1. **Introduction**

1.1 This document aims to provide a common understanding of the procedure for the submission and processing of revision requests for projects funded by the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF) by:

   a) defining different types of project revisions which may be required;
   b) setting out general rules in relation to the admissibility of project revision requests;
   c) outlining procedures to be followed for the submission, review and approval of project revision requests, clarifying roles and responsibilities for each stakeholder involved; and
   d) describing issues related to monitoring and reporting arising from project revisions.

1.2 The primary intended audiences are; Cluster Coordinators and Co-coordinators, implementing partners, OCHA and UNDP (within the joint SSHF Technical Secretariat), as well as the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and interested donors.

2. **Types of Project Revisions**

2.1 Changes in project implementation for which prior approval is required through the submission of a project revision request include:

   a) significant changes in programmatic aspects (addition / removal of one or more core project objectives, outputs, activities; change in location at state level; change in the type of beneficiaries, for example from IDPs to host community, change in target number of beneficiaries exceeding 15% of the approved target);
   b) budget realignments, where the variation under any budget heading/category\(^1\) exceeds 20% of the originally allocated amount. Expenditures made without the requisite prior approval may result in their ineligibility; and
   c) changes in project duration (no-cost extensions). Cost extensions are not currently practiced.

2.2 Changes in project implementation for which prior approval is not required, and therefore for which the submission of a project revision request is not applicable, include:

   a) minor changes in project programmatic aspects (textual, non-substantive modification of project title, objectives, outputs, and activities; change in location at county or payam level; change in beneficiary numbers not exceeding 15% of the established target)
   b) budget realignments where the variation under any budget heading/category is not more than 20% of the originally allocated amount; in such cases the SSHF TS and the respective Cluster Coordinator / Co-coordinator should be notified in writing (by email), including the justification and rationale for the change. The SSHF TS will use this notification as a ‘note to file’ for future reference. The realigned budget should be reflected in subsequent reporting.

2.3 Where there may be uncertainty about whether or not prior approval of a change is required through the submission of a project revision request, the onus lies with the implementing partner to seek clarification directly with the SSHF TS. Where changes are made in project implementation but without the requisite prior approval, the implementing partner runs the risk of negative assessments of project performance and / or ineligible expenditures.

---

\(^1\) SSHF budget headings/categories are : (1) staff and other personnel costs, (2) supplies, commodities & materials, (3) equipment, (4) contractual services, (5) travel, (6) transfers and grants to counterpart, and (7) general operating and other direct costs.
3. **Admissibility of project revision requests**

3.1 Before a project revision request can be accepted for consideration the following admissibility criteria must be met:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admissibility Criteria</th>
<th>No Cost Extensions (NCEs)</th>
<th>Programmatic change(s) (excluding NCEs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Intention to request project revision notified to SSHF TS through email at least one month prior to approved project end date.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. All normal prior reporting requirements for the project have been met.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In the case of a NCE request, the cumulative period of extension requested does not exceed 3 months.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In the case of a NCE request, a minimum of 30% of the total amount allocated is reported as spent.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Where the relevant admissibility criteria are not met, the formal submission of a project revision request will only be entertained where exceptional admissibility is granted by the Humanitarian Coordinator. To request exceptional admissibility, the Head / Representative of the partner organisation should send a written request via email to the SSHF TS (SSHF@un.org) addressed to the Humanitarian Coordinator clearly specifying the project to be revised, why the normal admissibility criteria are not met, and justifications for the proposed revisions. The requesting organisation must provide an overview of expenditure, activities implemented and pending, and a commitment to finalise pending activities within any proposed period of extension.

3.3 The SSHF TS will concurrently review the request for exceptional admissibility and the substance of the proposed revision, and make a corresponding recommendation to the HC. Where exceptional admissibility is granted the GMS will be activated for the partner to formalise the project revision process which must be initiated no later than 2 working days following the notification of the approval of exceptional admissibility, and finalised within 7 working days of the granting of exceptional admissibility. Failure by the partner to engage with the process within 2 working days may result in the revision request being cancelled or rejected. Where the exceptional admissibility is not granted the GMS will not be activated and the revision request will not proceed further.

4. **Procedures for the submission, review and approval of project revision requests**

4.1 The requesting partner shall communicate to the SSHF TS by email its intention to submit a project revision request at least one month prior to the approved project end date. The notification should be made by email to SSHF@un.org. A template to assist partners to draft the email will be available.

4.2 The SSHF TS shall provide feedback to the requesting partner within two (2) working days from the receipt of the email regarding the admissibility of the request as well as additional guidance on the next steps. If the request is admissible, the SSHF TS will activate the workflow in the GMS for the formal submission of the revision request. If the proposed request is not admissible, the SSHF TS will not activate the workflow in the GMS and formal submission of the request will not be possible, until exceptional admissibility is granted by the HC.
4.3 Where a project revision request is admissible it is the responsibility of the requesting partner to submit the details of the project revision request within a maximum of two (2) working days after the activation of the related workflow in the GMS. Any project revision request submitted beyond two working days after the activation of the related workflow in the GMS may be rejected.

4.4 The SSHF TS shall activate the full review process of the project revision request within two (2) working days from the date of submission of the revision request by the partner in the GMS. The revision request will be reviewed by the Cluster Coordinator / Co-coordinator and the SSHF TS. Where further information or clarification is required from the partner, this shall be provided within a further two (2) working days from notification by the SSHF TS. The review of the project revision request between the requesting partner, the Cluster Coordinator / Co-coordinator and the SSHF TS should be completed within a maximum of 10 working days.

4.5 The timeframes outlined in the preceding paragraphs aim to ensure that project revision requests are submitted and reviewed in a timely manner. In particular, for revision requests submitted towards the end of the agreed project implementation period the review process must be completed sufficiently in advance of the end date of the project to allow for any further queries which may be raised by the OCHA Head of Office or the Humanitarian Coordinator to be addressed prior to final approval. The SSHF TS will not be responsible for delays in engagement from the partner and/or the Cluster Coordinator / Co-coordinator which result in the review process becoming protracted and which could lead to the rejection of the request, particularly in cases where the end date of the project has already passed.

4.6 Budget realignments should not increase or decrease the total approved budget. The realignment should not involve diverting funding from direct costs to administrative and support costs without strong justification, nor should it eliminate or add a core project activity, fundamentally changing the original intent of the project, unless there is strong justification.

5. Monitoring and Reporting

4.1 An additional narrative or financial report may be required at the time of analysing the request for a project revision. Even where this is not required, the revision request will include a clear overview of results achieved to date by using the templates provided in the GMS. The provision of monitoring documentation that can substantiate these results may be required. Approval of the project revision may be contingent upon a monitoring activity undertaken by the SSHF TS, or may trigger a subsequent monitoring activity to verify the project status and achievements.

4.2 Where an approved project revision substantively alters the original project design and logical framework (budget, activities, outputs and outcomes), these changes will be clearly reflected in any subsequent project reports.

4.3 Project revisions involving a no-cost extension may affect narrative and financial reporting requirements and timelines. Such changes will be notified to the implementing partner by the SSHF TS at the time of the approval of the project revision, and the changes will be clearly reflected on the partner’s GMS dashboard.
6. Roles and responsibilities for review and approval of Project Revisions

6.1 The following table summarises the different roles and responsibilities in the process of clearance, endorsement and final approval (or rejection) of project revision requests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of project revision</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>SSHF TS</th>
<th>OCHA HoO</th>
<th>HC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- No-cost extension of more than one month</td>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Endorsement</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No-cost extension of up to one month</td>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Significant changes in programmatic aspects (objectives, outputs, activities, geographical locations and target beneficiaries)</td>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budget realignments (variation exceeds 20% of amount allocated at level of budget heading)</td>
<td>Clearance</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>