the different target groups, especially within the context of global citizenship education;
- If the outcome forms part of the continuation of a previous programme, explain the reasons justifying the maintenance or further development of the activities.

Specifically, for all of the outcomes covered by a geographical JSF or a thematic JSF, the organization must also:

- Demonstrate the outcome's contribution towards the Strategic Targets identified in the JSF;
- Make reference to the chapters in the JSF identifying the relevant stakeholders in the field of development and describe the local civil society, decentralized authorities, public institutions and their principal partners;

Specifically, for all non-JSF outcomes, the organization must also:

²⁰ OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, [Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use](#), 2019, pp. 7-8.

- Demonstrate how the outcome presented is part of the Strategic Plan updated by the organization submitting the programme;
- Demonstrate the relevance of the outcome and the planned intervention strategy in relation to the contextual analysis that must be provided in the annex, and demonstrate that the outcome responds to the needs and priorities of the partners and target groups;
- Identify relevant stakeholders in the field of development within this context;
- Describe the local civil society, decentralized authorities, public institutions and their principal partners;

Supply **in the annex** an analysis of the local context (legal, political, socio-economic, cultural) as well as national policies in association with the outcome/chosen sector and the positions adopted in relation to these national policies. This contextual analysis must make explicit reference to the SDGs involved.

2. Description of Coherence

Coherence²¹: Is the intervention in accordance with the other interventions underway?

- *Extent to which the intervention is compatible with other interventions underway within a country, a sector or an institution. Included are **internal coherence** and **external coherence**.*
- *Internal coherence concerns the synergies and interdependencies between interventions carried out by the same institution/administration, as well as the coherence between the intervention and relevant international standards and criteria to which the institution/administration adheres.*
- *External coherence concerns the coherence between the intervention under consideration and those carried out by other actors in the same context. It encompasses complementarity, harmonization and coordination with other actors and verifies that the intervention provides added value whilst avoiding any overlapping of activities.*

Reminder:

- *Complementarity: Basing an actor's interventions on the aspects that make them unique and their comparative advantages avoids overlaps with those of other actors as part of a clear division of labour with a view to contributing to the same general objective by overcoming individual limitations. Complementarity may be passive; it does not necessarily require a working relationship. For example: geographical complementarity and the sharing of tasks.*
- *Complementary aspects are neither aimed exclusively at Belgian actors nor exclusively at the development cooperation sector.*
- *Synergies with other actors and/or programmes shall be addressed in the dedicated criterion (see Chapter II, Part G, 8th point).*

Free text – 4000 characters, incl. spaces (= 1 page)

Generally speaking, in this chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Explain the possible unique characteristics of the outcome with regards to the activities of other actors (local, Belgian, international, ...) present in the same context;
- Describe how the outcome is complementary and might add to other actors' activities (local, Belgian, international, ...) in the same context, in the sector, theme, geographical area, target groups, etc.;
- Make the link between the Coherence of the outcome and the Theory of Change presented in Chapter II, Part C, 5th point; where applicable, coherence between outcomes which occurs as part of the thematic JSFs must be observed in relation to geographical JSFs.
- Demonstrate, where applicable, the coherence of the outcome with regard to other activities carried out by the organization within the same context, falling under distinct

²¹ OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, [Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use](#), 2019, p. 9.

programmes/projects (financed by the own funds or by other donors).

3. Description of Effectiveness

Effectiveness²²: Could the intervention achieve its objectives?

- *Extent to which the objectives and results of the intervention could be achieved, have already been achieved or are in the process of being achieved, including a breakdown of results by different sections of the population.*
- *Analysis of the effectiveness requires the relative importance of the objectives or results to be taken into account.*

Free text – 12000 characters, incl. spaces (= 3 pages)

Generally speaking, in this chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Demonstrate the realistic and achievable nature of the outcome and expected results, in conjunction with the Theory of Change set out in Chapter II, Part C, 5th point;
- Demonstrate how the expected results can be closely attributed to the outcome (as opposed to the impact);
- Explain how the baselines have been identified and how the organization has ensured that they can be used as part of the intermediate or final evaluations or even impact assessment;
- Explain how marginalized groups are to be taken into account and explain how the outcome will ensure that inequalities will not widen, especially by distributing the expected results across the different groups (concept of “differentiated results” – *Leave no one behind*).

Specifically, for all outcomes covered by a geographical JSF or a thematic JSF, the organization must also ➤ demonstrate how one or several common approaches that have been identified and formulated in the reference JSF will be put into operation.

4. Description of Efficiency

Efficiency²³: Will optimal use be made of resources?

- *Extent to which the intervention produces, or is likely to produce, economic results over time.*
- *The term “economic” denotes converting inputs (funding, expertise, natural resources, time, etc.) into outputs, achievements and impacts that are as economically advantageous as possible, with regard to the options that were feasible in the context.*
- *The expression “over time” denotes the respecting of deadlines set or deadlines that have been reasonably adapted to the demands of the changing context.*

Free text – 4000 characters, incl. spaces (= 1 page)

Generally speaking, in the chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Justify and detail the budget presented for the outcome and explain the relationship between the (human, material, financial) means allocated to its implementation and the

²² OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, [Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use](#), 2019, p. 10.

²³ OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, [Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use](#), 2019, p. 10.

- expected results, so as to demonstrate clearly the cost/benefit ratio;
- Justify the decisions identified and selected in terms of allocating resources, for achieving the expected results, as opposed to other means that could have been used. Demonstrate that full consideration was granted to the various options and that the option that was ultimately selected was not only the most economical but also the most appropriate considering the context and constraints;
- Present, where applicable, the “organizational and logistical” synergies which will be implemented as part of the outcome and their potential effects on Efficiency (e.g. sharing of offices, sharing of logistical services, pooling of human resources including a division of tasks and responsibilities, pooling of resources to carry out joint external evaluations [as part of common outcomes within the programme or between programmes], etc.);
- Justify, where applicable, the sending of volunteers into the field as well as their role in executing the outcome. Explain this decision on the basis of the volunteer-sending policy compared to the option of recruiting personnel on the ground (local office) or the policy of delegating responsibilities to a local partner.

5. Description of the expected Impact

Impact²⁴: What difference will the intervention make?

- *Extent to which the intervention has produced, or is expected to produce, significant and broad-ranging effects, positive or negative, intentional or otherwise.*
- *The impact concerns the ultimate importance and the potentially transformative effects of the intervention. It aims to determine what its social, environmental and economic effects will be over the longer term or on a broader scale than those already evaluated as part of the effectiveness criteria.*
- *Beyond the immediate effects, the impact criteria aim to assess the indirect, secondary and potential effects of the intervention, by examining global and sustainable developments in systems or standards, as well as the potential effects on populations’ wellbeing, human rights, gender equality and the environment.*

Free text – 2000 characters, incl. spaces (= ½ page)

Generally speaking, in the chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Explain the expected impact of the outcome, especially for the target groups identified in Chapter II, Part C, 4th point and make the link with the Theory of Change presented in Chapter II, Part C, 5th point.

6. Description of Sustainability

Sustainability²⁵: Are the benefits sustainable?

- *Extent to which the net benefits of the intervention will last over time or are likely to last over time.*
- *It encompasses an examination of the financial, economic, social, environmental and institutional capacities of the systems required to continue the net benefits over time. This includes analysis of resilience, risks and potential trade-offs between priorities. Depending on the moment at which the evaluation is carried out, the process will make it possible to analyze the real flow of net benefits or to estimate the likelihood of the net benefits lasting into the medium and long term.*

²⁴ OECD/DAC Development Assessment Network (EvalNet), *Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use*, [Better Criteria for Better Evaluation – Revised Evaluation Criteria Definitions and Principles for Use](#), 2019, p. 12.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 13

Free text – 4000 characters, incl. spaces (= 1 page)

Generally speaking, in the chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Demonstrate the viability of the outcome, from the viewpoint of:
 - Technical sustainability (management by the partners and long-lasting support for target groups);
 - Financial sustainability (partners' and/or target groups' capacity to bear recurring costs);
 - Social sustainability (control of the intervention by the target groups);
 - Institutional sustainability (appropriation);
 - Ecological sustainability (desired effects after the action).
- Explain, when implementing the outcome requires capacity-building of the partners, which capacities must be strengthened and how this will be achieved;
- Explain, where applicable, the disengagement/empowerment strategy at the end of implementing the outcome, and the conditions for sustainability, including considerations about:
 - The development of partnerships as part of the outcome, from a financial and technical disengagement point of view;
 - Potential partnerships and cooperation (without financial consequences) that could be established with a view to making the results last over time.
- Explain, where applicable, if the outcome aims to raise awareness, launch action or is even aiming at individual or collective engagement (in particular in the framework of global citizenship education);
- When the outcome involves “multiplier” stakeholders, explain who these stakeholders are, with which groups of people they work (i.e. who exactly they are aiming to multiply), and what and how this will contribute towards its sustainability. Examples of “multiplier” stakeholders: professors and teachers, extension workers, volunteers, those in charge of other civil society associations, etc.

7. Description of the Partnership Strategy

Framework – Reminder:

1. **Partnership:** *Relationship between an accredited organization and an association representing civil society, an institution of public interest, a private stakeholder or decentralized authority, influencing and/or reinforcing a programme that contributes towards development cooperation objectives.*
 - *A partnership aims to mutually strengthen the parties and/or provide support from the accredited organization to its partner.*
 - *A partnership implies shared responsibility for the programme's implementation, or for part of the programme, from the viewpoint of attaining the desired outcome(s) and result(s).*
 - *A partnership does not necessarily involve a financial relationship between an accredited organization and its partner.*
 - *A partnership is always based on a Partnership Agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding, for part of, the full length of or longer than the full length of the programme submitted.*
- *When the partnership has its headquarters in a country of the “South”, it responds to the definition of “Local Partner”, as described in Article 1, paragraph 3 of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation.*
- *Local partner (Art. 1, 3° of the RD of 11/09/16): an association representative of civil society, an institution of public interest or a decentralized authority in a developing country, associated by a partnership agreement or a Memorandum of Understanding with an accredited organization.*

Free text – 6000 characters, incl. spaces (= 1 + ½ page)

Generally speaking, in the chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Demonstrate the involvement of the partner(s) in compiling the outcome, as well as their role in implementing it:
 - *For the outcomes covered by a geographical or thematic JSF:* This demonstration in particular must be carried out in accordance with the analyses and identifications made in the JSF concerned;
 - *For the non-JSF outcomes:* This demonstration must be carried out by 1) identifying and describing the types of potential partners, and 2) by justifying the choice of partner(s) with regard to this analysis;
 - *For outcomes concerning GCE:* An explanation must also be provided explaining what role the organization's local partners are to play (mobilized within the framework of other outcomes of the programme or other activities of the accredited organization).
- Demonstrate that the number of partners has been adapted in line with implementing the intervention strategy, and matches the capacities of the accredited organization;
- Provide, in association with the description of Sustainability, the capacity-building strategy of the partners so as to promote the outcome's technical sustainability;
- Demonstrate the link between the partner(s) and the target groups identified in Chapter II, Part D, 4th point.

8. Description of Synergies

Framework – Reminder:

- *Synergy: Basing the interventions of several actors on their active collaboration as part of a clear division of labour with a view to obtaining the same outcome and generating added value beyond the cumulative individual efforts of each organization. There are 2 different types of synergy:*
 - *Operational synergies: Synergies at the level of carrying out the activities and/or results desired within a given programme, which benefit from the link to other actors/programmes. For example: the pooling of expertise, technical and methodological capacities, or the compilation of common intervention methods, or even the allocation of tasks so as to reinforce the capacities of a common partner.*
 - *Organizational and logistical synergies: Collaboration from several actors with a view to increasing the efficiency of their respective interventions. For example: the sharing of offices, logistics services, the pooling of human resources including the allocation of tasks and responsibilities.*
- *The “operational” synergies are to be addressed in this chapter, in order to focus attention here on the synergies which have direct effects on the results. “Organizational and logistical” synergies are included as part of the description of Efficiency (Chapter II, Part G, 4th Point) as they have effects on how the planned resources are to be used.*
- *The synergies may be organized and implemented by organizations of all origins: local, Belgian or international organizations.*

Free text – 8000 characters, incl. spaces (= 2 pages)

Generally speaking, in the chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must:

- Describe the operational synergies put in place with a view to contributing towards achieving the outcome. In particular, this description involves highlighting:
 - The common objective that the synergy is seeking;
 - The roles and duties of each organization involved, as well as how the different tasks are to be allocated;
 - Material and financial contributions, as well as the total budget involved in the collaboration, where applicable.

- This description must be provided with a clear distinction between the synergies according to whether they involve:
 - Accredited Belgian organizations on the one hand;
 - Other Belgian non-accredited organizations, local organizations and international organizations on the other hand.
- Where applicable, explain the outcomes that are common to several organizations and the synergies that are part of that framework, both within a joint programme as well as across several different programmes.

Specifically, for all outcomes covered by a geographical JSF or a thematic JSF, the organization must also ➤ demonstrate how the planned synergies render operational the engagements undertaken by accredited organizations as part of the JSFs.

Specifically, for all non-JSF outcomes, the organization must also ➤ draw the link between the planned synergies, and the actors identified as part of the contextual analysis and described as part of the description of Relevance (Chapter II, Part G, 1st Point).

9. Description of how individual or collective recommendations and lessons are to be taken into account

Framework – Reminder:

- *The principle of learning has an important place in regulating the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation. Whether it is at the level of organizations, common strategic frameworks or programmes: the objective is to make continual improvements by drawing lessons from previous experiences. This chapter aims to examine how exactly this principle of learning is to be put into practice.*

Free text – 4000 characters, incl. spaces (= 1 page)

Generally speaking, in this chapter per outcome, the accredited organization submitting the programme must describe how it has taken into account the recommendations and lessons learned from:

- Implementing and monitoring previous programmes;
- External evaluations covering previous programmes;
- The programmes of other organizations and which have been pooled/shared where applicable.

Specifically, for all outcomes covered by a geographical JSF or a thematic JSF, the organization must also ➤ describe how the recommendations and lessons identified through the Joint Strategic Framework, Strategic Dialogue(s) and learning pathways have been taken into account.

III. Mandatory annexes classified by outcome

Illustration of the loading module for annexes in the portal:	
Title of the annex:	Free text – 100 characters including spaces
Type of document:	List: Type to be determined → CFR PRISMA
Confidentiality of the document:	List: Confidential - Public

1. Theory of Change associated with the outcome

Refer to Chapter II, Part C, 5th point for the description of the expectations associated with the Theories of Change.

2. Analysis of risks associated with the outcome

Refer to Chapter II, Part C, 6th point for the description of the expectations associated with the Risk Assessments.

3. Country map showing the location of the intervention zone

In the event that the functionality is not included in the portal.

4. Fact sheet per partner

Acronym ²⁶ :	
Full name:	
Address/Location	
E-mail:	
Contact person:	
Partnership start date:	
Brief description of the partner's role for this outcome:	
Total operational costs for the local partner for this outcome:	

5. Draft Partnership Agreement

For each one of the organizations with which a partnership is planned in the context of the programme, the accredited organization must provide a partnership agreement that has been

²⁶ **Note:** If the need is expressed to keep a partner's data confidential (see Point E "List of local partners"), the Fact sheet concerned must be the subject of a specific appendix explicitly mentioning "Confidential"

negotiated with the partner, and signed by the parties, at the latest by 30 days after it has taken effect.

For formally-recognised partnerships involved in executing the programme, it is expected that the signed agreements are sent to the DGD in the month following the signature. This means that when submitting the programme, the draft partnership agreements must be provided.

Guide to establishing a partnership agreement²⁷	
1)	Description of the common objective;
2)	The description of the mutual responsibilities and engagements of the two parties, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What each party is to contribute and what role they will play with regard to the outcome and the results; ● How the tasks are to be divided between each party; ● The rights and duties of each party; ● What the local partner is to contribute towards the activities of the accredited organization in Belgium; ● Considerations and commitments in the area of stereotypes and representations of beneficiaries and partners, for any potential communication from the partnership; ● The shared vision with regard to mutual capacity-building.
3)	The amounts of financing and the share of the subsidy granted to the partner, as well as a clause stipulating that the financial relationship commences on the date of the programme being approved by the Minister and not on the theoretical start date (1 January 2022);
4)	The terms by which the partner intends to take over locally and the sustainability of the activities that were initially started jointly, if applicable;
5)	A clause regulating the transfer of property rights for acquired assets to the partner, by the end of the financing period at the latest;
6)	The objectives and practical terms of recruiting personnel who are assigned to the partnership, for each one of the parties;
7)	A clause stating that the Belgian administration, or its representative, may at any moment carry out spot checks on how the subsidy is being used, both at the ANGC headquarters as well as the partner's headquarters, by virtue of Articles 35, 5° and 50 of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation;
8)	Identification of any planned local audits;
9)	A clause addressing the matter of integrity (commitments, possible preventive measures, complaint mechanisms, ...).

The signed partnership agreements will therefore be appended to the programme once it has been approved.

When a partner is involved in multiple outcomes, the Partnership Agreement linking it to the ANG C must be supplied all at the same time.

²⁷ This guide does not apply to university cooperation projects. If the Guide is indicative, the non-application of one or more points of the Guide for the establishment of a Partnership Agreement must be justified in the chapter dedicated to the description of the Partnership Strategy (see Chapter II, Part G, 7th point).

6. Fact sheet per collaboration

Acronym:	
Full name:	
Address/Location:	
E-mail:	
Contact person:	
Brief description of the role of the cooperation for this outcome:	
Operational costs for the cooperation for this outcome (if applicable):	

7. Draft Collaboration Agreement

As part of formally recognizing Synergies, when the collaboration involves a financial relationship, the accredited organization is expected to provide a collaboration agreement, for each one of the stakeholders with which synergies of operational or organizational/logistical nature are planned. Each collaboration agreement must be negotiated with these other stakeholders and the document, signed by the parties, must be sent to the DGD, at the latest by 30 days after it has taken effect. This means that when submitting the programme, the draft collaboration agreements must be provided.

Guide to establishing a Collaboration Agreement	
1)	The description of the common objective being sought;
2)	The description of roles and duties, as well as the allocation of tasks;
3)	Considerations and commitments in the area of stereotypes and representations of the beneficiaries and partners for any potential communication from the collaboration;
4)	The financial/material contribution of each of the parties;
5)	The total budget;
6)	A clause stating that the Belgian administration or its representative may at any moment carry out spot checks on how the subsidy is being used, both at the ANGC headquarters as well as the headquarters of the organization with whom the cooperation is established, by virtue of Articles 35, 5° and 50 of the Royal Decree of 11 September 2016 concerning non-governmental cooperation.

The signed collaboration agreements will therefore be appended to the programme once it has been approved.

When a collaboration is involved in multiple outcomes, the Collaboration Agreement linking it to the ANGC must be supplied all at the same time.

8. Non-JSF outcome: Contextual analysis

For an outcome that is not covered by a Joint Strategic Framework only: Provide an analysis of the local context (political, economic, social, environmental, ...), as well as national policies, in conjunction with the outcome/chosen sector. The contextual analysis must also include some analysis of the cross-cutting subjects of Gender and the Environment.

When there are several outcomes in one country, the contextual analysis may be distinguished by outcome or may cover the country all at once.

Maximum 5 pages.

9. Non-JSF outcome: Coherence with the organization's Strategic Plan

For an outcome that is not covered by a Joint Strategic Framework only: The organization must demonstrate that the country(-ies) concerned by the outcome is/are coherent with its Strategic Plan. In this context, it must provide an update of:

- The concise description and vision of the organization's mission in the area of development cooperation, and the role it wishes to play in this regard in the country;
- The concise description of the medium and long term objectives in this country;
- The concise description of the strategy that the organization intends to use to achieve the objectives described above.

Maximum 5 pages.

10. Description of the joint programme's cooperation strategy

For a joint programme only: the common strategy put in place by the programme must be described and explained: in other terms, its internal coherence. This coherence may take on different dimensions but it should be possible to demonstrate it.

Not all actors have to take part in all outcomes together necessarily, but there must be interaction between the different actors and the logic underpinning their cooperation must be presented.

Maximum 5 pages.

11. Structural Cooperation Agreement between the ANGC associates

For a joint programme only: the accredited organizations involved are expected to present a structural cooperation agreement.

Guide to establishing a Structural Cooperation Agreement	
1)	The description of the common objective being pursued;
2)	The description of roles and duties, as well as the distribution of tasks in the context of the cooperation;
3)	The financial/material contribution of each of the parties;
4)	The total budget;

The structural cooperation agreements signed by all parties must be **sent to the DGD by the time of submitting the joint programme at the latest.**