## PRC/Non-PRC Review Submission and Approval Form

|  |
| --- |
| **Partnership Submission & Approval Form** |
| Submission to the [ ]  Partnership Review Committee (above $100,000 or higher office-established threshold)[ ]  Non- Partnership Review (Simplified Programme Documents below $100,000 /Humanitarin)  (to be filled by the requesting officer before submitting to the PRC secretary) |
| Name of proposed CSO partner |  |
| Title of proposed programme document |  |
| Date programme document submitted by partner |  |
| Total value of UNICEF’s contribution to programme document  | Cash | % |
| Supplies | % |
| Total | % |
| Total value of Partner contribution to programme document | Cash | % |
| Supplies | % |
| Total | % |
| Total PD Value | Currency & Value |
| The following documents are attached to the submission:

|  |
| --- |
| Type of document submitted to PRC |
| **[ ]**  Partner Declaration, Profile and Due Diligence Verification *(for partners without internet access)* |
| [ ]  PCA *(only for new partners in programme cycle)* |
| [ ]  Programe Document or [ ]  Amendment  |
| [ ]  Final partnership review/progress report *(for existing partners only)* |
| [ ]  Other, indicate: |

 |
| Type of CSO selection approach used and documentation:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CSO selection approach | [ ]  Open selection [ ]  Direct selection  |
| [UN Partner Portal](https://www.unpartnerportal.org/landing/) ID# |  |
| Reference document | Evaluation matrix attached to the submission |
| If direct selection, explain rationale for not using open selection:: |  |

 |
| **Submitted By:** Porgramme Document Focal PersonThe CSO selection and all technical elements of the submission have been agreed by programme focal person:Name: ……………………………………… Signature: ……………………………Title: …..…………………………………… Date: …………………………………. |
| **Endorsed By:** Porgramme Document Budget OwnerProgramme budget owner is overall satisfaied with partner selection, intervention scope, planned results and has been granted to use of funds. Name of Budget Owner: …………………………….. Signature: …………………………Title: …..…………………………………… Date: ……………………………… |
| **Reviewed By**: PRC secretaryThis submission is complete with regards to documentation.Name: ……………………………………… Signature: ……………………………Title: …..…………………………………… Date: …………………………………. |
| Review and recommendationTo be completed during the PRC meeting or by the Deputy Representative of Programmes or Chief of Field Office for non-PRC review) |
| **Date of Review:** Click here to enter a date. |
| The PRC/Dy. Rep has reviewed the key elements of the submission as noted below.

| Considerations | Yes | No | Comments (if required) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The proposed relationship is best represented and regulated by partnership (as opposed to procurement), with both UNICEF and the CSO making clear contributions to the PD/SPD | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| The partner selection evidences the CSO’s comparative advantage and value for money in relation to the planned results | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Previous UNICEF/UN relationships with the proposed CSO have been positive | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| The proposed PD/SPD is relevant to achieving results in the country programme document, the relevant sector workplan and or humanitarian response plan | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| The results framework of the proposed PD/SPD has been guided by M&E feedback during the drafting process | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| Gender, equity and sustainability have been considered in the programme design process | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| The budget of the proposed PD/SPD is aligned with the principles of value for money with the effective and efficient programme management costs adhering to office defined limits | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |
| The relevant supply issues have been duly considered | [ ]  | [ ]  |  |

 |
| **Recommendation:** [recommends / does not recommend] that the UNICEF Authorized Officer should approve the submission.With the following adjustments *(if any)*:1. ..………………………………………………………………………………………………
2. ..………………………………………………………………………………………………
3. ..………………………………………………………………………………………………

Submission requires another review before submission to the Authorised Officer: YES: …… NO: …….. |
| For only PRC Submission: Signature of PRC Members

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Member name | Signature | Date | Objections |
| Chair: |  |  |  |
| Member 1: |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

**For Non -PRC review:** Dy Rep/Chief of Field office: Signatire & Date  |
| **Approving Officer:** I have reviewed the above recommendation and agree / disagree with the recommendation. The submission is: Approved …… Not Approved …….Comments *(required if not approved)*: …………………………………..……………………….…………………………………………………………………………………………………............................................……………………………………………………………………………………............................................ |
| Name: ……………………………………………… Signature: ……………………………Title: …..…………………………………….……… Date: ………………………………….  |