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# **1. Assignment of User Roles in UNPP**

UNPP currently has four different user roles on the UN side at Country Office level: UN Reader, UN Basic Editor, UN Advanced Editor, and UN Administrator. Additionally, UNPP has one user role on the UN side at HQ level: UN HQ Editor. The table below provides a brief overview of each of these five roles.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **User Role** | **User Permissions** | **UNICEF Staff Profile** |
| **UN Reader** | * View UN-published information on open selection and direct selection partnership opportunities * View CSO profiles, including information on UN cash transfers, if the CSO’s vendor number has been added * View verification status of CSO profiles * View number—but not content—of observations added to CSO profiles * Generate reports on CSOs | * UNPP is integrated with UNICEF’s Active Directory. All UNICEF staff with an @unicef.org e-mail address will be able to access UNPP and with user permissions set to the UN Country Office Reader role by default. * Staff profile: Any staff member who is not subsequently assigned a more advanced user role. |
| **UN Basic Editor** | * *All UN Reader permissions* * Add vendor number to CSO profiles to push VISION data on UNICEF cash transfers * Draft—but not publish—open selection and direct selection partnership opportunities * View and assess CSO applications submitted for open selection calls drafted by or assigned to the user * Nominate—but not select—CSOs for open or direct selection partnership opportunities * Finalize open selection and direct selection partnership opportunities created by the user * Generate reports on partnership opportunities | * The UN Basic Editor role is for UNICEF staff who are involved in day-to-day partnership processes at working level and have a secretarial/technical role in preparing partnership documentation (e.g. drafting open and direct selection partnership opportunities for management review) and supporting partnership selection processes. * Staff profile: Programme Associate, Programme Officer, Operations Officer |
| **UN Advanced Editor** | * *All UN Basic Editor permissions* * Publish open selection and direct selection partnership opportunities * Select CSO for an open or direct selection partnership opportunity, and notify selected CSO accordingly * Finalize open selection and direct selection partnership opportunities for which the user is focal point * View number—and content—of observations added to CSO profiles. * Add new observations to CSO profiles * Escalate risk observations to UN HQ editor * Conduct due diligence and “verify” national CSOs in one’s country, as well as national offices of international CSOs whose headquarters have already been verified by a UN HQ Editor * Generate reports on verifications and observations | * The UN Advanced Editor role is for UNICEF staff who are involved in oversight of partnership processes and have a technical/management role in reviewing or signing off on partnership documentation (e.g. authorizing the publication of open and direct selection opportunities) and managing partnership selection processes. * UNICEF staff who have professional responsibility to access and/or add potentially sensitive risk observations associated with CSO profiles should also be given the UN Advanced Editor role. * Staff profile: Section Chief, Partnerships Specialist, Chief of Field Office, Deputy Representative, Chief of Operations |
| **UN Administrator** | * *All UN reader permissions* * Assign user roles to colleagues * Deactivate users | * Each UNICEF Country Office should have 1-2 staff members with the UN Administrator role. Upon a Country Office’s initial adoption of UNPP, the UN Administrator is responsible for upgrading users from the default UN Reader role to a UN Basic Editor or UN Advanced Editor role as appropriate, based on the instructions of the Deputy Representative. The UN Administrator is responsible for maintaining users as staff members join or leave the Country Office. * Staff profile: IT colleague |
| **UN HQ Editor** | * *All UN reader permissions* * Add new observations to CSO profiles * Receive and respond to risk observations escalated by UN Advanced Editors * Conduct due diligence and “verify” the headquarters profiles of international CSOs, as well as any other CSO profiles * Generate reports on partnership opportunities and verifications and observations | * UNICEF Field Results Group (FRG) will assign the UN HQ Editor role to relevant HQ colleagues involved in management and oversight of civil society implementing partners. * Staff profile: FRG Implementing Partnership Management Specialist, DOC Civil Society Partnership Specialist |

# **2. Considerations for Posting a Partnership Opportunity on UNPP**

UNPP can be used to post an open selection partnership opportunity that is publicly viewable by all CSOs. UNPP can also be used to post a direct selection partnership opportunity that is only viewable by the intended CSO chosen for the direct selection.

The UNICEF CSO Procedure allows both open and direct selection. FRG’s 2017 global quality review of civil society partnerships found that in 90% of partnerships sampled, the direct selection approach was used. Surveys with Country Offices found that one of the primary reasons why direct selection is so frequently used is because of the absence of a supportive platform to facilitate the posting of open selection opportunities. It is anticipated that with the rollout of UNPP, one of the bottlenecks to more frequently using open selection will be removed.

Whether a Country Office opts for an open selection or direct selection approach for a given partnership opportunity will depend on the office’s assessment of how best comparative advantage can be obtained, and how the highest quality results for children can be delivered.

The decision to post an open or direction selection partnership opportunity on UNPP should take place after:

* The office has determined that partnership with a civil society implementing partner is the best way of achieving the intended results. If the intended programme results could be better achieved using another modality (e.g. by implementing through government ministries/agencies or by entering into a procurement relationship to contract the services of an individual or institutional service provider), then UNPP should not be used.
* The office has determined that the partnership opportunity it would like to post is linked to the office’s Country Programme Document and Annual Work Plan, and funds are available to support the intended partnership.

# **3. Using UNPP for UNICEF-Initiated Direct Selection**

Direct selection is used when UNICEF Offices select the CSO partner based on specific considerations that are appropriate to the programming environment.

Direct selection may take place on the basis of UNICEF soliciting a specific proposal from a CSO.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This is what is currently done in the absence of UNPP** | **This is what will be done in UNPP** |
| 1. UNICEF determines that achieving a particular programme result requires partnership with a specific CSO. | 1. UN Basic Editor (or Advanced Editor) creates a New Direct Selection in UNPP, providing basic information about the project and expected results, and nominating a CSO for the direct selection opportunity, with specific justification provided. |
| 1. UNICEF reaches out to the specific CSO that it believes has best comparative advantage to achieve the expected results, typically via e-mail or a phone call. Other CSOs are not aware of and do not have access to this information. | 1. UN Advanced Editor reviews the direct selection opportunity and the nominated CSO and “publishes” the direct selection if in agreement. This triggers UNPP to send a notification to the directly selected CSO, sharing key information about the direct selection opportunity. Other CSOs are not aware of and do not have access to this information.   *Note: The UN Advanced Editor can only “publish” a direct selection if the nominated CSO has a completed UNPP profile that has been verified by the UN. If the UN Advanced Editor wants to directly select a CSO, but the CSO has not yet completed a UNPP profile, or does not have verified status, these actions must first be taken.* |
| 1. The CSO considers the direct selection opportunity from UNICEF and determines whether it would like to move forward with accepting this opportunity. | 1. The CSO reviews the information sent in UNPP and accepts/declines the direct selection opportunity. By “accepting” the direct selection opportunity, the CSO confirms that it will be sending a draft PD to UNICEF for review and feedback. |
| 1. The CSO submits a draft PD for review by and feedback from UNICEF programme section. | 1. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 1. The CSO and UNICEF programme section collaborate to finalize the workplan and budget and use the relevant templates from the CSO Procedure to complete a Programme Document. | 1. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 1. The UNICEF programme section presents the proposed PD to the office Partnership Review Committee (PRC). | 1. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |

# **4. Using UNPP for CSO-Initiated Direct Selection (Unsolicited Concept Notes)**

Direct selection may also take place on the basis of a CSO submitting to UNICEF an innovative proposal to achieve results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This is what is currently done in the absence of UNPP** | **This is what will be done in UNPP** |
| 1. A CSO that is interested in partnership with UNICEF submits an unsolicited concept note. The unsolicited concept note may come in any format, as there is no widely publicized standard template. The CSO either e-mails the unsolicited concept note to a generic UNICEF e-mail account (e.g. [info@unicef.org](mailto:somalia@unicef.org)) or directly to a UNICEF employee with whom it has previously liaised. | 1. CSO creates a “New Unsolicited Concept Note” in UNPP, providing basic information about the proposed project and uploading the concept note in the form of a word document. UNPP provides the guidance, “Please ensure that you have used the concept note template provided by the UN agency to whom you are submitting this unsolicited concept note.”   *Note: The CSO can only submit an unsolicited concept note via UNPP if it has a completed UNPP profile.* |
| 1. UNICEF reviews the unsolicited concept note against programme alignment and funding availability. If there appears to be a good fit, UNICEF contacts the submitting CSO to discuss possible partnership. Other CSOs are not aware of and do not have access to this information. | 1. UN Advanced Editor reviews the unsolicited concept note against programme alignment and funding availability. If there appears to be a good fit, UN Advanced Editor clicks “Convert to Direct Selection.” This triggers UNPP to send a notification to the submitting CSO, informing that the unsolicited concept note has been converted into a direct selection. Other CSOs are not aware of and do not have access to this information. |
| 1. The CSO considers the direct selection opportunity from UNICEF and determines whether it would like to move forward with accepting this opportunity. | 3. The CSO reviews the information sent in UNPP and accepts/declines the direct selection opportunity. By “accepting” the direct selection opportunity, the CSO confirms that it will adapt the unsolicited concept into a draft PD and send it to UNICEF for review and feedback. |
| 4. The CSO submits a draft PD for review by and feedback from UNICEF programme section. | 1. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 5. The CSO and UNICEF programme section collaborate to finalize the workplan and budget and use the relevant templates from the CSO Procedure to complete a Programme Document. | 1. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 1. The UNICEF programme section presents the proposed PD to the office Partnership Review Committee (PRC). | 6. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |

# **5. Using UNPP for Open Selection**

## **A. Overview**

Open selection is used when UNICEF Offices issue a Call for Expressions of Interest to solicit interest among CSOs. Participation in a Call for Expressions of Interest does not guarantee the CSO will be ultimately selected for partnership with UNICEF.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **This is what is currently done in the absence of UNPP** | **This is what will be done in UNPP** |
| 1. UNICEF determines that achieving a particular programme result requires partnership with a CSO. UNICEF decides to use open selection to identify the CSO and advertises calls for expressions of interest in newspapers, websites or other media. | 1. UN Basic Editor (or Advanced Editor) drafts a “New Call for Expressions of Interest” on UNPP. After review, the UN Advanced Editor publishes the Call For Expressions of Interest, making it publicly viewable. |
| 1. CSOs interested in applying for the Call for Expressions of Interest e-mail or deliver hard copies of their application to UNICEF. | 2. CSOs interested in applying for the Call upload their application/concept note in the form of a word document.  *Note: The CSO can only submit an application via UNPP if it has a completed UNPP profile.* |
| 3. UNICEF assembles an evaluation committee to assess applications. Each member of the evaluation committee assigns scores to the applications.  On the basis of the scores assigned by the reviewers, and other relevant factors, UNICEF identifies the CSO(s) with the best comparative advantage to support achievement of results for children. | 3. UN Basic Editor who drafted the Call (or UN Advanced Editor chosen to serve as the “focal point” of the Call) reviews all CSO applications and shortlists applications that meet certain criteria.  UN Basic Editor who drafted the Call (or UN Advanced Editor focal point) uses the “Manage Reviewers” function to assemble a virtual review panel of colleagues to assess the applications of shortlisted CSOs. Each member of the virtual review panel completes the assessment by assigning scores to the applications.  On the basis of the scores assigned by the reviewers, and other relevant factors, the Basic Editor nominates or the Advanced Editor focal point identifies the CSO(s) with the best comparative advantage to support achievement of results for children.  Alternatively, an offline committee can be assembled and once the scoring has been completed, the Basic Editor or Advanced Editor can enter the scores on behalf of the review committee |
| 4. UNICEF contacts the successful CSO, typically via e-mail or a phone call, to notify it of the results of the open selection process. | 4. UN Advanced Editor “selects” in UNPP the successful CSO. This triggers UNPP to send a notification to the successful CSO and inform it of the results of the open selection process. |
| 5. The CSO considers the partnership opportunity from UNICEF and determines whether it would like to move forward with accepting this opportunity. | 5. The CSO reviews the information sent in UNPP and accepts/declines the open selection opportunity. By “accepting” the open selection opportunity, the CSO confirms that it will adapt its successful concept note/application into a draft PD and send it to UNICEF for review and feedback. |
| 6. The CSO submits a draft PD for review by and feedback from UNICEF programme section. | 6. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 7. The CSO and UNICEF programme section collaborate to finalize the workplan and budget and use the relevant CSO Procedure templates to complete a Programme Document. | 7. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 8. The UNICEF programme section presents the proposed PD to the office Partnership Review Committee (PRC). | 8. No change. This process takes place outside of UNPP. |
| 9. All other applicant CSOs are informed of the unsuccessful outcome of their submissions. | 9. UN Basic Editor or Advanced Editor clicks “finalize” in UNPP. This triggers UNPP to send a notification to all unsuccessful applicants and inform them of the results of the open selection process. |

## **B. Selection Criteria**

At the time an open selection Call for Expressions of Interest is being drafted, the UN Basic Editor (or Advanced Editor) must indicate one or more selection criteria.

UNPP includes 12 selection criteria, and one “other” selection criterion. In general, it is recommended that 1-5 selection criteria are selected per Call for Expressions of Interest. Selection criteria may either be weighted (i.e. different selection criteria have different weights, with more important selection criteria having heavier weights than less important selection criteria), or unweighted (i.e. all selection criteria having equal weight). In cases where selection criteria are differentially weighted, the weights of the chosen selection criteria should, when added together, sum to 100.

The table below provides an overview of each of the selection criteria, and the parts of the CSO profile and concept note that should be reviewed to assess the extent to which an applicant CSO demonstrates competence in a particular selection criterion.

If, for example, it is determined that a particular Call for Expressions of Interest has weighted selection criteria, and the “access/security considerations” criterion has a weight of 40/100, then the reviewer should, on the basis of a review of the relevant parts of a CSO applicant’s profile and concept note, assess whether a CSO should be given a score of 1 (minimal competence in this selection criterion) or 40 (perfect competence in this selection criterion).

| **UNPP selection criterion** | **Description** | **Relevant parts of CSO profile** | **Relevant parts of CSO concept note** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Access/security considerations** | This selection criterion is especially relevant where a programme intervention is to be implemented in a high-threat context with limited access. This selection criterion emphasizes that the CSO should have the ability to gain access to and implement programmes in the given location. | Profile: Mandate and mission: Country Presence.  Profile: Mandate and mission: Security: Does the organization have the ability to work in high-risk security locations? | 2.6 Risk management |
| **Clarity of activities and expected results** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize UNICEF’s results-based management approach to programming, and assess a CSO’s RBM capacity. | N/A | 2.3 Proposed programme approach/methodology  3. Expected results, performance indicators, activities, implementation period and budget |
| **Contribution of resource** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize the importance of contributions—whether financial or non-financial—from the CSO. | N/A | 2.5 Prospective partner’s contribution and comparative advantage  3. Expected results, performance indicators, activities, implementation period and budget |
| **Cost effectiveness** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize the expectation that a given programme intervention achieve results at a lower cost compared with alternatives. | N/A | 3. Expected results, performance indicators, activities, implementation period and budget |
| **Experience working with UN** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize prior experience working with the UN and knowledge/understanding of UN-specific processes | Profile: Collaboration: History of Partnership: Has your organization collaborated with any UN agency? | 2.5 Prospective partner’s contribution and comparative advantage  2.7 Key personnel |
| **Innovative approach** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize a programmatic approach that is different from the “traditional” way of working. | N/A | 2.3 Proposed programme approach/methodology |
| **Local experience and presence** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize the CSO’s prior experience with and presence in a given community and geographic context. | Profile: Mandate and Mission: Country Presence | 2.5 Prospective partner’s contribution and comparative advantage |
| **Other** | This selection criterion is used to indicate a selection criterion that is not already among the drop-down list. The “description” field that appears under “other” should be used to provide more information. |  |  |
| **Project management** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize project management skills | Profile: Project Implementation: Programme Management | 2.3 Proposed programme approach/methodology  2.7 Key personnel |
| **Realistic timelines and plans** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize realistic timelines and plans, notably those that align with the “estimated start date” and “estimated end date” indicated by UNICEF in the CFEI. | N/A | 2.3 Proposed programme approach/methodology  3. Expected results, performance indicators, activities, implementation period and budget |
| **Relevance of proposal to achieving expected results** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize how directly the concept note addresses and is likely to achieve the “expected results” indicated in the CFEI. | N/A | 2.1 Rationale/justification  2.5 Prospective partner’s contribution and comparative advantage  3. Expected results, performance indicators, activities, implementation period and budget |
| **Sector expertise and experience** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize previous expertise and experience in the sector/area of specialization to which the CFEI relates. It may be especially relevant for those CFEIs that require deep sector-specific technical knowledge. | Profile: Mandate and Mission: Experience: Sectors, areas of specialization, and years of experience | 2.5 Prospective partner’s contribution and comparative advantage  2.7 Key personnel |
| **Sustainability of intervention** | This selection criterion is used to emphasize the sustainability of the approach proposed by the CSO. | N/A | 2.4 Gender, equity and sustainability |

## **C. Requests for Clarification**

When drafting an open selection Call for Expressions of Interest, UNICEF staff should take care to ensure that the fields are filled out with an appropriate level of clarity and detail, so that interested CSOs are able to submit Concept Notes. However, it is understood that there may be situations where CSOs would like to submit requests for additional information or clarification. The “Call For Expressions of Interest” feature in UNPP allows for CSOs to submit such requests before a certain clarification request deadline. In general, it is recommended that the clarification request deadline be set at least one week after the CFEI has been posted, and at least one week prior to the application deadline.

The CFEI creator or focal point should review the questions submitted by CSOs and determine whether a clarification response is necessary, appropriate and value-adding. The CFEI creator or focal point should prepare the responses in one centralized document, and upload the document in UNPP. While requests for clarification are placed by individual CSOs, the UNICEF response to requests is made publicly available to all interested CSOs. This is to preserve the fairness of UNPP, and to give all interested CSOs an equal opportunity in preparing an application. This is in line with the CSO Procedure’s “Templates for Open Selection of CSOs,” which states that “UNICEF responses to any queries or clarification requests will be made available to all online before the deadline for submission of applications.”

CSOs who submit clarification requests via e-mail, telephone or any medium other than UNPP should be reminded to use UNPP to submit their requests to support both tracking and fairness.

## **D. Shortlisting Prospective Partners**

All applications submitted by CSOs prior to the application deadline appear in the “Applications” tab of the relevant Call For Expressions of Interest. In this tab, the CFEI creator and focal point have access to a variety of filters, including country, sector and area of specialization, and type of organization, to aid in sorting through and shortlisting applications, most especially for those CFEIs where there is a very large number of applications. Shortlisting of applicants can only be done once the application deadline has passed.

The “shortlist” filters can be used to quickly identify applications submitted by CSOs with presence in the target country, experience in the relevant sector and area of specialization, etc. The filters found in a CFEI’s “Applications” tab can be used in conjunction with the more detailed manual review of concept notes and UNPP profiles to identify which CSO applicants should be shortlisted.

## **E. Assembling a Technical Review Panel**

For open selection Calls for Expressions of Interest, the CFEI creator or focal point has the ability to assemble a technical review panel. Depending on the preferences of the CFEI creator or focal point and guidance from the office, the technical review panel can consist of one or more members. In general, it is recommended that the technical review panel not consist of more than three staff members. In composing the technical review panel, it may be helpful to consider the inclusion of staff members with different perspectives/expertise.

## **F. Sample Terms of Reference for the Technical Review Panel**

**OBJECTIVE**

1. The objective of the Technical Review Panel (TRP) is to provide impartial and transparent review of the applications submitted by CSOs in response to UNICEF Calls For Expressions of Interest (CFEIs). A CSO application consists of its UNPP profile and completed Concept Note.
2. The TRP’s review serves as an input to the CFEI focal point’s decision in partner selection.

**MEMBERSHIP**

1. The CFEI creator or focal point is responsible for assembling the TRP. If the CFEI creator or focal point is also part of the TRP s/he will need to also add themselves to the review panel.
2. Depending on the preferences of the CFEI creator or focal point and guidance from the office, the TRP may consist of one or more members. Where the TRP consists of just one member, this will typically be either the CFEI creator or focal point themselves, or another programme colleague to whom technical review responsibility has been delegated.
3. In assembling a multi-member TRP, the CFEI creator or focal point is encouraged to consider the inclusion of staff members with different perspectives/expertise. For example, a TRP may include, in addition to the CFEI creator or focal point, an operations, PME, HACT or emergency colleague. In general, it is recommended that the TRP not consist of more than three staff members.
4. In assembling the TRP, it should be noted that any proposed PD will subsequently be reviewed by the office’s Partnership Review Committee (PRC). The TRP and PRC have different mandates and the membership of these two bodies should typically not overlap.

**RESPONSIBILITIES**

1. The members of the TRP are responsible for reviewing the UNPP profiles and Concept Notes submitted by CSOs in response to UNICEF-issued CFEIs. Based on the selection criteria indicated in the CFEI, the members of the TRP assign scores to each of the CSO applicants.
2. Sections and documents on UNPP to be reviewed by the TRP include the following:
   * *Organizational Profile*: This will serve to understand and assess a CSO’s capacity, geographical presence, technical and project management expertise, and administrative and financial management capacity. The CSO’s profile should also be reviewed to confirm whether it has necessary and up-to-date legal and administrative documentation to work in the target areas (registration documents, etc.)
   * *Concept Note:* TRP members will review the concept note to assess the CSO’s proposed approach to programme intervention, identification of target beneficiaries, best comparative advantage, value for money, and alignment with expected results.
3. The members of the TRP may work individually, and separately record in UNPP their scores, by selection criterion, for each CSO applicant.
4. Alternatively, the members of the TRP may meet as a group and work collectively to record in UNPP a consensus score, by selection criterion, for each CSO applicant.
5. **The members of the TRP should complete their assessments of CSO applicants no later than 10 working days after the CFEI application deadline**, ensuring that the CFEI’s notification of results date is respected.

**TRP SCORES AS AN INPUT TO PARTNER SELECTION**

1. As the members of the TRP enter their scores in UNPP, the CFEI creator and focal point are able to view the scores entered, by selection criterion and by CSO applicant.
2. The completion of TRP review in UNPP triggers the CFEI focal point to initiate partner selection in UNPP. Under normal circumstances, the CFEI focal point should select the CSO applicant with the highest TRP score, provided that this CSO is already verified or can become verified. If the CSO applicant with the highest TRP score has not already been verified in UNPP, the CFEI focal point should attempt verification.
3. There may be circumstances in which the CFEI focal point, in view of programmatically relevant considerations, opts to select a CSO other than the one with the highest TRP score. For example, if the CSO with the highest TRP score cannot be verified, then the CFEI focal point may attempt to verify and select another CSO.
4. The TRP review serves as an important, but not determinative, input to the CFEI focal point’s partner selection process. The CFEI focal point bears the ultimate responsibility for selection of the CSO with whom s/he will develop a draft Programme Document (PD).

**TRP SCORES AS AN INPUT TO PRC REVIEW**

1. An overview of the TRP review process is provided to the PRC as an input to review of the partner selection process.

# **6. Linkage between UNPP and the UNICEF Process for Submission, Review and Approval of Proposed PDs**

After a CSO has been selected in UNPP—either through an open selection process, or through a direct selection process—the CSO and UNICEF embark on the process of jointly developing a draft Programme Document. UNICEF and the CSO selected in UNPP are encouraged to make every good faith effort to develop a PD based on the principles of partnership, and with due consideration of results-based management and results-based-budgeting principles. However, the “selection” of a CSO in UNPP does not automatically commit UNICEF to signing a PCA/PD with the CSO, or transferring funds to the CSO.

In the case of open selection and Unsolicited Concept Notes, the concept note submitted by the CSO should form a firm basis for the expedited development of a Programme Document, as the format and content of the two documents are very closely aligned.

In the case of UN-initiated direct selection with no accompanying concept note, UNICEF and the directly selected CSO should collaborate to draft the PD.

Once a PD has been developed by the CSO and UNICEF, and Parts 1 and 2 of the Annex G PRC Submission, Review and Approval form have been completed as per the office’s normal work processes, the office PRC should review the submission. The PRC should be made aware of how the proposed partnership was identified in UNPP (open selection, unsolicited concept note converted into direct selection, or UNICEF-initiated direct selection). In the case of open selection, the PRC should be provided with an overview of the number of applications received for the CFEI, and the CFEI review panel’s assessment. Particularly for CSOs identified via open selection on UNPP, the PRC is encouraged to factor into its deliberations the quality assurance already undertaken by the review panel, as well as the UNPP verification/due diligence process, and lighten its review accordingly.

# **7. UNPP Sectors and Areas of Specialization**

UNPP is an inter-agency platform that makes reference to “sectors” and “areas of specialization.” CSOs, when creating organizational profiles in UNPP, are asked to indicate their sector(s) and area(s) of specialization. UN agencies, when posting CFEIs for open selection, or issuing direct selections, are asked to indicate the relevant sector(s) and area(s) of specialization. Several of the screens in UNPP allow for the CSO and UN agency users to filter lists by sector or area of specialization.

The sectors and areas of specialization contained in UNPP were harmonized across the three participating UN agencies: UNHCR, UNICEF and WFP. In future, should additional UN agencies join UNPP, sectors and areas of specialization may be added or otherwise adjusted.

Broadly speaking, UNPP sectors map to the “goal areas” in the UNICEF Strategic Plan (2018-2021), while UNPP areas of specialization map to the “result areas” in the UNICEF Strategic Plan (2018-2021).

The table below presents a mapping of how the UNPP sectors and areas of specialization are aligned, respectively, to the goal areas and result areas contained in the UNICEF Strategic Plan. In general, there is a one-to-one mapping between UNPP areas of specialization and UNICEF result areas. For example, the UNPP area of specialization on immunization maps neatly to UNICEF result area 21-02 – Immunization. In some instances, however, because of the slightly variant ways in which UNPP areas of specialization and UNICEF result areas are formulated, there is a one-to-many mapping. For example, UNPP includes only one area of specialization on HIV/AIDS. In contrast, the UNICEF Strategic Plan contains two result areas related to HIV: 21-06 – Treatment and care of children living with HIV, and 21-07 – HIV prevention.

In UNPP, several of the sectors include an emergency-related area of specialization. For example, the UNPP sector on education includes an underlying area of specialization on education in emergencies. These emergency-related areas of specialization align well with the concept of the “humanitarian marker” included in the UNICEF Strategic Plan.

| **UNPP Sector** | **UNICEF Strategic Plan Goal Areas (2018 – 2021)** | **UNPP Area of Specialization** | **UNICEF Result Area** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Camp coordination & camp management** |  | Camp management |  |
| Coordination and partnerships |  |
| **Cross-sectoral areas** | 24 – Safe and clean environment  25 – Equitable chance in life  26 – Cross-sectoral | Communication for development | 26-03 – Cross-sectoral communication for development |
| Conflict sensitivity and humanitarian access | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Disability and inclusion | 25-05 – Children with disabilities |
| Early recovery | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction | 24-03 – Disaster risk reduction |
| Emergency response and management | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Gender equality | 25-04 – Gender discriminatory roles and practices  *\*Gender equality marker* |
| Monitoring and evaluation | 26-02 – Cross-sectoral monitoring, data and situation analyses |
| 26-05 – Evaluation and research |
| Research and data analysis | 26-02 – Cross-sectoral monitoring, data and situation analyses |
| 26-05 – Evaluation and research |
| Resource mobilization |  |
| Service provision and platform activities |  |
| Training, capacity building and capacity development |  |
| **Durable solutions** |  | Integration, reintegration |  |
| Resettlement |  |
| Voluntary return |  |
| **Education** | 21 – Survive and Thrive  22 – Learn  25 – Equitable chance in life | Early childhood development | 21-08 – Early childhood development |
| Education in emergencies | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Education- general | 22-01 – Equitable access to quality education |
| Learning outcomes | 22-02 – Learning outcomes |
| Out-of-school education |  |
| School meals |  |
| Skills development for adolescents | 22-03 – Skills development |
| 25-03 – Adolescent empowerment |
| **Food security** |  | Agricultural inputs |  |
| Cash assistance |  |
| Food assistance |  |
| Food assistance for assets |  |
| Food security and market analysis/vulnerability analysis and mapping (VAM) |  |
| **Health** | 21 – Survive and Thrive | Adolescent health | 21-09 – Adolescent health and nutrition |
| Child health | 21-03 – Child health |
| Health- general |  |
| Health in emergencies | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Health systems strengthening |  |
| HIV/AIDS | 21-06 – Treatment and care of children living with HIV |
| 21-07 – HIV prevention |
| Immunization | 21-02 – Immunization |
| Maternal and newborn health | 21-01 – Maternal and newborn health |
| Reproductive health services |  |
| **Livelihoods** |  | Cash and voucher assistance |  |
| Co-existence with local communities |  |
| Community mobilization |  |
| Microfinance, microcredit and revolving loan funds |  |
| Self-reliance |  |
| Smallholder agricultural market support |  |
| Technical and vocational education and training |  |
| **Logistics** | 26 – Cross-sectoral | Distribution of supplies, including basic and domestic items | 26-04 – Supply and logistics |
| Logistics in emergencies | 26-04 – Supply and logistics  *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Operations management, coordination and support | 26-04 – Supply and logistics |
| Procurement of goods and services | 26-04 – Supply and logistics |
| Vehicle workshop in the field (vehicle maintenance and servicing) |  |
| Warehouse and inventory management | 26-04 – Supply and logistics |
| **Nutrition** | 21 – Survive and thrive | Infant and young child feeding |  |
| Malnutrition prevention and treatment | 21-04 – Prevention of stunting and other forms of malnutrition |
| 21-05 – Treatment of severe acute malnutrition |
| Micronutrients |  |
| Nutrition- general |  |
| Nutrition in emergencies | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| **Protection** | 23 – Protection from violence and exploitation  25 – Equitable chance in life | Access to asylum |  |
| Birth registration |  |
| Child protection |  |
| Detention and freedom of movement |  |
| Family re-unification |  |
| Legal assistance and access to justice | 23-03 – Access to justice |
| Prevention of and response to crime/violence, including SGBV | 23-01 – Prevention and response services for violence against children |
| Protection- general | 23-02 – Harmful practices (FGM/C and child marriage) |
| 25-05 – Children with disabilities |
| Protection advice and support |  |
| Protection in emergencies | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Registration and profiling |  |
| **Shelter** |  | Settlement support (e.g. site planning, urban planning) |  |
| Shelter construction and reconstruction |  |
| Shelter in emergencies | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Shelter preparedness and risk reduction |  |
| Shelter-related non-food items (NFIs) |  |
| **Social policy and advocacy** | 24 – Safe and clean environment  25 – Equitable chance in life | Policy advocacy |  |
| Public finance and local governance | 24-04 – Children in urban settings / local governance |
| 25-01 – Child poverty / public finance for children |
| Social policy and advocacy- general |  |
| Social protection and multidimensional poverty | 25-01 – Child poverty / public finance for children |
| 25-02 – Social protection |
| Social safety nets |  |
| South-south cooperation |  |
| **WASH and environment** | 24 – Safe and clean environment | Basic sanitation | 24-02 – Sanitation |
| Energy |  |
| Hygiene |  |
| Natural resources, environmental pollution and climate action | 24-05 – Environmental sustainability  *\*Climate marker* |
| WASH in emergencies | *\*Humanitarian marker* |
| Water | 24-01 – Water |

# **8. Verification in UNPP**

## 

## **A. Overview**

UNPP includes a feature to “verify” the self-reported information provided by CSOs in their organizational profiles. The UNPP verification feature is analogous to the current “core values assessment” undertaken by UNICEF prior to entering into a partnership agreement with a CSO.

Not all UN users of UNPP have the ability to verify CSOs. UN Advanced Editors—but not UN Basic Editors or UN Readers—have the ability to conduct verification of CSOs in their country. Only UN Headquarters Editors have the ability to verify the headquarters profiles of international NGOs, in line with the UNICEF CSO Procedure, which requires that international NGOs undergo due diligence review by the UNICEF Division of Communication’s Civil Society Partnerships (CSP) unit at HQ level.

## **B. Verification Questions**

Verification of a CSO profile in UNPP consists of the following actions:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Verification Question** | **Relevant Profile Questions to Review** | **Action** |
| **Has the CSO/partner uploaded its valid, non-expired registration certificate issued by the correct government body, or otherwise indicated eligibility to operate in the country?** | Click on the CSO’s profile.  Under the “Identification” section and “Legal Status” sub-section of the profile, review the CSO’s response to the question: “Is the organization registered to operate in the country?”  Review the document uploaded by the CSO under “registration document” or the comment provided by the CSO explaining why it is not registered to operate in the country. | Click yes if:   * The CSO has declared that “yes,” it is registered to operate in the country, and the registration document uploaded by the CSO (a) appears to be genuine, (b) reflects the organization’s legal name, (c) does not have an expired validity date, and (d) has been issued by the government body tasked with the registration of CSOs in the country. * The CSO has declared that “no,” it is not registered to operate in the country, and the comment that it has provided is acceptable (e.g. the government ministry responsible for registering CSOs in the country is defunct).   Otherwise, click no. Note that clicking no prevents the CSO from obtaining a “verified” status and therefore prevents it from being selected in UNPP. |
| **Are the partner’s mandate and mission consistent with that of the UN?** | Click on the CSO’s profile.  Under the “Mandate & Mission” section and “Background” sub-section of the profile, review the CSO’s response to the questions “Briefly state the background and rationale for the establishment of the organization” and “Briefly state the mandate and mission of the organization.” | Click yes if:   * The text entered by the CSO under the “Mandate & Mission” section of its profile suggests that it shares the core values of the UN.   Otherwise, click no. Note that clicking no prevents the CSO from obtaining a “verified” status and therefore prevents it from being selected in UNPP. |
| **Does the CSO/partner have mechanisms to combat fraud and corruption, prevent sexual exploitation and abuse, and protect and safeguard beneficiaries?** | Click on the CSO’s profile.  Under the “Mandate & Mission” section and “Ethics” sub-section of the profile, review the CSO’s response to “Briefly describe the organization’s mechanisms to safeguard against the violation and abuse of beneficiaries, including sexual exploitation and abuse” and “Briefly describe the organization’s mechanisms to safeguard against fraud, corruption and other unethical behaviour.” Also review the copies of the policies/codes of conduct uploaded by the CSO, if any. | Click yes if:   * The text entered by the CSO describing how it safeguards against the violation and abuse of beneficiaries, and against fraud, corruption and other unethical behaviour, suggests strong, functioning mechanisms.   Otherwise, click no. Note that clicking no prevents the CSO from obtaining a “verified” status and therefore prevents it from being selected in UNPP.  Note that if the CSO has uploaded supporting policies/codes of conduct, this is a best practice. However, UNICEF does not have a global requirement that all CSOs must have *documented* policies on beneficiary safeguarding and fraud/corruption. This is in recognition of the fact that community-based organizations and other smaller CSOs, due to their level of organizational development, may not have such policies in place. |
| **Do the [risk-related observations associated with the CSO/ partner and captured in UN Partner Portal] pose unacceptable risk to the UN?** | Review the risk-related observations, if any, captured in UNPP. | Click no if:   * There are no risk-related observations * There are risk-related observations, but they do not pose unacceptable risk to the UN.   Otherwise, click yes. Note that clicking yes prevents the CSO from obtaining a “verified” status and therefore prevents it from being selected in UNPP. |
| **Are there any other risk-related observations associated with the CSO/ partner that are not captured in UN Partner Portal, but which pose unacceptable risk to the UN?** | Click on the CSO’s profile and review the text inputted and documents uploaded by the CSO.  Conduct an internet search of the CSO, focusing on credible websites. If necessary/relevant, consult colleagues from UNICEF, other UN agencies, or other trusted humanitarian/ development actors to determine whether the CSO presents any risk that is not already captured in the “observations” section of the Portal. | Click no if:   * There is no potential reputational risk identified from public or other sources.   Click yes if potential reputational risk is identified from the CSO’s UNPP profile, on the internet or other media sources, or via trusted humanitarian/development actors.  Note that clicking yes prevents the CSO from obtaining a “verified” status and therefore prevents it from being selected in UNPP.  *If potential reputational risk is identified during the attempted verification process, then consider exiting out of the verification workflow and adding a risk-related observation to the CSO’s profile, as per the “Observations in UNPP” guidance.* |

## **C. Verification: What it does and does not mean**

A CSO that has been accorded the “verified” status in UNPP has met all of the UN’s minimal due diligence requirements, meaning that it appears to be able to lawfully operate in the country, appears to have a mission and mandate that is in alignment with that of the UN, appears to have adequate measures to safeguard both resources and beneficiaries, and does not appear to pose unacceptable reputational risk to the UN. This is the equivalent of a CSO having an Annex E that has been reviewed and signed by UNICEF.

The fact that a CSO has “verified” status does not mean that it is competent to implement programme activities in any particular sector or geographic area. It also does not mean that the CSO is necessarily the best choice for any particular partnership opportunity. Verification merely means that a CSO has been reviewed by an authorized UN user, and has been deemed to satisfactorily meet minimal due diligence requirements. A “verified” CSO should subsequently undergo additional review of its suitability for a particular partnership opportunity in terms of technical, financial and other strategic considerations.

## **D. Updates of Verification Status**

Some of the questions included in the verification process can be objectively answered, e.g. Is the organization able to legally operate in the country? In contrast, other verification questions may not be fully objectively answered. For example, one UN agency’s definition of “unacceptable” reputational risk may differ from another’s. UNPP is designed so that a CSO’s verification status is dynamic and can be updated, either on the basis of newer information, or a newer interpretation of existing information. Where a UN user with verification rights disagrees with a CSO’s current verification status, s/he may subject the CSO to a new verification process, which may result in the assignment of a different status. As the sponsoring UN agencies gain more experience in verifying CSOs, greater clarity on what is considered acceptable and not acceptable reputational risk may become clearer.

A CSO’s verification status in UNPP can be continuously updated, but does not automatically expire. In contrast, the current UNICEF policy states that the “core values assessment” of CSO partners is valid for five years. As UNICEF gains experience using UNPP in the initial months/years after rollout, UNICEF will review current policies to determine whether the policies should change, or whether enhancements can be made to the UNPP system.

# **9. Observations in UNPP**

## **A. Overview**

UNPP has an “observations” feature that allows for the UN to append observations to a CSO’s profile. Observations may be related to risk, or they may not be related to risk (e.g. observations may be in regard to neutral or favourable issues.)

Observations in UNPP are only viewable to a subset of UN users. They are never viewable by CSOs.

UNPP Advanced Editors have the ability to add observations to CSOs, and only to CSOs located in their own country. UN HQ Editors have the ability to add observations to CSOs, regardless of location. The content of observations added in UNPP is visible to UN Advanced Editors and UN HQ editors, whether in UNICEF or UNHCR or WFP. UN Basic Editors and UN Readers are able to view the number—but not the content—of observations. CSOs do not have access to the observations feature.

UN Advanced Editors and UN HQ Editors are encouraged to exercise professional judgment when adding observations to CSO profiles, ensuring that observations contain credible, value-adding information that would aid UN colleagues when considering partnership with a given CSO. In cases where a CSO profile already has one or more observations associated with it, UN Advanced Editors and UN HQ Editors should review the existing observations before adding any new observations, to ensure non-duplication.

## **B. Types of Observations in UNPP**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Observation Type** | **Description** |
| **Not risk-related observation** | A non-risk-related observation is appended by a UN Advanced Editor or UN HQ Editor to record salient information of a neutral or positive nature about a CSO that would be of relevance and interest to other UN agencies in deciding whether or not to pursue partnership. A non-risk-related observation may be appended, for example, to provide background information on a CSO. |
| **Risk-related observation** | A risk-related observation is added to a CSO profile by a UN Advanced Editor or UN HQ Editor when a CSO presents one of the following kinds of risk: (1) sanctions match; (2) reputational / ethical; (3) financial; (4) operational; (5) compliance; (6) sexual exploitation and abuse; (7) safeguarding violation; and (8) other.  A risk-related observation may be added on the basis of first-hand knowledge, monitoring reports from UNICEF or other UN entities, and local media reports or other credible sources, including credible internet sources.  The addition of such a ‘regular’ risk-related observation indicates that the risk is not of a magnitude, severity or certainty that justifies the escalation to a UN HQ Editor, or the immediate blocking of the CSO. However, it indicates that there is risk that should be considered prior to the selection of the CSO in UNPP. Any UN Advanced Editor who wishes to select such a CSO with a risk-related observation may proceed to do so, subject to local guidance at Country Office level. |
| **Risk-related observations escalated to UN HQ Editor** | A risk-related observation escalated to UN HQ Editor is a risk-related observation that is of a magnitude, severity of certainty that requires the review of a UN HQ Editor, for further guidance. A risk-related observation may be created and immediately escalated to UN HQ Editor. Alternatively, a risk-related observation initially accorded the ‘regular,’ non-escalated status may subsequently be escalated to a UN HQ Editor.  An escalated risk-related observation should be reviewed by the UN HQ Editor, and a decision made as to whether the risk-related observation should be de-escalated (and deferred back to the Country Office for local decision making), or “confirmed.” In “confirming” the escalated observation, the UN HQ Editor appends a red flag to the CSO’s profile, thus barring it from being selected. |

## **C. Risk Categories in UNPP**

There are 8 categories of risk: (1) sanctions match; (2) reputational / ethical; (3) financial; (4) operational; (5) compliance; (6) sexual exploitation and abuse; (7) safeguarding violation; (8) other.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Risk Category** | **Description** |
| **Risk category #1: Sanctions match** | UNPP has an automated sanctions list scanning feature. Any CSO that enters an organizational name or personnel names that form a text string match with an entry on the UN Security Council Sanctions List will have a system-generated risk-related observation appended to its profile. |
| **Risk category #2: Reputational/ ethical risk** | UNICEF’s CSO implementing partners should demonstrate a commitment to the highest ethical standards. The [UNICEF Policy Prohibiting and Combatting Fraud and Corruption](https://www.unicef.org/publicpartnerships/files/Policy_Prohibiting_and_Combatting_Fraud_and_Corruption.pdf)states that CSO implementing partners are expected to adopt and enforce robust policies combatting fraud and corruption. Partners who fail to do so present reputational/ethical risk to the UN. |
| **Risk category #3: Financial risk** | UNICEF is implementing the HACT Procedure. Partners who have consistently received problematic spot check reports or audits demonstrating inability to provide assurance of funds provided by UNICEF present financial risk. |
| **Risk category #4: Operational risk** | UNICEF’s CSO implementing partners should demonstrate adequate and strongly functioning internal processes, people and systems, to successfully implement programme activities. CSOs that consistently demonstrate inability to deliver services on time, within budget, in accordance with agreed/set terms, and toward the achievement of defined targets present operational risk. |
| **Risk category #5: Compliance risk** | UNICEF’s civil society implementing partners are expected to comply with the General Terms and Conditions of the Programme Cooperation Agreement or Small Scale Funding Agreement signed with UNICEF. Partners who do fail to do so present compliance risk. |
| **Risk category #6: Sexual exploitation and abuse** | UNICEF’s civil society implementing partners are expected to ensure that all employees and personnel comply with the provisions of the UN Secretary-General’s Bulletin on [“Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Sexual Abuse.”](https://undocs.org/ST/SGB/2003/13) Civil society organizations who fail to address sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) through appropriate preventive measures, investigation and corrective action present SEA risk. |
| **Risk category #7: Safeguarding violation** | UNICEF’s civil society implementing partners are expected to familiarize themselves with the [UNICEF Policy on Conduct Promoting the Protection and Safeguarding of Children.](https://www.unicef.org/supply/files/Executive_Directive_06-16_Child_Safeguarding_Policy_-_1_July_2016_Final.pdf) They are expected to have in place policies for the protection and safeguarding of children and beneficiaries, and must ensure that none of their employees and personnel exposes children or any other intended beneficiary to any form of discrimination, abuse or exploitation. They are required to inform UNICEF if they have reasonable suspicions or become aware of any reports or allegations that their personnel have engaged in conduct that is prohibited under safeguarding policies. Civil society organizations who do not demonstrate commitment to promote the protection and safeguarding of all children and beneficiaries present safeguarding violation risk. |
| **Risk category #8: Other** | Depending on the local programme context, it may be relevant to add a risk-related observation that cannot be neatly categorized by one of the other categories above. A non-exhaustive list of additional potential risk factors include a CSO’s linkages to political, business or military actors; issues of community legitimacy and acceptance; previous performance on other UNICEF or UN-supported projects; issues around transparency, etc. |