



CALL FOR PROPOSALS – 6th JULY 2026

Ukraine's Cities: Inclusive by Design

Disability-inclusive relief, response, recovery,
and reconstruction for cities and communities

Deadline for EOI submissions: **10th August 2026**



Call overview

Thematic priority	Ukraine's Cities: Inclusive by Design Disability-inclusive relief, recovery, and reconstruction for cities and communities
Geographic scope	Ukraine
Programme lots and budget size	Lot 1: Up to 350,000 USD per programme with at least 10% allocated to OPDs. Lot 2: Up to USD 500,000 per programme with at least 10% allocated to OPDs Lot 3: Up to 500,000 USD per initiative, with at least 10% allocated to OPDs.
Duration	Up to 24 months (divided into two phases).
Number of programmes	Lot 1: max 3 - Lot 2: max 2 - Lot 3: max 2
Eligible lead applicants	Lot 1 and Lot 2: Municipality, INGO, NGO, UN, Development bank, Academia, (max 1 lead applicant /proposal) For Lot 3, UN entities with humanitarian mandate, INGOs with active operational presence and humanitarian programming in the target city; national NGOs that have demonstrated experience in humanitarian disability programming. <i>If not UN, lead applicant must provide evidence of valid GDF framework agreement or satisfactory HACT/micro-HACT and satisfactory PSEAH assessments, or accepted equivalent such as EU pillar assessment or GCF accreditation.</i>
Partnerships	Multi-stakeholder consortium required Lot 1: Municipality and at least one OPD as one of the consortium partners is mandatory Lot 2: At least one OPD as one of the consortium partners is mandatory; strong municipality engagement in the programme required, as consortium partner strongly preferred Lot 3: One OPD as consortium partners is mandatory. Formal municipality partnership is strongly encouraged where municipal capacity permits, but is not mandatory, and documented engagement with municipal emergency structures serves as a minimum. Formal partnership with humanitarian coordination mechanism.
Co-financing	Evidence of co-financing or leverage from large-scale mainstream finance sources for Ukraine's urban recovery and reconstruction will be viewed as a strategic advantage and will significantly strengthen proposals, particularly under Lot 1.
Deadline for submission of the EOI	10 th August 2026 to globaldisabilityfundcalls@undp.org

Overview of the selection process

The call for Expression of Interest for Ukraine's Cities: Inclusive by Design, will be conducted through a two-step selection process.

- In **Step 1**, applicants will submit an Expression of Interest (EOI) outlining their core programme idea and demonstrating eligibility. The GDF Secretariat will first conduct a pre-screening comprising: (i) an eligibility check to confirm that submissions meet the call's minimum requirements; and (ii) a technical assessment of eligible EOIs against the pre-defined criteria. Shortlisted expressions of interest will proceed to the next stage. Balance between geographic, thematic and type of actor serving as lead applicant will be considered. Only shortlisted applicants will be formally invited to proceed to Step 2.
- In **Step 2**, shortlisted applicants will be invited to develop and submit full proposals using the programme guidance package and templates provided. Complete full proposals received by the deadline will be reviewed for eligibility and compliance by the GDF Secretariat. Eligibility and compliance requirements are non-negotiable: any proposal that does not meet these requirements will not be considered for the next step of the selection process. Eligible and compliant proposals will be then assessed through a transparent process by an external, independent assessment panel against 12 pre-defined criteria. Based on the panel's assessment, the GDF Secretariat will prepare a set of recommendations for review by the Programme Committee. The GDF secretariat recommendation will consider technical scores and ranking as well as a balance in the diversity of geographies, sub-themes and type of stakeholders acting as lead.

Contents

1. Background and rationale	1
Ukraine Context	1
GDF's Strategic Response.....	1
2. Purpose of the Call	1
3. Geographic scope	4
4. Thematic priority, sub-themes and challenges	4
Priority Sub-Theme 1: Inclusive and Resilient Urban Public Infrastructure	5
Priority Sub-Theme 2: Inclusive Urban Livelihoods and Economic Systems.....	5
Priority Sub-Theme 3: Integrated and Inclusive Urban Essential Services and Support Systems	6
Priority Sub-Theme 4: Institutionalization of Disability Inclusion in Municipal Governance, Data, and Digital Systems	7
5. Expected outcomes for this call for proposals	7
Lot 1: Scaling and Accelerating Disability-Inclusive Urban Recovery and Reconstruction	8
Lot 2: Incubating New Solutions for Inclusive Urban Service Delivery Systems	8
Lot 3: Strengthening Disability-Inclusive Relief, Response, and Early Recovery	9
6. Guidance for defining the programme thematic challenge and results framework at EoI stage	10
6.1 Priority Sub-Theme and Programme Thematic Challenge	10
6.2 Programme Impact.....	10
6.3 Programme Specific Objective	11
6.4 Contextualized Programme Outcomes	12
7. Partnership expectations.....	12
7.1 Multistakeholder formal consortium	12
7.2 Programme partnership and engagement	13
7.3 OPD Partnership and Engagement	14
8. Cross-Cutting Principles	15
9. Duration and phasing	15
Lot 1: Scaling and Accelerating	15
Lot 2: Incubating Innovative Solutions for Urban Service Delivery Systems	15
Lot 3: Strengthening Disability-Inclusive Relief, Response, and Early Recovery	16
10. Funding envelope and grant structure	16
11. Eligibility Criteria	17
11.1 Eligibility of Lead Applicant and Consortium Partnership	17
11.2 Eligible Thematic Challenge	18
11.3 Eligible Activities and Geographic Scope	19

11.4 Eligible and Ineligible Costs	19
12. Two-Step Selection Process	20
12.1 Overview	20
12.2 Eligibility and Technical Review Criteria	20
13. Application Process and Indicative Timeline	23
14. Expression of Interest Submission Instructions.....	23
How to Submit	23
Questions and Support	24

1. Background and rationale

Urban recovery after conflict or disaster is a critical decision point: cities can rebuild exclusionary systems or embed accessibility and inclusion from the start. Today, barriers remain systemic. Infrastructure, transport, housing, municipal data, procurement, and recovery financing often lack disability-inclusion standards, meaning even large reconstruction investments can reproduce exclusion.

The opportunity is equally systemic. Recovery and reconstruction create rare moments when infrastructure, services, policies, financing, and institutions are redesigned together. Embedding disability inclusion now is more durable and cost-effective than retrofitting later. For cities still under active conflict or humanitarian stress, the same logic applies. Emergency services, coordination systems, needs assessments, and response mechanisms must include persons with disabilities, disability-disaggregated data, and OPDs from the outset. Humanitarian response is therefore a parallel leverage point distinct from reconstruction, but equally decisive for inclusive urban futures.

Ukraine Context

Ukraine's recovery and reconstruction present a critical opportunity to embed disability inclusion from the start. An estimated 6 million people in Ukraine live with disabilities, while conflict-related injury, trauma, displacement, and disrupted services continue to increase need. Yet persons with disabilities remain under-identified and under-reached, including in humanitarian response.

More than 2 million persons with disabilities are among those in humanitarian need, and around two-thirds of internally displaced households include at least one person with a disability. Still, only 12% of people reached under the 2024 Humanitarian Needs and Response Plan were recorded as having a disability, highlighting a systemic gap in data, coordination, and service delivery.

With reconstruction needs estimated at nearly USD 588 billion over the next decade, Ukraine has a rare window to make accessibility, OPD leadership, inclusive services, governance, and financing part of recovery systems from the outset. This call responds to cities across the full recovery-reconstruction continuum from high-need urban areas still under humanitarian stress to cities ready to embed disability inclusion into large-scale reconstruction.

GDF's Strategic Response

The Global Disability Fund is launching this Call for Proposals to embed disability inclusion across Ukraine's urban relief, recovery, and reconstruction continuum. Recognizing that Ukrainian cities are at different stages, from acute humanitarian response to active reconstruction, the call supports systems-level change in how cities plan, deliver services and respond to emergencies. It aims to ensure that persons with disabilities and their representative organizations are identified, reached, and meaningfully involved as leaders and partners in shaping inclusive urban recovery.

The call reflects GDF's strategic focus on transforming systems and institutions, so disability inclusion is built into service delivery, emergency response, governance, financing, data, and reconstruction from the start not treated as an add-on.

2. Purpose of the Call

This Call for Proposals aims to place disability inclusion at the heart of Ukraine's urban relief, recovery, and reconstruction agenda. It seeks to support cities and communities across the full crisis-to-recovery

continuum: enabling those ready to scale inclusive recovery and reconstruction, supporting those developing new disability-inclusive service delivery models, and addressing the needs of those still confronting acute humanitarian challenges.

The call is divided into three lots:

Lot 1: Scaling and Accelerating Disability-Inclusive Urban Recovery and Reconstruction

Purpose: To accelerate and scale proven disability-inclusive solutions that strengthen urban recovery and reconstruction across Ukrainian cities.

This lot focuses on adapting and integrating evidence-based solutions into large-scale urban recovery plans, investments, and municipal systems. It is intended for initiatives with clear proof of concept and strong potential for scaling.

This lot prioritizes programmes that:

- address complex, systemic disability-inclusion challenges;
- demonstrate strong evidence-based models with a clear proof of concept;
- show secured municipal buy-in for scaling and acceleration; and
- present robust scaling strategies, including business and financing plans that GDF can support.

Lot 2: Incubating New Solutions for Inclusive Urban Service Delivery Systems

Purpose: To develop innovative, locally anchored solutions that address unmet needs of persons with disabilities in urban recovery and reconstruction contexts. Lot 2 is intended for early-stage solutions, prototypes, or ideas that are not yet ready for scaling but have strong potential to improve inclusive urban service delivery systems.

This lot prioritizes programmes that:

- address complex, systemic service delivery challenges related to disability inclusion;
- propose solutions that respond to unmet needs not yet solved by existing approaches;
- align with or contributing to municipal recovery and reconstruction priorities; and
- present a realistic incubation plan with clear milestones for prototype development, testing, and refinement.

Lot 3: Strengthening Disability-Inclusive Relief, Response, and Early Recovery in High-Need Urban Settings

Purpose: To support disability-inclusive approaches to essential service continuity, protection, emergency response, and early recovery in Ukrainian cities facing acute humanitarian need, where large-scale reconstruction investment pipelines are not yet operational.

This lot focuses on mainstreaming disability inclusion within existing city-level service delivery systems, humanitarian coordination mechanisms, and emergency response structures, with OPDs as co-designers, implementers, and accountability actors within those systems. It recognizes that cities under acute humanitarian stress require a different entry point: one that strengthens systems already operating now, rather than waiting for reconstruction conditions to emerge.

This lot prioritizes programmes that:

- address a specific systemic disability-inclusion gap in relief, early recovery service delivery, emergency response, or coordination;
- demonstrate active operational presence in the target city, with established relationships with humanitarian actors and OPDs;
- show engagement with the municipality or relevant emergency structures, even where formal partnership is constrained by the operating context;
- ensure persons with disabilities are identified, reached, and served through the programme;
- position OPDs as substantive actors in design, implementation, decision-making, and accountability, not only as consultees; and
- present a realistic co-design and implementation strategy adapted to insecurity and the humanitarian operating environment.

This call for proposals is expected to support

- **Lot 1: up to 3 programmes**
- **Lot 2: up to 2 programmes**
- **Lot 3: up to 2 programmes**

To achieve its ambition for systemic change, this Call for Proposals seeks programmes that strengthen disability-inclusive urban relief, recovery, and reconstruction at city and local levels. Programmes are expected to work across four interconnected pathways:

Pathway	Lot 1 Scaling and accelerating	Lot 2 Incubating new solutions	Lot 3 Relief, Response, and Early Recovery
Practices pathway	Contextualize, adapt, and replicate proven, evidence-based solutions for resilient and inclusive cities in Ukraine.	Identify, test, and develop promising locally led solutions for inclusive urban service delivery systems.	Identify, adapt, and embed disability-inclusive approaches within existing humanitarian service delivery systems, drawing on proven models where relevant and adapting them to acute humanitarian settings.
Partnerships pathway	Strengthen multi-stakeholder collaboration at city and national levels, with municipal ownership and meaningful OPD engagement	Build, strengthen, and formalize multi-stakeholder partnerships, with meaningful engagement from municipalities and OPDs.	Strengthen collaboration between humanitarian actors, municipal emergency structures, and OPDs, with OPDs in substantive decision-making roles and links to existing humanitarian coordination mechanisms.
Policies and financing pathway	Advance inclusive governance, policy, and financing reforms that support resilient and inclusive cities in Ukraine.	Initiate the policy and financing reforms needed for new inclusive service delivery solutions to become sustainable and scalable.	Integrate disability inclusion into humanitarian response plans, municipal emergency protocols, and early recovery financing frameworks.
Knowledge and learning pathway	Generate and share learning on how to scale disability inclusion in cities in Ukraine.	Generate and share learning on inclusive urban service delivery innovation and the shift from exclusionary to inclusive systems.	Generate operational evidence on disability inclusion in the transition from relief to early recovery in urban settings.

3. Geographic scope

The call is open to all cities across Ukraine.

Each proposed programme should focus on one city.

For Lot 1 and Lot 2 initiatives, applicants should clearly explain why the selected city is strategically relevant to the objectives of the call.

Lot 3 initiatives are expected to be implemented in high-need urban settings facing acute humanitarian needs, where large-scale reconstruction investment pipelines are not yet operational. Given the different operating context, Lot 3 initiatives will normally be implemented in cities other than those selected under Lot 1 and Lot 2.

Eligible cities under Lot 3 should have confirmed humanitarian access, a high concentration of internally displaced persons and/or proximity to frontline areas, and active humanitarian coordination structures.

In selecting initiatives, GDF will consider geographic balance, the quality of the proposal, the relevance of the city context, and the strategic fit of each initiative within the overall portfolio.

4. Thematic priority, sub-themes and challenges

The thematic priority of this call is **disability-inclusive urban relief, response, recovery, and reconstruction**.

Within this thematic priority, GDF has identified four priority sub-themes for this Call for Proposals. Applications are expected to focus on one clearly defined, large-scale thematic challenge that describes the core problem the programme aims to address. The selected challenge must directly contribute to at least one of the GDF priority sub-themes listed below.

Lots 1 and 2 may select from all four priority sub-themes. Lot 3 initiatives should focus primarily on sub-themes 3 or 4. Lot 3 initiatives can address sub-theme 1 if they only focus on emergency preparedness and infrastructure continuity, not on longer-term urban mobility or reconstruction.

Each priority sub-theme includes one overarching challenge and a set of related sub-challenges. Applicants must select the priority sub-theme most relevant to their programme and respond to an associated thematic challenge.

Guidance on how to select a priority sub-theme and define a programme challenge is provided in Section 6. Applications with a thematic challenge that falls outside the priority sub-themes of this call will not be eligible.

Priority sub-themes	Core Focus
1. Inclusive and resilient urban public infrastructure	Inclusive physical and digital infrastructure systems, including transport, housing, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), energy, and public spaces.

Priority sub-themes	Core Focus
2. Inclusive urban livelihoods and economic systems	Urban economic ecosystems, municipal economic, market and business services, skills development systems, labour markets, urban social protection systems, and financial products and services.
3. Integrated and inclusive urban essential services and support systems	Urban essential services, including health, rehabilitation, GBV response, WASH, nutrition, social protection, and emergency services.
4. Institutionalization of disability inclusion in municipal governance, data, and digital systems	Municipal data systems and civil registries, urban disaster risk reduction, preparedness and emergency response systems, municipal planning, budgeting and performance management systems, city-wide public information and communication systems, and accountability mechanisms.

Priority Sub-Theme 1: Inclusive and Resilient Urban Public Infrastructure

This sub-theme focuses on inclusive physical and digital infrastructure systems, including transport, housing, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), energy, and public spaces.

The overarching challenge for this sub-theme is:

How might we ensure that urban physical and digital infrastructure systems [including transport, housing, WASH, energy, and public spaces] enable safe, seamless mobility and full participation for persons with diverse disabilities in all aspects of city life?

Related sub-challenges include:

- How can we redesign the planning of urban infrastructure and transport systems to be inclusive and safe for persons with disabilities from the outset?
- How might we effectively remove physical and social mobility barriers that prevent persons with diverse disabilities from accessing transport networks, housing infrastructure, WASH facilities, energy systems, and public spaces?
- How might we improve first- and last-mile urban connectivity for assistive technology users and other mobility-impaired groups, so that independent mobility becomes the norm rather than an afterthought?
- How might we transform disaster preparedness and emergency response infrastructure systems, such as evacuation routes and shelters, so they protect persons with diverse disabilities and their caregivers before, during, and after climate and disaster events?

Priority Sub-Theme 2: Inclusive Urban Livelihoods and Economic Systems

This sub-theme focuses on urban economic ecosystems, municipal economic, market and business services, skills development systems, labour markets, urban social protection systems, and financial products and services.

The overarching challenge for this sub-theme is:

How might we transform urban economic ecosystems, so they systematically enable equitable economic participation and income security for persons with diverse disabilities?

Related sub-challenges include:

- How can we redesign municipal economic, market and business services — including business licensing, permits, and municipal economic development programmes — so they are accessible and responsive to the needs of persons with diverse disabilities?
- How can we transform skills development systems and apprenticeship programmes so they become inclusive of persons with diverse disabilities, in particular veterans with disabilities?
- How might we reduce barriers within urban labour markets, including informal and micro-enterprise sectors, that prevent persons with diverse disabilities, in particular veterans with disabilities, from accessing decent work, entrepreneurship opportunities, and participation in local value chains?
- How can we redesign city-level economic development strategies, public procurement systems, business registration processes, and incentive schemes so they actively promote the economic inclusion of veterans with disabilities including through disability-inclusive enterprises and employment?
- How might we ensure that urban social protection systems and financial services are accessible and responsive to persons with diverse disabilities, including by addressing economic vulnerability and the additional costs associated with disability before, during, and after crisis?
- How can we redesign financial products and services so that persons with diverse disabilities have equitable opportunities to access, use, and benefit from them?

Priority Sub-Theme 3: Integrated and Inclusive Urban Essential Services and Support Systems

This sub-theme focuses on urban essential services, including health, rehabilitation, GBV response, WASH, nutrition, social protection, and emergency services.

The overarching challenge for this sub-theme is:

How might we redesign the planning, financing, and delivery of urban essential services — including health, rehabilitation, GBV response, WASH, nutrition, social protection, and emergency services — so they are integrated, accessible, and affordable for persons with diverse disabilities, particularly those in informal settlements?

Related sub-challenges include:

- How can we build a robust urban ecosystem of care and support services, including assistive technology, personal assistance, and accessible transport, that improves the autonomy of persons with disabilities and their equitable access to all aspects of urban life?
- How might we build and integrate social protection systems and cross-sectoral referral pathways that reliably connect persons with disabilities to the full range of services they need, including health, housing, and livelihoods?
- How might we redesign urban essential service information systems including information on rights, entitlements, referral pathways, and service locations to ensure universal access for persons with diverse disabilities and their caregivers, including during crisis?
- How can we redesign essential urban service systems to ensure equitable continuity of care for persons with diverse disabilities during shocks and crises?
- How might we redesign urban emergency preparedness so that persons with disabilities can access uninterrupted support and services during climate and public health emergencies?
- How might we ensure that urban health systems, including maternal health and GBV response services, are accessible, safe, and responsive to women and girls with diverse disabilities?
- How can we redesign the planning and delivery of urban essential services to guarantee equitable and continuous access for persons with diverse disabilities in cities under active humanitarian stress, including during periods of infrastructure disruption and population displacement?

Priority Sub-Theme 4: Institutionalization of Disability Inclusion in Municipal Governance, Data, and Digital Systems

This sub-theme focuses on municipal data systems and civil registries, urban disaster risk reduction, preparedness and emergency response systems, municipal planning, budgeting and performance management systems, city-wide public information and communication systems, and accountability mechanisms.

The overarching challenge for this sub-theme is:

How might we institutionalize disability inclusion in municipal governance, data, and digital systems so that decision-making, public communication, and accountability are accessible to and informed by persons with diverse disabilities?

For Lot 3, the focus within this sub-theme should be on emergency data systems, disability-disaggregated needs identification, and the integration of disability inclusion into humanitarian needs assessments and response plans, rather than long-term municipal planning reform.

Related sub-challenges include:

- How might we redesign municipal data systems and civil registries, so they are inclusive of persons with diverse disabilities?
- How might we transform urban vulnerability and risk assessment systems, so they reflect the specific needs, perspectives, and priorities of persons with diverse disabilities?
- How might we design municipal planning, budgeting, and performance management systems that make disability inclusion visible, trackable, and binding?
- How might we transform preparedness and disaster risk reduction planning, budgeting, and governance systems so they meet the specific needs and vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities and their caregivers in crisis settings?
- How might we transform city-wide public information systems — including information on rights and entitlements, services, transport, emergencies, civic processes, and urban accessibility features — so they provide practical, inclusive, and user-centred resources for persons with diverse disabilities?
- How might we redesign municipal communication strategies to reach, represent, and positively portray persons with diverse disabilities?
- How can we develop sustainable and inclusive accountability mechanisms, such as feedback platforms, participatory monitoring, or municipal communication mechanisms, that enable persons with diverse disabilities to hold city authorities accountable for inclusive governance and services?
- How might we transform disaster preparedness and emergency response communication systems, such as emergency warning systems and signage, so they protect persons with diverse disabilities and their caregivers before, during, and after climate and disaster events?

5. Expected outcomes for this call for proposals

Lasting change for persons with disabilities requires shifting the systems that shape inclusion, autonomy, and full participation. Guided by the GDF global theory of change, this Call for Proposals is structured around four mutually reinforcing pathways for systemic transformation:

- **Practice:** Improving the design and delivery of disability-inclusive services, infrastructure, programmes, and urban recovery processes.
- **Partnerships:** Strengthening the leadership of Organizations of Persons with Disabilities and collaboration among cities, communities, civil society, service providers, and recovery actors.
- **Policy and financing:** Embedding disability inclusion in policies, plans, standards, budgets, and investment decisions that shape relief, recovery, and reconstruction.
- **Knowledge and learning:** Generating and sharing evidence, tools, models, and lessons to support wider adoption and scale.

Each programme should define clear, contextualized outcomes across these four pathways, aligned with its proposed lot, scope, timeframe, and operating context.

Guidance on how to define the programme challenge and results framework is provided in Section 6.

Lot 1: Scaling and Accelerating Disability-Inclusive Urban Recovery and Reconstruction

Lot 1 focuses on scaling proven, evidence-based solutions for disability-inclusive urban recovery and reconstruction. Programmes under this lot are expected to contribute to the following four outcomes:

Pathway	Outcome	Focus
Practice	[A-U-C1*]: High-impact, evidence-based solutions for disability-inclusive urban recovery and reconstruction are replicated at scale through adaptation and adoption in pilot city in Ukraine	Scaling proven innovative solutions through systematic replication, adaptation, and validation of proof of concept and scalability.
Partnerships	[A-U-C2*]: Equitable and inclusive multi-stakeholder collaborations drive the scaling of proven solutions and related policy and financing reforms in pilot city in Ukraine.	Strengthening partnerships and coalitions among local, specialized, and mainstream stakeholders to support contextualized replication and reform.
Policy and Financing	[A-U-C3*]: Disability inclusion is integrated into policies, governance systems, and financing mechanisms for urban recovery and reconstruction.	Embedding disability inclusion within municipal and national policies, governance systems, and sustainable financing mechanisms.
Knowledge and Learning	[A-U-C4*]: Knowledge and learning on scaling disability-inclusive urban recovery and reconstruction inform effective strategies.	Generating actionable insights from scaling processes and using evidence to refine strategies through rapid learning cycles.

* Please retain these outcome codes exactly as shown when completing Annex A: Expression of Interest Template (Section 5). The codes are standardized and should not be modified or renumbered.

Lot 2: Incubating New Solutions for Inclusive Urban Service Delivery Systems

Lot 2 focuses on identifying, developing, and testing locally led solutions for inclusive urban service delivery systems. Programmes under this lot are expected to contribute to the following four outcomes:

Pathway	Outcome	Focus
Practice	[N-U-C1*]: Small-scale, locally led innovative solutions for disability-inclusive urban service delivery systems are identified and piloted at local level.	Supporting the iterative development of locally led solutions through ideation, piloting, prototyping, learning, and adaptation.

Pathway	Outcome	Focus
Partnerships	[N-U-C2*]: Local and national partnerships, with meaningful participation of diverse OPDs, drive locally led disability-inclusive solutions.	Building, strengthening, and formalizing partnerships for inclusive urban service delivery innovation and systemic change.
Policy and Financing	[N-U-C3*]: Policy and financing reforms for inclusive urban service delivery systems are advanced, supporting sustainable scaling.	Advancing reforms to the laws, policies, governance systems, budgets, and financing mechanisms that shape mainstream service delivery systems.
Knowledge and Learning	[N-U-C4*]: Knowledge and learning on innovative solutions and reforms for inclusive urban service delivery informs adaptation and decision-making.	Generating, applying, and sharing data, evidence, and learning to support adaptation, practice change, and policy dialogue.

* Please retain these outcome codes exactly as shown when completing Annex A: Expression of Interest Template (Section 5). The codes are standardized and should not be modified or renumbered.

Lot 3: Strengthening Disability-Inclusive Relief, Response, and Early Recovery

Lot 3 focuses on adapting and embedding disability-inclusive approaches within existing humanitarian relief, emergency response, and early recovery systems. Programmes under this lot are expected to contribute to the following four outcomes:

Pathway	Outcome	Focus
Practice	[E-H-C1*]: Disability-inclusive solutions for humanitarian relief, emergency response, and early recovery are adapted and embedded within existing systems in pilot city.	Strengthening existing humanitarian relief, response, and early recovery systems by adapting and testing practical disability-inclusive approaches.
Partnerships	[E-H-C2*]: Multi-stakeholder collaborations, with OPDs in substantive decision-making and co-leadership roles, strengthen disability-inclusive humanitarian relief, response, and early recovery systems in target city in Ukraine.	Building collaboration among humanitarian and municipal actors, using existing coordination mechanisms, and ensuring OPDs engage as co-leaders or substantive decision-makers.
Policy and Financing	[E-H-C3*]: Opportunities for policy and financing reforms that integrate disability inclusion into humanitarian response plans and early recovery financing are developed, tested, and/or leveraged.	Strengthening existing humanitarian planning and financing systems by increasing accountability for disability inclusion.
Knowledge and Learning	[E-H-C4*]: Operational evidence on disability-inclusive humanitarian relief, response, and early recovery informs learning, adaptive management, and future programming.	Generating and sharing operational evidence on what works to strengthen disability inclusion across humanitarian relief, response, and early recovery systems.

* Please retain these outcome codes exactly as shown when completing Annex A: Expression of Interest Template (Section 5). The codes are standardized and should not be modified or renumbered.

6. Guidance for defining the programme thematic challenge and results framework at Eol stage

This section guides applicants on how to define the specific thematic challenge their programme will address and how to complete the results framework section of the EOI. It should be read together with the priority sub-themes and challenges in Section 4 and the expected outcomes in Section 5.

6.1 Priority Sub-Theme and Programme Thematic Challenge

Applicants must select one priority sub-theme from the four sub-themes identified in Section 4 and define one clear, contextualized, large-scale thematic challenge that the programme will address.

The challenge statement should describe the core systemic problem the programme seeks to solve. It should be framed as a question, using the format:

“How might we...” or “How can we...”

Applicants may:

- use or adapt one of the overarching challenge statements or sub-challenges listed under the relevant priority sub-theme;
- combine several related sub-challenges within the same priority sub-theme, provided they are reframed as one coherent challenge; or
- propose a different challenge, provided it is clearly aligned with the selected priority sub-theme, has a strong systems focus, and is feasible within the programme scope.

The selected priority sub-theme and challenge statement must be included in Section 2 of the EOI.

Applicants should also briefly demonstrate the scale and systemic nature of the challenge. This means showing that the issue is not limited to isolated cases, but is structural, recurring, and affects outcomes for a significant number of persons with disabilities. Evidence may include national or municipal data, research, OPD assessments, humanitarian or recovery needs assessments, published reports, or the applicant’s own systems analysis and learning.

The expected framing differs by lot:

- **Lot 1 – Scaling and Accelerating:** Programmes should address a large-scale systemic challenge in disability-inclusive urban recovery and reconstruction, using a proven solution or model that is ready to be adapted, replicated, and scaled.
- **Lot 2 – Incubating New Solutions:** Programmes should address a large-scale systemic challenge through the development and testing of a locally led solution, prototype, or early-stage idea that has the potential to contribute to wider systems change in the future.
- **Lot 3 – Relief, Response, and Early Recovery:** Programmes should focus on a specific systemic gap in disability inclusion within relief, emergency response, early recovery service delivery, humanitarian coordination, or emergency governance in the target city. The challenge must be clearly linked to the humanitarian operating context and supported by evidence such as humanitarian needs assessments, OPD situational analysis, service delivery gap analysis, or coordination mapping. Challenge statements for Lot 3 should reflect acute humanitarian conditions and should not assume stable municipal governance or active reconstruction investment pipelines.

6.2 Programme Impact

The programme impact should describe the long-term change the programme aims to contribute to in the lives of persons with disabilities. It should focus on the concrete improvement in their autonomy, resilience, inclusion, participation, access to services, or well-being that is expected to result from the broader system change.

6.3 Programme Specific Objective

Applicants should define the specific objective the programme expects to achieve by the end of the programme period. The specific objective should describe the systems-level change the programme will directly contribute to within the selected city, service, institution, or policy area.

The specific objective should contribute clearly to the programme impact. Shortlisted applicants may refine and finalize the specific objective during the full proposal development stage.

For each lot, the specific objective should be framed as follows:

- **Lot 1 – Scaling and Accelerating:** The specific objective should describe the medium-term systems-level change expected by the end of the programme as a result of adapting, replicating, and scaling a proven disability-inclusive solution. It should show how the programme contributes to the broader scaling vision for disability-inclusive urban recovery and reconstruction.
- **Lot 2 – Incubating New Solutions:** The specific objective should describe the stage of development the proposed solution is expected to reach by the end of the programme. It should show how the solution, prototype, or early-stage idea will generate systemic shifts in services, behaviors, policies, financing, or institutional practice, with potential for future scaling.
- **Lot 3 – Relief, Response, and Early Recovery:** The specific objective should describe the systems-level change expected within humanitarian relief, emergency response, or early recovery systems by the end of the programme. It should specify the delivery service, coordination, or emergency governance system being strengthened; the expected change in capacity, practice, or accountability; who will benefit; and in which city.

Key principles for framing the programme specific objective

The programme specific objective should be:

- **Systemic:** It should describe the systems-level change expected in relation to the thematic challenge, including changes in institutional practice, policy, financing, service delivery, and OPD participation.
- **Focused:** It should clearly identify the specific system, service, process, or institution the programme will change.
- **Time-bound:** It should state the change expected by the end of the programme period.
- **Contextualized:** It should reflect the city, country, target population, operating context, and selected lot.
- **Results-oriented:** It should describe the concrete change the programme expects to achieve, not only the activities it will implement.

A strong specific objective should answer the following questions:

- **By when?** The end date of the programme.
- **What system will change?** The specific system, service, process, or institution being strengthened or reformed.
- **What will change in that system?** For example, changes in policies, financing, service delivery, coordination, data, accountability, or OPD participation.

- **Who will benefit?** The specific groups of persons with disabilities, including where relevant by disability, gender, age, displacement status, or other intersecting factors.
- **Where?** The city, municipality, region, or national level where the change is expected.

6.4 Contextualized Programme Outcomes

All applications must define expected outcomes across the four pathways for systemic change. The emphasis on each pathway may vary depending on the selected lot, programme context, and thematic challenge.

For each pathway, applicants should state the contextualized outcome expected by the end of the programme period. Shortlisted applicants may refine these outcomes during the full proposal stage.

Contextualized outcomes should be informed by:

- the relevant GDF global outcomes for the selected lot in Section 5;
- the country and city context, selected thematic challenge, and system being targeted;
- the proposed solution or approach: a proven solution to scale for Lot 1, an early-stage solution to incubate for Lot 2, or a relief, response, and early recovery approach to embed for Lot 3; and
- the proposed scaling, incubation, or adaptive implementation strategy.

7. Partnership expectations

Country programmes must be implemented through strong collaboration among the actors needed to deliver systems change. This includes partners required to scale proven solutions under Lot 1, incubate new solutions under Lot 2, or strengthen disability-inclusive relief, response, and early recovery under Lot 3.

Collaboration should include both a formal multi-stakeholder consortium and broader programme partnerships. OPDs, municipalities or city authorities, and, where relevant, national government actors should play central roles in programme design, implementation, decision-making, and accountability.

The EOI must present an indicative partnership approach, including how formal consortium partners will be engaged, how partnerships will be formalized, and how coordination will be managed. Applicants should also describe how they will engage OPDs, municipal and national authorities, UN agencies, and other relevant stakeholders, whether as formal consortium partners or broader programme partners.

7.1 Multistakeholder formal consortium

Country programmes are expected to be implemented through formal multi-stakeholder consortia that bring together the actors needed to deliver systems change. This includes actors required to scale proven solutions under Lot 1, incubate new solutions under Lot 2, and strengthen disability-inclusive relief, response, and early recovery under Lot 3.

The lead applicant will provide overall programme leadership, coordinate implementation, convene the partnership, consolidate narrative and financial reporting, and serve as the main interface with GDF. The lead organization is expected to be one of the direct recipients of GDF funds and will be responsible for oversight of programme results and delivery. Further eligibility requirements for lead applicants are outlined in Section 11.1.

Consortium partners, also referred to as formal partners, are expected to formalize their collaboration through a signed partnership agreement. All consortium partners are mutually accountable for programme delivery and results.

At EOI stage, applicants must submit letters of agreement from expected consortium partners.

Consortia may include a diverse range of stakeholders. However, each lot must include the following partners

Lot 1: Scaling and Accelerating

- Municipality. (Municipalities can be lead applicants, please review requirements to be lead applicant)
- A formal partnership with at least one OPD as a consortium partner is mandatory. (OPDs cannot be lead applicants in this call)

Lot 2: Incubating New Solutions

- A formal partnership with at least one OPD as a consortium partner is mandatory. (OPDs cannot be lead applicants in this call)

Lot 3: Relief, Response, and Early Recovery

- Formal partnership with an entity holding a recognized coordination role in the humanitarian architecture is required. This may be a UN entity or a non-UN entity formally designated as cluster lead or co-lead, engaged through the UN cluster system or equivalent coordination mechanism.
- A formal partnership with at least one OPD as a consortium partner is mandatory. (OPDs cannot be lead applicants in this call)

Required Consortium Expertise

Across the consortium, formal partners should demonstrate relevant expertise and experience in the following areas:

- **Urban recovery and reconstruction in Ukraine:** Understanding of Ukraine's urban recovery and reconstruction context, including relevant local and national frameworks, policies, and financing mechanisms.
- **Systems change:** Technical capacity and track record in systems-level work, including policy development, institutional strengthening, service delivery reform, and stakeholder engagement at local or national level.
- **Innovation and scaling:** Capacity to incubate and develop early-stage solutions under Lot 2 and/or adapt and scale proven solutions under Lot 1, preferably in the sector relevant to the selected sub-theme.
- **Humanitarian operations:** For Lot 3, demonstrated capacity to operate in humanitarian settings, including experience with emergency response, humanitarian coordination, and adaptive implementation under conditions of insecurity.
- **OPD engagement and partnership:** Evidence of successful OPD partnerships or a clear plan to establish meaningful OPD engagement, leadership, and accountability.
- **Co-financing and resource leverage:** Ability to demonstrate co-financing or leverage additional resources from urban recovery, reconstruction, humanitarian, or other relevant financing sources. This is highly desirable, particularly for Lot 1.

7.2 Programme partnership and engagement

In addition to the formal consortium, programmes are expected to build broader partnerships with actors that are relevant to systems change, implementation, learning, and sustainability. These partnerships should support scaling under Lot 1, incubation under Lot 2, or disability-inclusive relief, response, and early recovery under Lot 3.

The level and type of engagement may vary depending on the programme design, the operating context, and the role of each actor. Broader programme partners may include:

- OPDs represent the diversity of persons with disabilities, including diversity by disability, gender, age, displacement status, and location within the urban context;
- community groups, CSOs, INGOs, women's rights organizations, and formal or informal service providers, including both mainstream and specialized providers;
- humanitarian actors and coordination mechanisms, particularly for Lot 3;
- academia, private sector actors, local authorities, national authorities, and other relevant institutions.

For Lot 1, strong engagement and ownership by local authorities, and where relevant national authorities, is required to support sustainable scaling through official coordination mechanisms.

For Lot 2, strong municipality engagement in the programme required, as consortium partner strongly preferred

For Lot 3, where formal municipal partnership is not feasible due to the humanitarian context, applicants must demonstrate engagement with municipal emergency structures or other relevant local coordination mechanisms.

Evidence of this engagement, such as letters of support or formal meeting records, will be required at the full proposal stage.

7.3 OPD Partnership and Engagement

At least one OPD must be included as a formal consortium partner. Beyond the formal consortium, programmes are expected to proactively engage diverse OPDs throughout the programme cycle, including in design, implementation, decision-making, monitoring, learning, and adaptation.

OPD engagement must be meaningful, accessible, and adequately resourced. Applicants are expected to:

- allocate at least 10% of the total programme budget to OPDs for direct implementation, with direct fund management by OPDs. This is an eligibility requirement; EOIs without a clear commitment to this allocation will not be considered;
- include a dedicated capacity-strengthening plan for OPDs, focused on institutional strengthening and not limited to training linked to programme activities;
- establish mechanisms that enable inclusive, accessible, and equitable OPD participation from the design and planning stage onward;
- budget accessibility-related costs as core programme costs, including sign language interpretation, transport, personal assistance, accessible materials, assistive technology, and other reasonable accommodations;
- recognize OPD expertise through appropriate compensation for OPD staff time and contributions.

OPDs cannot serve as lead applicants under this call. A separate call for proposals, open exclusively to OPDs and focused on OPD-led innovation and systems change for urban recovery and reconstruction in Ukrainian cities, will be launched after this call.

For Lot 3, the mandatory 10% OPD budget allocation remains the minimum requirement. Given the acute humanitarian context and the central role of OPDs in community-based disability identification, outreach, and accountability, proposals that allocate a higher share of funding to OPDs will be viewed favorably during technical review.

8. Cross-Cutting Principles

These principles set minimum expectations for inclusive, rights-based, and safe programming across design, delivery, monitoring, and learning. All proposals should reflect the following, where relevant:

- **Universal design and accessibility:** Ensure accessible participation, engagement, communication, services, and activities.
- **Intersectionality:** Combine systemic mainstreaming with targeted interventions, and ensure MEL captures disaggregated data, lived experiences, and power dynamics.
- **Inclusive procurement:** Embed accessibility and universal design requirements in procurement documents, contracts, and terms of reference.
- **Disability- and gender-inclusive MEL:** Ensure all MEL tools, processes, and knowledge products integrate disability and gender considerations.
- **Local, indigenous, and traditional knowledge:** Reflect local cultural, social, and legal realities, while respecting participation, cultural protocols, and data sovereignty.

9. Duration and phasing

Programmes may have a maximum duration of 24 months from the start date and must be implemented in two phases.

Lot 1: Scaling and Accelerating

Phase 1: Transitioning to Scale — 3 to 9 months

By the end of Phase 1, programmes should have assessed readiness to scale, validated the proof of concept, completed organizational scalability assessments, and co-designed scaling plans. They should also have formalized consortium partnerships, developed broader programme partnerships, and established measurement, learning, and knowledge strategies to inform scaling.

Only programmes assessed as ready to scale at the end of Phase 1 will proceed to Phase 2 and access related funding, based on an agreed plan. The exact duration of Phase 1 will depend on initial readiness to scale.

Phase 2: Scaling and Accelerating Change — 15 to 21 months

Phase 2 will implement the scaling strategies developed and adapted through Phase 1. The duration will depend on the total programme length and the final duration of Phase 1. The number of programmes funded in Phase 2 will depend on the end-of-Phase 1 readiness assessment.

Lot 2: Incubating Innovative Solutions for Urban Service Delivery Systems

Phase 1: Understanding and Ideating — 3 to 9 months

By the end of Phase 1, programmes should have deepened their understanding of the systemic challenge, identified and assessed feasible solution ideas, developed a prototyping plan, and identified priority policy and financing needs to support the proposed solution. They should also have formalized consortium partnerships, explored broader programme partnerships, and established measurement, learning, and knowledge strategies to inform incubation.

Only programmes assessed as ready for incremental prototyping and related policy or financing reform will proceed to Phase 2 and access related funding, based on an agreed plan. The exact duration of Phase 1 will depend on initial readiness to prototype.

Phase 2: Prototyping and validating — 15 to 21 months

Phase 2 will implement iterative prototyping of the innovative solution and related policy or financing reforms, adapted based on Phase 1 findings. The duration will depend on the total programme length and the final duration of Phase 1.

Lot 3: Strengthening Disability-Inclusive Relief, Response, and Early Recovery

Phase 1: Systemic Needs Assessment, Actor Mapping, and Co-Design — 3 to 9 months

By the end of Phase 1, programmes should have completed a disability-specific gap analysis within the target city's humanitarian coordination and service delivery systems; mapped humanitarian actors, OPDs, and municipal emergency structures; assessed OPD capacity and partnership readiness; and co-designed the Phase 2 implementation plan with OPDs and humanitarian partners.

A readiness assessment will determine whether the programme proceeds to Phase 2. The exact duration will depend on the complexity of the operating environment.

Phase 2: Implementation and Early Institutionalization — 15 to 21 months

Phase 2 will implement disability-inclusive relief and early recovery interventions, adapted from Phase 1 findings. The focus should be on strengthening existing service delivery platforms and humanitarian coordination mechanisms, rather than creating parallel systems.

Early institutionalization means embedding disability inclusion within municipal emergency protocols, humanitarian cluster planning cycles, or service delivery operating procedures, so that changes can continue beyond the grant period. The duration will depend on the total programme length and the final duration of Phase 1.

10. Funding envelope and grant structure

This call offers one unified funding stream for systems-level disability-inclusive urban relief, recovery, and reconstruction in Ukraine.

Maximum GDF funding per programme:

- **Lot 1: Up to USD 350,000, divided across two phases**

- **Lot 2: Up to USD 500,000, divided across two phases**
- **Lot 3: Up to USD 500,000, divided across two phases**

Funding will be phased as follows:

- **Phase 1:** approximately 30% of the total budget
- **Phase 2:** approximately 70% of the total budget

Access to Phase 2 funding will depend on the results of the end-of-Phase 1 readiness assessment and an agreed implementation plan.

Co-financing or resource leverage is highly desirable, particularly for Lot 1, where GDF is expected to contribute as one co-financing partner. GDF aims to support initiatives that are already developed and ready to scale by providing complementary funding and disability-inclusion expertise.

For Lot 2, GDF aims to support early-stage solutions that are embedded within broader programmes or strategies, rather than stand-alone activities, and that can progress toward proof of concept and future readiness for scaling.

For Lot 3, co-financing may include leverage from humanitarian pooled funds, CERF, EU humanitarian instruments, or other emergency financing sources.

Co-financing may support the full programme or a specific programme outcome. It may include:

- direct financial co-financing of programme activities; or
- leverage of larger mainstream investments that can be made more disability-inclusive through the programme.

11. Eligibility Criteria

11.1 Eligibility of Lead Applicant and Consortium Partnership

To be eligible, the lead applicant must meet the following requirements:

1. Eligible organization type

For **Lots 1 and 2**, eligible lead applicants include:

- municipalities;
- INGOs;
- NGOs;
- UN agencies;
- academic institutions;
- development banks.

For **Lot 3**, eligible lead applicants include:

- UN agencies with humanitarian mandates;
- international NGOs with active operational presence and humanitarian programming in the target city;
- National NGOs that meet GDF due diligence requirements and have demonstrated experience in humanitarian disability programming.

2. Presence or registration in Ukraine

The lead applicant must have physical presence in Ukraine and/or be legally registered in Ukraine.

Lead applicants that are not UN entities and do not have a valid framework agreement with GDF must have valid PSEAH and micro-HACT assessments at the time of application and for the duration of the programme. Non-UN organizations that are EU pillar-assessed or GCF-accredited may provide these assessments in lieu of a full HACT assessment. HACT and PSEAH assessments are valid for five years.

3. Relevant capacity and experience

The lead applicant must demonstrate relevant capacity and experience in:

- urban recovery and reconstruction for Lots 1 and 2, including service delivery systems for Lot 2 and the selected priority sub-theme;
- the Ukrainian local and national context;
- management of multi-stakeholder consortium partnerships;
- engagement and collaboration with OPDs;
- for Lot 3, humanitarian programming in Ukraine or comparable conflict-affected contexts, disability inclusion in humanitarian response, and established relationships with OPDs and humanitarian coordination mechanisms in the target city.

4. Financial and operational capacity

The lead applicant must demonstrate financial and operational management capacity, including systems capable of managing grants of up to USD 500,000, experience managing grants of similar scale, and adequate procurement, risk management, safeguarding, and compliance systems.

5. Consortium partnership requirements

Each proposal must include a formal consortium partnership with the lead applicant and relevant partners.

- For Lot 1, formal partnership with a municipality as a consortium partner is required.
- For Lots 1, 2, and 3, formal partnership with at least one OPD as a consortium partner is mandatory.
- For lot 3 Formal partnership with an entity holding a recognized coordination role in the humanitarian architecture is required. This may be a UN entity or a non-UN entity formally designated as cluster lead or co-lead, engaged through the UN cluster system or equivalent coordination mechanism.

Please note:

- A lead applicant in one proposal may be a formal partner in another proposal.
- An organization may serve as lead applicant in only one proposal.
- The same organization may be listed as a formal partner in multiple proposals.

11.2 Eligible Thematic Challenge

The proposed thematic challenge must align with and directly contribute to one of the priority sub-themes of this Call for Proposals. Applications with a thematic challenge outside the call's priority sub-themes will not be eligible.

11.3 Eligible Activities and Geographic Scope

Proposals must clearly specify the lot under which they are applying. Applications that merge or combine lots will not be admissible.

Proposed activities must align with the purpose and thematic focus of the call, the selected priority sub-theme, and the results framework.

Only applications that meet the geographic scope of this call will be eligible. Applications outside the defined geographic scope will not be considered.

11.4 Eligible and Ineligible Costs

The requested budget must remain within the maximum GDF funding limit for the selected lot.

Eligible costs may include:

- staff and technical expertise;
- transfers or grants to OPDs, with at least 10% of the total programme budget allocated to OPDs for direct implementation and direct fund management. This is an eligibility requirement; EOIs without a clear plan and budget commitment for this allocation will not be considered;
- OPD capacity development, engagement, and participation costs, including personal assistance, transport, accessible materials, sign language interpretation, and assistive technology needed for participation;
- individual support linked to reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities and OPD participation in the programme;
- reasonable accommodation for programme activities, including digital, communication, and physical accessibility;
- activities related to scaling readiness assessment and the design and implementation of scaling strategies;
- partnership costs, including consortium and steering committee meetings;
- policy engagement and reform processes;
- monitoring, evaluation, and learning. GDF requires 7% to 10% of the total programme budget to be allocated to MEL, including joint review and learning meetings, with learning representing 3% to 4% of the total budget;
- research, budgeted separately from MEL;
- coordination costs, including planning, management, reporting, oversight, and alignment across partners and stakeholders;
- partner consultations, coordination, and management;
- communication and visibility costs;
- indirect costs, such as office rent and supplies. Indirect costs must be 7% of the programmable budget, with no variation.

Costs that may be considered with prior justification and GDF approval include:

- infrastructure, assistive device, service delivery, or technology development costs related to the design, testing, and adaptation of innovative solutions;
- costs related to the design, development, testing, and adaptation of small-scale, low-cost innovative solutions;

- costs related to testing and adaptation of innovative solutions at larger scale or with higher associated costs;
- international travel for cross-country learning or global engagement.

Any such costs must be clearly identified and justified in the budget.

Costs that are not eligible under any circumstances include:

- full-scale implementation costs for infrastructure investment, assistive device production, service delivery, or technology dissemination. These costs are expected to be financed through larger mainstream investments;
- capital equipment purchases;
- land or building acquisition;
- service delivery not linked to innovation testing, adaptation, or scaling; except where service delivery costs are part of approved Lot 3 disability-inclusive relief, response, or early recovery interventions.
- assistive device distribution not linked to innovation testing or adaptation;
- ongoing rehabilitation or therapy services not linked to innovation testing or adaptation;
- regular education services not linked to innovation testing or adaptation;
- individual support not related to reasonable accommodation for the participation of persons with disabilities and OPDs;
- individual scholarships or tuition fees;
- individual medical expenses.

12. Two-Step Selection Process

12.1 Overview

This call will follow a two-step selection process.

Step 1: Expression of Interest

Applicants submit an Expression of Interest. Eligible EOIs will undergo eligibility screening and technical assessment. Geographic, thematic, and lead applicant diversity will be considered in shortlisting.

Step 2: Full Proposal

Shortlisted applicants will submit full proposals. The GDF Secretariat will conduct eligibility and compliance screening. Eligible and compliant proposals will then be assessed by an external independent panel against predefined criteria. Based on the assessment, the GDF Secretariat will prepare recommendations for Programme Committee review.

12.2 Eligibility and Technical Review Criteria

Expression of Interest

EOIs will be reviewed against the following criteria:

1. Administrative eligibility and compliance

- lead applicant type and legal status;
- lead applicant capacities and expertise;

- HACT and PSEAH assessment status, where applicable;
- consortium partner letters;
- geographic scope;
- minimum 10% programme budget allocated to OPDs;
- total programme budget within the lot funding ceiling;
- thematic alignment with the call theme and priority sub-themes;
- eligible activities;
- eligible costs.

2. Relevance and alignment

Relevance to GDF priorities, national and local priorities, and the needs and demands of persons with disabilities, as well as clarity of the thematic challenge. For Lot 3, relevance will be assessed against the humanitarian context and the applicant's active operational presence in the target city, not against a reconstruction investment pipeline.

3. Solution innovativeness

Credibility and distinctiveness of the solution, and quality of the proposed scaling or incubation strategy. For Lot 3, this criterion assesses the credibility and distinctiveness of the operational approach and the quality of the adaptive implementation and early institutionalization strategy.

4. Consortium, broader partnership, and government engagement

Relevance and quality of formal consortium partnerships, broader programme partnerships, and engagement with government or relevant authorities.

5. OPD engagement

Relevance, diversity, and quality of OPD engagement, including OPD budget management, participation, influence, decision-making, and institutional capacity strengthening.

6. Impact and effectiveness

Coherence of the intervention logic, contribution to systems change, and appropriateness of budget phasing.

7. Budget and co-financing

Realism of the total budget, budget distribution, and evidence of co-financing mobilized or leveraged.

Full Proposals

Full proposals will be reviewed against the following criteria:

1. Administrative eligibility and compliance

- lead applicant type and legal status;
- lead applicant capacities and expertise;
- signed letters from all expected consortium partners;
- geographic scope;

- thematic alignment with the call theme and priority sub-themes;
- minimum 10% programme budget allocated to OPDs for direct management;
- total programme budget within the lot funding ceiling;
- eligible activities;
- eligible costs;
- letter of consent from the relevant local authority, national authority, municipal emergency structure, or coordination body, as applicable to the lot and operating context.

2. Relevance and alignment

How well the programme responds to the call purpose, selected sub-theme, and national and local priorities.

3. Solution innovativeness

How credible and distinct the proposed solution or idea is, and how well suited the scaling or incubation strategy is.

4. Consortium, broader partnership, and government engagement

How relevant and substantive the planned partnerships and government engagement are.

5. OPD engagement

How diverse, meaningful, and well-resourced OPD participation is across design, decision-making, implementation, and budget management.

6. Impact and effectiveness

How coherent the intervention logic is and how convincingly it contributes to systemic change.

7. Budget and co-financing

How realistic and well-distributed the budget is, and how much co-financing is mobilized or leveraged.

8. Value for money

How efficiently the proposed budget translates into expected results.

9. Monitoring, evaluation, and learning

How well the MEL approach captures disability- and gender-disaggregated evidence and supports adaptive learning.

10. Intersectionality

How well the programme addresses overlapping forms of exclusion, particularly for women and girls with disabilities.

11. Sustainability

How likely the results are to continue and become embedded within mainstream systems beyond the grant period.

12. Risks and safeguards

How well the programme identifies risks and includes adequate safeguarding measures.

13. Application Process and Indicative Timeline

Step 1: Launch of the Call for Proposals — Week 1

The call is published and disseminated through relevant channels.

Step 2: Expression of Interest Submission — by 10th August 2026

Applicants must submit the EOI using the required template globaldisabilityfundcalls@undp.org.

Incomplete EOIs or EOIs submitted after the deadline will not be considered.

Step 3: EOI Review and Shortlisting — approximately 4 weeks

Selected EOIs will be invited to submit a full proposal.

Step 4: Full Proposal Development Phase — 4 to 6 weeks

Shortlisted applicants will be invited to develop and submit a full proposal.

- Approximately one week after the invitation, shortlisted applicants will receive the full proposal development package. The submission deadline will be confirmed at that time.
- Approximately two weeks after the invitation, all shortlisted applicants will be required to participate in a mandatory kick-off workshop.
- A question-and-answer mechanism will remain open until two weeks before the full proposal submission deadline.

Step 5: Full Proposal Submission

Shortlisted applicants submit full proposals by the confirmed deadline.

Step 6: Proposal Review and Selection — approximately 6 weeks

Full proposals are reviewed and final selections are made.

Step 7: Grant Agreements and Transfer of Funds — approximately 6 weeks

This stage may include due diligence processes, where required.

Step 8: Start of Implementation

Programmes that are already compliant with GDF due diligence requirements are expected to begin implementation in January 2027.

14. Expression of Interest Submission Instructions

How to Submit

Applicants must:

- complete the attached EOI template (Annex A) in English;
- Attach letters of agreement from expected consortium partners, and due diligence or registration documents where applicable.

- Attach Evidence of valid GDF framework agreement, HACT/micro-HACT and PSEAH assessments, or accepted equivalent such as EU pillar assessment or GCF accreditation
- submit it by 10th August 2026 to globaldisabilityfundcalls@undp.org;
- ensure all required fields are completed.

Incomplete EOIs will not be considered.

Questions and Support

Applicants requiring support or clarification should contact globaldisabilityfundcalls@undp.org by 5th August 2026.