

APPENDIX 2: RAM LIGHT V.3 STANDARDS

THE APPLICANT ORGANIZATION
<p><u>Standard 1: The applicant's strategy</u></p> <p>The applicant has a general, long-term and realistic plan for the development work. The applicant has good analysis that provide justification for geographical and thematic priorities.</p>
<p><u>Standard 2: Development competence and capacity</u></p> <p>The applicant possesses professional and administrative competence and capacity to implement the planned work. This includes knowledge about the country(ies) concerned and relevant technical competence.</p>
<p><u>Standard 3: The organization's financial sustainability</u></p> <p>The applicant documents financial sustainability by providing an overview of all sources of revenue in addition to public funding and can provide a minimum of 10% of project costs (where required by the respective Grant Scheme Rules). The applicant also has sufficient equity to allow for some level of lack of funds over a certain period or cover possible losses (i.e. related to possible fraud).</p>
<p><u>Standard 4: Financial management</u></p> <p>The applicant exercises appropriate internal financial management and adequate follow-up and monitoring of partners. Financial irregularities are prevented, disclosed and actively followed up at all levels. The applicant undertakes a background check of its partners (e.g. <i>due diligence</i>). The applicant adheres to established routines to avoid corruption.</p>

PROGRAMME AND PROJECT PLANS
<p><u>Standard 5: Norwegian priorities for development policy</u></p> <p>The applicant's plans are relevant for the objectives and target groups as described in the National Budget (Budget Proposition 1 S, budget item 160.70) and the Storting's deliberations of the same. The plans fits with development priorities within central thematic areas.</p>

Standard 6: Context analysis and local needs

The applicant's plans for the work are based on credible context analysis. The plans appear to be relevant and realistic. The plans are based on real needs among target groups and civil society in the target country, the country's own development plans and the work of other actors.

Standard 7: Partners

The choice of cooperating partners is well argued, and the applicant demonstrates reflection on the partnership model. The applicant documents that the legitimacy of all partners has been assessed. The applicant systematically seeks to establish or maintain equal relations with its partners. The applicant has assessed the sustainability and plans for phasing out, thus permitting the partner to continue the initiatives and/or maintain the results when the support discontinues.

Standard 8: Results based management

The applicant submits results-oriented plans with a solid results framework. The applicant builds upon theories of change and/or a justification of how the initiative(s) will help address the main challenges that have been identified. Emphasis is placed on the clarity and logical structure of the results framework, and the inclusion of clear, measurable and realistic development objectives at the societal level (impact), at end user level (outcome) and at the delivery level (output); relevant indicators for goal achievement; reference to baseline data; and disaggregated data. The applicant's added value which is operationalized and measurable will count as a strength in the appraisal. The applicant can document capacity and routines for risk and results management internally in the organization.

Standard 9: Risk analysis

The applicant systematically identifies and analyses relevant risks that may prevent achievement of the objectives. The applicant has appropriate routines for following up and managing risks.

The applicant has identified significant risk factors that may have a negative effect on the cross-cutting issues for 1) human rights, especially linked to co-determination, accountability and non-discrimination, 2) women's rights and gender equality, 3) climate and environment, and 4) anti-corruption.

In the appraisal of the risks for not achieving the objectives and cross-cutting issues, emphasis will be placed on how the applicant has 1) identified risk factors, 2) assessed their probability and consequence, and 3) planned possible measures to reduce their probability and consequence. The appraisal includes internal as well as external risk factors.

Standard 10: Budget

The applicant's budgeted costs appear to be relevant, necessary and realistic for the implementation of the plans in such a way that the objectives are achieved. The applicant works with the partner(s) when preparing the budget.

The plans and budgets show how the costs have been distributed among the various sections of the applicant organization and the partners. The distribution of costs seems reasonable according to type of activity and value-added at each level. The applicant demonstrates reflection on the costs, and these appear justifiable and cost-effective.

RESULTS ACHIEVED

Standard 11: Changes at the outcome and societal levels

With the partners, the applicant has helped produce positive change at the outcome level. The applicant has determined the likelihood of the efforts having helped produce change at the societal level. The applicant has documented the results achieved and critically reflects on discrepancies and experiences. The applicant's added value is appraised, and if it has been included as an objective and is measurable, this will count as a strength in the appraisal.

Standard 12: Strengthening of civil society organizations

The applicant has helped produce positive changes for civil society organizations in the target country and is able to provide specific documentation of this.

Standard 13: Learning and adaptation

The applicant deliberately draws on experience and relevant evaluations to adapt and renew the efforts. The applicant provides representative examples to illustrate this.

Standard 14: Cost efficiency and budget control

Project accounts document that the applicant has exercised good budget control and has handled any deviations appropriately. Larger deviations between budget and accounting is explained and, where required (according to the contract), prior approval from Norad has been obtained. Achieved results are according to use of funds as specified in the accounts.