**Implementing Partner Grantee[[1]](#footnote-1) Assessment Form**

(ITC INTERNAL USE ONLY)

To be completed by ITC Responsible Officer (RO) and approved by Chief and Director

*THIS PARTNER ASSESSMENT FORM NEEDS TO BE COMPLETED FOR PARTNERS FROM THE BUSINESS AND*

*NON-GOVERNMENTAL SECTOR.*

**I. GENERAL INFORMATION**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Please select the type of entity: | Business | Commercial enterprises of all sizes |
| Business support organization | Business associations and trade and economic development agencies |
| Nonprofit organization | Nonprofit institutions of all sizes (incl. NGOs, Foundations) |
| Academia, training and research | Public or private institutions focusing on education, training or research |
| Other, please specify |  |
| Name of the entity: | [full legal name] | |
| Address: | [HQ Address] | |
| Website/ telephone: | [website]  [telephone] | |
| Main contact(s) at the entity: | [name and title] | |
| Countries/ regions of operation of the entity: | [countries/regions] | |
| Short description of the nature of the entity (e.g. sector, area of work): | [description] | |
| Ownership/Management: | Fully privately held and managed  Partially, managed and/or owned by a government  Publicly listed[[2]](#footnote-2) | |
| Number of employees: | [number of employees] | |
| Annual turnover in USD:  (Only if publicly available) | [turnover] | |
| Name of legal representative: | [name] | |
| Year of latest Annual Report  (provide web link, if available): | [year] | |
| Is this entity a subsidiary or country office of another entity? | Yes Name of the entity: | |
| No | |
| Have you carried out an  Expression of Interest? | Yes | |
| No | |

**II. EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Exclusionary criteria | | |
| Appearance on the United Nations Security Council Sanctions List or the United Nations Ineligibility List, or in violation of UN sanctions, relevant conventions, treaties and resolutions | *Entities directly engaged in activities inconsistent with the UN Security Council Sanctions, Resolutions, and other similar measures* | No |
| Weapons manufacturing or sales as a core business | *Entities directly and primarily involved in the sale, manufacture or distribution of weapons* | No |
| Direct and core involvement in the manufacturing or trading of controversial weapons subject to bans under International Treaties | *Entities directly and primarily[[3]](#footnote-3) involved in the sale, manufacture or distribution of weapons banned by UN treaties, including anti-personnel mines, cluster bombs and ammunitions, and biological, chemical, or nuclear weapons, for instance* | No |
| Tobacco manufacturers | *Entities for whom the core business is the production and wholesale distribution of tobacco products* | No |
| Direct involvement or complicity[[4]](#footnote-4) in systematic or egregious human rights abuses through operations, products, or services | *Entities engaging in any of the following:*   * *causing or directly contributing to gross human rights abuses through their own business activities (such as forced or compulsory labour or child labour, human rights violations, including rights of indigenous peoples and/or other vulnerable groups);* * *tolerating or knowingly ignoring such practices by an entity associated with it, or* * *knowingly providing practical assistance or encouragement that has a substantial effect on the perpetration of the gross human rights abuse* | No |
| Systematic failure to demonstrate a commitment or to meet in practice the principles of the United Nations, including statements or principles that are consistent with and reflect the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Rio Declaration and the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work, the UN Global Compact or the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights | *Entities that systematically[[5]](#footnote-5) fail to demonstrate a commitment to meet the stipulated principles (human rights, labour, environment and anti-corruption)* | No |
| *If any criteria apply to the partner* ***– refrain from further engagement unless there is sufficient rationale to justify a partnership.***  *If relevant, add in “Section V - Decision” the rationale for why the partnership should still be approved with or without conditions.* | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| UN GLOBAL COMPACT | | |
| Is the Entity a participant supporting the Global Compact Principles (list available at [www.unglobalcompact.org](http://www.unglobalcompact.org))? | Yes | No |

**II. EXCLUSIONARY CRITERIA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Self-Certification by the Implementing Partner | | |
| The self-certification applies only to IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS FROM THE PRIVATE SECTOR. All private sector partners that receive money from ITC will be requested to self-certify against the Exclusionary Criteria. If the exclusionary criteria and self-certification did not already take place during the Expression of Interest (EOI), it needs to be conducted at this stage. Once the entity has self-certified, the rest of the assessment form can be completed. | | |
| On behalf of [Entity] the herein authorized representative certifies the correctness of the following:   * [Entity] is not included in any of the Exclusionary Criteria listed above. | | |
| Remarks: | | |
| Representative Name:  Representative Title: | *(Signature)* | Date: |

**III. REPUTATIONAL RISK ASSESSMENT**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| POTENTIAL CONTROVERSIES | | | |
| Please carry out an internet search, focussing on information that shows criticism or controversies about the Entity.  There may be factors that can cause reputational risks to ITC, such as issues related to:   * **Labour**: e.g. violation on International Labour Law, discrimination in respect of employment or occupation * **Governance**: e.g. corruption, fraud, controversial individuals affiliated with the company * **Discrimination**: e.g. discrimination based on religion, gender, sex, ethnicity, race, or origin * **Environment**: e.g. pollution, climate change, mismanagement of waste | | | |
| Are there signs or evidence of: | | | |
| * Significant criticism from governments, media, or civil society organizations against the Entity | | Yes | No |
| * Demonstrations against the Entity | | Yes | No |
| * Lawsuits or legal actions against the Entity, or past convictions for unlawful activities | | Yes | No |
| * Other (specify): | | Yes | No |
| Provide relevant details of the controversies in view of possible reputational risks to ITC: | | | |
| ENGAGEMENT WITH THE United nations | | | |
| Does ITC or any other UN organization currently have, or has had in the past 5 years, any engagement with the Entity? | | Yes | No |
| If **yes**, please list: | | | |
| Did any previous engagement harm ITC’s or UN’s reputation? | | Yes | No |
| Contribution to the SDGs | | | |
| Is there evidence that the entity is committed and is contributing to the SDGs? (e.g. through CSR or the business model) | | Yes | No |
| CONCLUSION | | | |
| Entity shows no evidence of incurring potential reputational risk.   * + **LOW RISK LEVEL** | Entity shows some evidence of potential reputational risk for Management consideration.   * + **MEDIUM RISK LEVEL** | Entity is not suitable.   * + **HIGH RISK LEVEL** | |

**IV - CAPACITY AND OPERATIONAL RISK ASSESSMENT**

THE CAPACITY AND OPERATIONAL RISK ASSESSMENT HAS THREE DIFFERENT VERSIONS DEPENDING ON THE GRANT AMOUNT:

1. For grants between 30,000 and 50,000 USD please complete only part A
2. For grants between 50,000-400,000 USD please complete only part B
3. For grants above 400,000 USD please complete only part C

**A - SHORT ASSESSMENT: only for proposed grants between 30,000 USD and 50,000 USD**

(To be completed by Implementing Partner and reviewed by Project Manager)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Implementing Partner’s track record with ITC or the UN** | |
| 1.1 Does the implementing partner have prior experience in managing or implementing ITC, UN or other donor-funded technical assistance projects? | Yes No |
| * + 1. If the answer is “yes”, please provide a short list (max 5) of references.   [Dates of engagement, project title, amount granted, name of funder] | |
| 1.2 Based on available documentation and/or a discussion with the implementing partner: Do the implementing partner’s technical skills match those required to implement the proposed project or activity? Provide a short explanation and list the specific skills required.[[6]](#footnote-6) | |
| **2. Financial management (from available reports)** | |
| For this section, you may request from the implementing partner a copy of the last three financial statements and well as any available audit report conclusions for the same period. Based on such information, please provide your best answer to the following: | |
| 2.1 What is the Implementing Partner’s annual turnover[[7]](#footnote-7) or budget? | USD or local currency |
| 2.2 Is the Implementing Partner subject to external audit? If so, are the audit reports public? | Yes No |
| 2.3 From the audit reports, is there any evidence of deficiencies in custody of funds procedures or financial reporting? | Yes No |
| 2.4 Have audits identified instances of non-compliance with rules and procedures or misuse of financial resources? | Yes No |
| Remarks: |  |

**B - STREAMLINED ASSESSMENT: only for proposed grants between 50,000 USD and 400,000 USD**

(To be completed by Implementing Partner and reviewed by Project Manager)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1. Project management experience** | |
| 1.1 Does the implementing partner have prior experience in managing or implementing ITC, UN or other donor-funded technical assistance projects? | Yes No |
| 1.1.1 If yes, please list relevant project management experience (please provide detailed information using the table below, for a maximum of 5 references. You may ask the prospective IP to fill this out and certify for you):   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project title** | **Country/Region** | **Value (USD)** | **Dates (start/end)** | **Name of funder** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Type and scope of technical assistance provided** | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project title** | **Country/Region** | **Value (USD)** | **Dates (start/end)** | **Name of funder** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Type and scope of technical assistance provided** | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project title** | **Country/Region** | **Value (USD)** | **Dates (start/end)** | **Name of funder** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Type and scope of technical assistance provided** | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project title** | **Country/Region** | **Value (USD)** | **Dates (start/end)** | **Name of funder** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Type and scope of technical assistance provided** | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | | | |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Project title** | **Country/Region** | **Value (USD)** | **Dates (start/end)** | **Name of funder** | |  |  |  |  |  | | **Type and scope of technical assistance provided** | | | | | |  | | | | | |  | | | | | | |
| 1.2 Based on 1.1 does the implementing partner have sufficient experience in the management or implementation of technical assistance projects? | Yes No |
|  | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2. Technical skills** | |
| 2.1 Do the skills and experience of the Implementing Partner’s technical professionals match those required for the project? | Yes No |
| To answer question 2.1, please use the following table to evaluate the technical capacities of the organization against the relevant fields required by your project. You may ask the organization to fill out this table and certify it for you. (To be completed by IP)     |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Technical manpower** | **Last year** | | **Current year** | | **Period average** | | |  | **Overall** | **Relevant fields** | **Overall** | **Relevant fields** | **Overall** | **Relevant fields** | | Number of permanent staff |  |  |  |  |  |  | | Any other relevant information regarding staffing |  |  |  |  |  |  | | |
| **3. Financial management** | |
| For this section, you may request from the implementing partner a copy of the last three financial statements as well as any available audit report conclusions for the same period. Based on such information, please provide your best answer to the following: | |
| 3.1 What is the Implementing Partner’s annual turnover[[8]](#footnote-8) or budget? | Turnover in USD or local currency  (please indicate the currency): |
| 3.2 If the proposed grant is given to this implementing partner, what percentage of its annual turnover would it represent? | \_\_\_\_\_ % |
| 3.3 Is the implementing partner currently implicated –or has in the past been implicated- in proceedings regarding financial fraud or corruption? | Yes No |
| 3.4 Is the implementing partner subject to insolvency or winding up procedures, its assets being administered by a liquidator or by a court, or it is in an arrangement with creditors? | Yes No |
| 3.5 Is the implementing partner subject to external audit? If so, are the audit reports public? | Yes No |
| 3.6 Do the implementing partner’s activities meet Generally Accepted Accounting Principles? | Yes No |
| 3.7 Does the implementing partner have any unqualified audit reports in the last three years? (Attach evidence) | Yes No |

Additional Questions which can be answered by Implementing Partner (not mandatory)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| If the implementing partner is a business: Is the implementing partner a member of a relevant industry association? | Yes | No |
| Does the implementing partner have any relevant accreditations? (E.g. ISO 9000 or a registered training provider)  If **yes**, please name the accreditation: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Yes | No |

**C - FULL ASSESSMENT: only for proposed grants above 400,000 USD**

The full assessment contains two parts: the capacity of the partner and the risks and benefits of the partnership for ITC.

The Responsible Officers to define the level of risk for each subject matter section.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Risk Classification** | **Action** |
| **A - VERY LOW** | Very Low risk – Indicates a well-developed financial management system and functioning control framework with a low likelihood of negative impact on the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. | Cooperation with Implementing Partner is acceptable. |
| **B - LOW** | Low Risk – Indicates a developed financial management system and control framework with moderate likelihood of potential negative impact on the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. | Cooperation with Implementing Partner is accepted, with reservations and recommendations for reasonable control and monitoring of deployment of activities and eligibility of costs. |
| **C - MEDIUM** | Medium-Significant Risk – Indicates an underdeveloped financial management system or control framework with a significant likelihood of potential negative impact on the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. | Cooperation with Implementing Partner is not recommended.  Cooperation is possible under certain conditions established under the risk mitigation framework. |
| **D - HIGH** | High Risk – Indicates an underdeveloped financial management system and control framework with a significant likelihood of potential negative impact on the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. | Cooperation with Implementing Partner is excluded and Implementing Partner is not eligible. ITC shall not consider a new request or submission for cooperation for at least six (6) months / one (1) year after the review date. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CAPACITY ANALYSIS OF THE POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTING PARTNER (To be completed by Implementing Partner and reviewed by Project Manager) | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Staff Management experience** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Relevant project management experience (please provide detailed information): | | | | | | | |
| 2. Does the Implementing Partner have experience in the management or implementation of donor-funded projects? | | Yes No  (if yes, please provide relevant information) | | | | | |
| Other/Remarks: | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Planning and budget** | | | | | | | |
| Has the Implementing Partner designated a qualified focal point for the proposed project? | | Yes No  (if yes, please provide relevant information) | | | | | |
| Does the Implementing Partner have a formal planning and budgeting procedure and related documentation? (For instance, Manuals, Guidelines or similar) | | Yes No | | | | | |
| Does the Implementing Partner apply a results-based management methodology? | | Yes No  (if yes, please provide relevant information) | | | | | |
| 1. **Supervision, review, and reporting** | | | | | | | |
| How do managers supervise the implementation of work plans? How do they measure progress against targets?  [detail] | | | | | | | |
| How does the Entity document its performance, e.g., in annual or periodic reports?  [detail] | | | | | | | |
| 1. **Technical knowledge and skills** | | | | | | | |
| Do the skills and experience of the Entity’s technical professionals match those required for the project? | | Yes No | | | | | |
| Does the Entity have the necessary technical infrastructure (e.g., laboratories, equipment, software, technical data bases, etc.) to support the implementation of the project? | | Yes No | | | | | |
| 1. **Administrative capacity** | | | | | | | |
| Facilities, infrastructure and equipment | Does the Entity possess sufficient administrative facilities to carry out its activities, particularly in relation to the requirements of the project (i.e. appropriate facilities to conduct workshops)? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Procurement and contracting | Does the Entity have the legal authority to enter into contracts and agreements with other Entities? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Do procurement personnel have skills and experience that are appropriate to the requirements of the project? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Does the Entity have written procurement procedures? | Yes No | | | | | |
| 1. **Financial Management Capacity** | | | | | | | |
| Financial management Entity and personnel | Do finance personnel have experience managing donor resources? (If yes, provide evidence) | Yes No | | | | | |
| Is the Entity’s existing financial management capacity able to meet the additional demands of the project? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Does the Entity have a sustainable financial position? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Financial position | What is the Entity’s annual budget? | $ | | | | | |
| What is the maximum project amount per annum the Entity has ever managed? | $ | | | | | |
| If the proposed grant is given to this entity, what percentage of its annual turnover would it represent? | \_\_\_\_\_ % | | | | | |
| Internal control | Does the Entity have clear written procedures and internal controls governing receipt, handling and custody of funds and payments? (self-declaration) | Yes No | | | | | |
| Is there any evidence of non-compliance with financial rules and procedures? (self-declaration) | Yes No | | | | | |
| Has the Entity ever been implicated in proceedings regarding fraud? (Self-declaration) | Yes No | | | | | |
| Accounting and financial reporting | Are internal controls established and maintained in accordance with national standards or requirements? (self-declaration) | Yes No | | | | | |
| Audit | Is the Entity subject to external audit? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Are audit findings public? | Yes No | | | | | |
| Have audits identified instances of non-compliance with rules and procedures or misuse of financial resources? | Yes No | | | | | |
| ASSESSING THE PARTNERSHIP - RISKS AND BENEFITS FOR ITC | | | | | | | |
| **CONTACT HISTORY** | | | | | | | |
| 1. Provide any relevant information about ITC’s contact/collaboration with the entity in the past. | | | | | | | |
| 2. Are the concerned national Ministries and Donors informed/in agreement with the proposed partnership with the entity? | | | | Yes No | | | |
| 1. **PARTNERSHIP RISKS** | | | | | | | |
| ITC must maintain impartiality and accountability to all of its private and public stakeholders. Similarly, the agreed partnership must not in any way compromise the integrity and independence of ITC or that of the parties involved. Evaluate market risks and select applicable statements below: | | | | | | | |
| **Impartiality**  ITC will not – and will not be perceived to – give any unfair advantage to one or more businesses within an industry, sector or market, neither is it perceived to have endorsed a particular business, product or service. | | | | | Yes | | No |
| **No market distortion**  The partnership will not have negative unintended consequences by distorting a market by giving one business or group of businesses an unfair advantage and/or by crowding out other economic actors. | | | | | Yes | | No |
| **Non-exclusivity**  ITC will not enter in an exclusive relationship with an entity that would exclude ITC from working with another entity from the same sector. | | | | | Yes | | No |
| **Reasonable benefit**  The benefit to the entity from the collaboration will not be disproportionately high compared to the public benefits or benefits to ITC. | | | | | Yes | | No |
| **Non-dependency in procurement / No conflict of interest**  The entity has been informed that partnering with ITC will not provide preferential treatment in procurement process. | | | | | Yes | | No |
| **Political Risks[[9]](#footnote-9)**  According to the Project Document and Project Logframe the likelihood of any potential political risk is :  High  Medium  Low | | | | |  | |  |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |
| 1. **PARTNERSHIP BENEFITS** | | | | | | | |
| The balance between expected risks and expected benefits must be in line with the risk tolerance and appetite of ITC[[10]](#footnote-10).  ITC may generally be willing to bear higher risks if the benefits of the partnership clearly outweigh the risks. Select applicable statements below: | | | | | | | |
| There are significant potential gains in terms of achieving one or more of ITC’s strategic priorities within the ITC Strategic Plan and Entity’s Strategy. | | | Yes | | | No | |
| The entity is among the most suitable partners available in the country context. | | | Yes | | | No | |
| There is considerable potential for long-term engagement with the entity, in which resources are contributed on a significant scale, and there may be a significant outcome in terms of human development. | | | Yes | | | No | |
| The partnership is likely to create immediate results on the well-being of ITC’s beneficiaries | | | Yes | | | No | |
| The partnership will create wider awareness of and support for ITC | | | Yes | | | No | |
| The partnership allows access to new innovations for development. | | | Yes | | | No | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |
| 1. **MANAGEMENT OF THE PARTNERSHIP** | | | | | | | |
| Has the requesting Project Manager considered carefully the proposed Entity’s delivery capacity, taking into account any existing experience in the organisation? | | | Yes | | | No | |
| Does the entity comply with specific conditions or limitations required by the Donor (if any)? | | | Yes | | | No | |
| Will the Partnership with the Entity entail the disclosure of confidential information? | | | Yes | | | No | |
| Does the entity have managerial practices in place that mitigate the risk of fraud such as multiple approval processes and signatures in bank accounts? (Can be obtained through self-certification) | | | Yes | | | No | |
| Does the entity possess the necessary monitoring and evaluation capacity (especially if subcontracts are envisaged)? (self-certification) | | | Yes | | | No | |
| Comments: | | | | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting Documentation | |
| Responsible Officers has collected copies of documentation related to the Entity. Reference to the documents below and their assessment shall be referred in the Rationale for the decision on the Entity’s aptitude and risk for ITC. | |
| By Laws – Acts of Incorporation | **Yes, attached.  Not available.** |
| Comments if any: | |
| Last three (3) annual Financial Statements (audited if applicable) | **Yes, attached.  Not available.** |
| Comments if any: | |
| Last three (3) available External Financial Audits | **Yes, attached.  Not available.** |
| Comments if any: | |
| Last three (3) available Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) Activity Reports (optional) | **Yes, attached.  Not available.** |
| Comments if any: | |
| Other: ………………………………………. | **Yes, attached.  Not available.** |
| Comments if any: | |
| Other: ………………………………………. | **Yes, attached.  Not available.** |
| Comments if any: | |

**SECTION V - DECISION AND APPROVAL FOR ALL GRANTS**

The Responsible Officer certifies that s/he has carried out all best efforts to collect information and has also documented the risks that have been identified in relation to the proposed Entity under this assessment. Decision as to whether or not ITC should engage with the proposed Entity is based on the information collected, based on a reasonable search with the available means. Responsible Officers, Chief and Director assume full responsibility and accountability for the assessment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Under all “categories” the partner is considered apt and low risk.**  The risk-benefit analysis indicates that the partnership is worth pursuing.   * + **VERY LOW / LOW RISK** | **One or more “Categories or types” or risk are involved in the partnership or partner related.**  **Risks exist, but they are clearly outweighed by the expected benefits. Corporate approval is required to pursue the partnership.**  The risk-benefit analysis indicates that the partnership is worth pursuing.   * + **MEDIUM RISK LEVEL** | **One or more “no-go” risks are present, or significant risks are *not* sufficiently outweighed by benefits.**  The risk-benefit analysis indicates that ITC should refrain from engaging in the partnership.   * + **HIGH RISK LEVEL** |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk level** | **Recommendation** | **Next step** |
| **high risk** | refrain from engagement | The approval process is concluded by the Division Director. |
| **medium risk** | approve with conditions | ***If risk mitigation measures are applied as recommended in the risk mitigation matrix and grant is < 1 million USD:***  The approval process is concluded by the Division Director, who informs SMC. |
| ***If the conditions divert from the recommended risk mitigation and/or the grant is > 1 million USD:***  The decision needs to be escalated by the Division Director to SMC for final approval. |
| **very low/low risk** | approve the engagement | The approval process is concluded by the Division Director. |

|  |
| --- |
| PROCESS AND RESULTS |
| Process carried out for the identification and selection of the partner. Project Manager to provide the rationale for selection of partner and to keep records of process. |
|  |
| Provide a final summary of capacity analysis on the basis of the assessment above. |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **RISK AND BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THE PROPOSED PARTNERSHIP** |
| Provide a brief statement on the strategic objective of partnering with this entity. How will this partnership contribute to ITC’s work and development cooperation? What are the arguments that speak for a partnership with this entity? (e.g. technical expertise, cost effectiveness, multiplier effect, CSR, ownership and sustainability) |
|  |
| If relevant, describe what the prospective partner will expect from ITC in return, in addition to the payment, in the course of the partnership (e.g. permission to place ITC’s logo on websites or in reports): |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **OVERALL RISK ASSESSMENT RESULTS** |
| Based on the information collected and assessed (exclusionary criteria, reputational risk, capacity, risk-benefit assessment) the responsible officer rates the overall risk level:  **Low  Medium  High** |
| RECOMMENDATION BY THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICER |
| **Approve the engagement**  **Approve with conditions (risk mitigation measures applied)**  **Refrain from engaging** |
| Justification for the choice and explanation of the planned risk mitigation measures: |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICER** | |
| **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE (if applicable):** | |
| **SIGNATURE OF THE RESPONSIBLE OFFICER** | |
| *Date:* | *(Signature)* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATION** | |
| **SECTION CHIEF** | |
| **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE (if applicable):** | |
| **APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATION BY SIGNATURE:**  *Date:* | *(Signature)* |
| **DIVISION DIRECTOR** | |
| **CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE (if applicable):** | |
| **APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATION BY SIGNATURE:**  *Date:* | *(Signature)* |

|  |
| --- |
| Approval by SMC (If applicable) for all grants ABOVE 1,000,000 USD |
| **Approve the engagement**  **Approve with conditions (risk mitigation measures applied)**  **Refrain from engaging** |
| Decision: [Rationale] |
| Conditions: [Conditions] |

1. ITC provides financial resources to the partner. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A for-profit business that is listed on the stock exchange. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. “Primarily” here is intended to mean businesses that generate above 10 per cent of their total revenues from the activity, or which hold market share leadership on excluded activity (i.e. ranking among the top ten players in a market or globally), or which is publicly presented and promoted focusing on excluded activity. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For a more extensive definition of complicity see as reference the following publications: “Guiding Principles for Business and Human Rights” “Embedding Human Rights into Business Practice” https://www.unglobalcompact.org/library/1441 and Report of the Special Representative of the SG on the Issue of Human Rights and Transnational Corporations – Clarifying the Concepts of Sphere of Influence and Complicity (A/HRC/8/16). [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Systematic nature of such violations is measured through an assessment of issues using indicators such as: materiality, incidence and frequency, corporate response and remedial action, company specificity and peer assessment, etc. Specific tools and guidelines for this assessment will be developed and will follow this framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. This is in lieu of the explanation/justification of selection of partner provided in the memo which is submitted with the grant request. This memo will no longer be required. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. The gross inflow of economic benefits (cash, receivables, other assets) generated from the ordinary operating activities of the entity (such as sales of goods, sales of services, interest, royalties, and dividends) during the year. Public entities can provide equivalent information from their income statements. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. The gross inflow of economic benefits (cash, receivables, other assets) generated from the ordinary operating activities of the implementing partner (such as sales of goods, sales of services, interest, royalties, and dividends) during the year. Public implementing partners can provide equivalent information from their income statements. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Political risks include the consequences and likelihood of changes in government. Special attention should be given to countries under United Nations sanctions. Political risks also include the risk of having the government withdraw support for the partnership or ITC engaging in close partnership with an actor that is seen as business arm of the political elite. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. As per this Implementing Partner selection policy, Responsible Officers (ROs) in charge of the assessment may at any time request **SPPG assistance and advice on determining the risks associated with an IP, particularly in regards to ITC’s Risk Policy and Appetite.** [↑](#footnote-ref-10)