



REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (RFP)

<p style="text-align: center;">UNDP, FOURAH BAY CLOSE, OFF MAIN MOTOR ROAD WILBERFORCE, FREETOWN , SIERRA LEONE.</p>	DATE: July 20, 2020
	REFERENCE: SLE/RFP/2020/004

Dear Sir / Madam:

We kindly request you to submit your Proposal for: **Consultancy firm to conduct MICRO ASSESSMENT**. Please be guided by the form attached hereto as Annex 2, in preparing your Proposal.

Proposals may be submitted on or before Monday, August 03, 2020 5:00p.m Sierra Leone Time (1700hrs GMT) and via email, courier mail or fax to the address below:

United Nations Development Programme
Fourah Bay Close, Off Main Motor Road, Wilberforce
Procure.sle@undp.org
Yona Samo
Yonah.samo@undp.org

Your Proposal must be expressed in the English Language, and valid for a minimum period of 120 days (One Hundred and Twenty Work Days (Mondays to Fridays)).

In the course of preparing your Proposal, it shall remain your responsibility to ensure that it reaches the address above on or before the deadline. Proposals that are received by UNDP after the deadline indicated above, for whatever reason, shall not be considered for evaluation. If you are submitting your Proposal by email, kindly ensure that they are signed and in the .pdf format, and free from any virus or corrupted files.

Services proposed shall be reviewed and evaluated based on completeness and compliance of the Proposal and responsiveness with the requirements of the RFP and all other annexes providing details of UNDP requirements.

The Proposal that complies with all of the requirements, meets all the evaluation criteria and offers the best value for money shall be selected and awarded the contract. Any offer that does not meet the requirements shall be rejected.

Any discrepancy between the unit price and the total price shall be re-computed by UNDP, and the unit price shall prevail, and the total price shall be corrected. If the Service Provider does not accept the final price based on UNDP's re-computation and correction of errors, its Proposal will be rejected.

No price variation due to escalation, inflation, fluctuation in exchange rates, or any other market factors shall be accepted by UNDP after it has received the Proposal. At the time of Award of Contract or Purchase Order, UNDP reserves the right to vary (increase or decrease) the quantity of services and/or goods, by up to a maximum twenty-five per cent (25%) of the

total offer, without any change in the unit price or other terms and conditions.

Any Contract or Purchase Order that will be issued as a result of this RFP shall be subject to the General Terms and Conditions attached hereto. The mere act of submission of a Proposal implies that the Service Provider accepts without question the General Terms and Conditions of UNDP, herein attached as Annex 3.

Please be advised that UNDP is not bound to accept any Proposal, nor award a contract or Purchase Order, nor be responsible for any costs associated with a Service Providers preparation and submission of a Proposal, regardless of the outcome or the manner of conducting the selection process.

UNDP's vendor protest procedure is intended to afford an opportunity to appeal for persons or firms not awarded a Purchase Order or Contract in a competitive procurement process. In the event that you believe you have not been fairly treated, you can find detailed information about vendor protest procedures in the following link:

<http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/operations/procurement/business/protest-and-sanctions.html>

UNDP encourages every prospective Service Provider to prevent and avoid conflicts of interest, by disclosing to UNDP if you, or any of your affiliates or personnel, were involved in the preparation of the requirements, design, cost estimates, and other information used in this RFP.

UNDP implements a zero tolerance on fraud and other proscribed practices, and is committed to preventing, identifying and addressing all such acts and practices against UNDP, as well as third parties involved in UNDP activities. UNDP expects its Service Providers to adhere to the UN Supplier Code of Conduct found in this link :

https://www.un.org/Depts/ptd/sites/www.un.org.Depts.ptd/files/files/attachment/page/pdf/unscc/conduct_english.pdf

Thank you and we look forward to receiving your Proposal.

Sincerely yours,

Yonah Samoh

Yonah Samoh
Procurement Specialist
7/20/2020

Km

Description of Requirements

Context of the Requirement	Consultancy firm to conduct MICRO ASSESSMENT of UNDP Implementing Partners
Implementing Partner of UNDP	Head of the Planning and Support Unit (PSU) in close consultation with UNDP HACT Focal Points.
Brief Description of the Required Services ¹	<p>In February 2014, the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) formally released the second version of the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (2014 UNDG HACT Framework¹) which supersedes the previous framework, adopted in 2005. Sierra Leone, in response, has been making progress towards the adoption and rollout of the new HACT Framework pursuant to the UN General Assembly Resolution 56/201 on the triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP (UNDG Ex-Com Agencies). An affirmative action in that regard was the establishment of an inter-agency Task Force, Direct Programme Support Task Force (DiPS) by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Sierra Leone to coordinate and implement the HACT roll-out plan. The Taskforce provides technical support and oversight of all agency specific or inter-agency micro assessments, spot checks, field visits, scheduled audits and other assurance functions.</p> <p>UNDP Sierra Leone conducted a micro assessment of 38 partners in January 2014 in preparation for the Country Programme Document (CPD) cycle 2015-18. The second round of assessment was conducted for 30 partners in 2017. This is a third round of assessment for mostly existing but unassessed, new and potential partners. This assessment will help in the identification and planning to address IP capacity gaps through direct assistance by UNDP or through other development partners. The results of the HACT assessment will be used in determining the Cash Transfer Modality (CTM) as well as help focus future capacity development activities in key thematic and mandated areas of development, and on developing the financial management capacity necessary for any IP.</p> <p>This is a move towards the adoption of a common operational framework for transferring cash to government and non-government Implementing Partners. The adoption of the new harmonized approach is a further step in implementing the Rome Declaration on Harmonization and Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which call for a closer alignment of development aid with national priorities and needs. The approach allows efforts to focus more on strengthening national capacities for management and accountability, with a view to gradually shift to utilizing national systems. It will also help UNDP shape its capacity development interventions and provide support to new aid modalities.</p> <p>.</p>

¹ A detailed TOR may be attached if the information listed in this Annex is not sufficient to fully describe the nature of the work and other details of the requirements.

<p>List and Description of Expected Outputs to be Delivered</p>	<p>Basic objectives of consultancy/contractor (assignment) services:</p> <p>The purpose of this assessment is to identify and manage risk of cash transfers derived from project level controls. It is meant to reaffirm a shift from a control-based to a risk-based management approach. On the high side, it is to ensure a closer alignment of development aid with national priorities and strengthen national capacities for management and accountability, with the ultimate objective of gradually shifting to national systems.</p> <p>Accordingly, the two primary outputs of the micro-assessment are: (a) An overall risk rating related to cash transfers to IPs (low, moderate, significant, or high); and (b) The appropriate type and frequency of assurance activities and cash transfer modality</p> <p>The Micro Assessment will be conducted for 35 Implementing Partners to provide an overall assessment of each IP financial and program management capacity. The review should include but not limited to the following: (i) Funds flow, (ii) Staffing (iii) Accounting policies and procedures (iv) Internal audit (v) External audit (vi) Reporting and monitoring (vii) Information systems; etc.</p> <p>Methodology, Procedures and Management Arrangements</p> <p>The Micro-assessment includes one or more site visits to the IP. The assessment primarily consists of interviews with IP personnel and a review of relevant documentation sufficient to complete Annex 2 “the Micro Assessment Questionnaire”. The questionnaire provides an overall risk rating based on responses provided, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low Risk – indicates a well-developed financial management system and functioning control framework with a low likelihood of potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. • Medium Risk – indicates a developed financial management system and control framework with moderate likelihood of potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. • Significant Risk – indicates an underdeveloped financial management system or control framework with a significant likelihood of potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. • High Risk – indicates an underdeveloped financial management system and control framework with a significant likelihood and potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan. <p>The micro assessment procedures are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prepare for the assessment, the third-party service provider will receive general information regarding the IP and the programme from the UNDP HACT Focal Point in preparation for the assessment. Refer to Annex 2 “Programme-specific information” for details.
---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third-party service provider will review this documentation in advance of performing a site visit to the IP. • The third-party service provider should provide the IP with an advance request of the documents and interviews they would like to have while on site, to ensure efficient use of time while on on-site. • The third-party service provider will complete the Micro Assessment Questionnaire (Annex 2, with instructions) based on the procedures performed during the assessment period. • The third-party service provider will discuss the results of the questionnaire with the UNDP Programme Management Support Unit (PMSU) and the HACT Focal Point before finalizing it. • The third-party service provider should have full and complete access to all records and documents (books of account, legal agreements, minutes of committee meetings, bank records, invoices and contracts, etc) and all employees of the IP that provide answers to the questions in Annex 2. If the access to any records, persons or locations during the course of the assessment is restricted, this restriction should be clearly defined, with reasons, in the report. • The service provider should give special attention to records and documents relating to the IP's issues, experiences and lessons with regard to the implementation and management of programmes/projects that are funded by official development assistance in general and technical assistance in particular. <p>Management Arrangement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The micro assessment should be completed within four weeks, including site visits. The HACT focal point will introduce the service provide and the IP to aid coordination of the required site visit. • The service provider will report to Head of the Planning and Support Unit (PSU) in close consultation with UNDP HACT Focal Points. • The Third Party service provider should assess the partner's control system with equal emphasis on: (1) the effectiveness of the system in providing the partner's management with useful and timely information for the proper management of the partner; (2) the general effectiveness of the internal control system in protecting the assets and resources of the partner. • Once draft reports are provided by the consulting firm, UNDP will review the draft report and send their official comments to the consulting firm so that the consulting firm can finalize the report. Such a review should include (i) IP Management's comments/clarifications on each of the consulting firm's findings and (ii) their suggested follow-up actions to improve the IP's financial management capacity generally. Upon the final approval, the final report will be officially shared with the IPs for appropriate follow-up actions when required. <p>Deliverables</p> <p>The micro-assessment deliverables are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An inception report, which will provide an overview of the work at hand with clear timelines of each stage of the entire assessment process • The Draft and Final Report including the following: Overall risk rating and risk rating of funds flow, staffing, accounting policies and procedures,
--	---

Km

	<p>internal audit, external audit, reporting and monitoring and information systems; a description of implementing partners, standards applied, specific internal control concerns and recommendations (both for monitoring and assurance activities and to resolve/eliminate the internal control weaknesses)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An executive summary, detailing the overall risk rating and specific identified risks • The completed Micro Assessment Questionnaire. • A briefing, organized by PSU and made by the service provider on the results of the micro-assessment to UNDP Senior Management <p>UNDP Sierra Leone will share the micro assessment reports with the involved UN Agencies, the IPs and the Government Coordinating</p> <p>Qualifications of the consulting firm</p> <p>General expertise and qualifications of the consulting firm should be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong and relevant expertise and recognized professional qualifications and experience • be experienced in performing assessments similar to a micro assessment and assessing risks related to organizational financial management capacity (i.e. accounting, reporting, procurement and internal controls). • Good internal quality assurance system. • Proven record of the firm's human resources including number for each level of professional staff, partner/ staff ratio. <p>CVs of all members of the assessment team should be provided and should include details on engagements carried out by relevant staff, including ongoing assignments indicating responsibilities assumed by them and their qualifications and experience in undertaking similar assessments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The third-party service provider should have a good public reputation in the area of business. • Familiarity with the policies, rules and procedures of the agencies of United Nations and the Government of Lao PDR respectively is an asset. <p>The consulting firm must be completely impartial and independent from all aspects of management or financial interests in IPs being micro-assessed or those of its implementing/supervising agency or directly related entities. The consulting firm should not, during the period covered by the assessment nor during the undertaking of the assessment, be employed by, or have any financial or close business relationships with any senior participant in the management of the entity. CV of all members of the assessment team should be provided, with details on assessments or audits carried out by the relevant staff, including on-going assignments indicating responsibilities assumed by them, and their qualifications and experience in undertaking audits.</p>
--	--

	<p>Duration of Assignment and Payment terms</p> <p>The duration of the assessment should be a maximum of four weeks for the completion of assessments. Assessments of different partners can be done simultaneously during this time frame depending on the capacity of the Assessment team.</p> <p>The successful service provider will commence the assignment as soon as the procurement process is completed, and the contract is signed. Submissions will be accepted from both National and International service providers. The terms of payment for the consultancy will be as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 20 % upon presentation and adoption of the Inception Report • 50 % upon presentation of Draft Reports • 30% - final payment upon satisfactory completion of work and approval of the Final Report.
Person to Supervise the Work/Performance of the Service Provider	Head of the Planning and Support Unit (PSU) in close consultation with UNDP HACT Focal Points.
Frequency of Reporting	<i>Based on successfully completed deliverables.</i>
Progress Reporting Requirements	Successfully achieved deliverables
Location of work	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Exact Address/es Freetown, Sierra Leone. <input type="checkbox"/> At Contractor's Location
Expected duration of work	One month (1 Month)
Target start date	Immediately
Latest completion date	Four Weeks after signing of the contract
Travels Expected	TBD (if any)
Special Security Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Security Clearance from UN prior to travelling <input type="checkbox"/> Completion of UN's Basic and Advanced Security Training (not required) <input type="checkbox"/> Comprehensive Travel Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> Others <i>[pls. specify]</i>
Facilities to be Provided by UNDP (i.e., must be excluded from Price Proposal)	<input type="checkbox"/> Office space and facilities (not required) <input type="checkbox"/> Land Transportation (not required) <input type="checkbox"/> Others <i>[pls. specify]</i>
Implementation Schedule indicating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required

breakdown and timing of activities/sub-activities	<input type="checkbox"/> Not Required
Names and curriculum vitae of individuals who will be involved in completing the services	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Required <input type="checkbox"/> Not Required
Currency of Proposal	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> United States Dollars <input type="checkbox"/> Euro <input type="checkbox"/> Local Currency
Value Added Tax on Price Proposal ²	<input type="checkbox"/> must be inclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> must be exclusive of VAT and other applicable indirect taxes
Validity Period of Proposals (Counting for the last day of submission of quotes)	<input type="checkbox"/> 60 days <input type="checkbox"/> 90 days <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 120 days In exceptional circumstances, UNDP may request the Proposer to extend the validity of the Proposal beyond what has been initially indicated in this RFP. The Proposal shall then confirm the extension in writing, without any modification whatsoever on the Proposal.
Partial Quotes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not permitted <input type="checkbox"/> Permitted
Payment Terms ³	To Be Determined
Person(s) to review/inspect/ approve outputs/completed services and authorize the disbursement of payment	Head of the Planning and Support Unit (PSU) in close consultation with UNDP HACT Focal Points..
Type of Contract to be Signed	<input type="checkbox"/> Purchase Order <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Institutional Contract <input type="checkbox"/> Contract for Professional Services

² VAT exemption status varies from one country to another. Pls. check whatever is applicable to the UNDP CO/BU requiring the service.

³ UNDP preference is not to pay any amount in advance upon signing of contract. If the Service Provider strictly requires payment in advance, it will be limited only up to 20% of the total price quoted. For any higher percentage, or any amount advanced exceeding \$30,000, UNDP shall require the Service Provider to submit a bank guarantee or bank cheque payable to UNDP, in the same amount as the payment advanced by UNDP to the Service Provider.

	<input type="checkbox"/> Long-Term Agreement ⁴
Criteria for Contract Award	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lowest Price Quote among technically responsive offers <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Highest Combined Score (based on the 70% technical offer and 30% price weight distribution) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Full acceptance of the UNDP Contract General Terms and Conditions (GTC). This is a mandatory criterion and cannot be deleted regardless of the nature of services required. Non-acceptance of the GTC may be grounds for the rejection of the Proposal.
Criteria for the Assessment of Proposal	Technical Proposal (70%) <input type="checkbox"/> Expertise of the Firm 20% <input type="checkbox"/> Methodology, Its Appropriateness to the Condition and Timeliness of the Implementation Plan 40% <input type="checkbox"/> Management Structure and Qualification of Key Personnel 10% Financial Proposal (30%) To be computed as a ratio of the Proposal's offer to the lowest price among the proposals received by UNDP.
UNDP will award the contract to:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> One and only one Service Provider <input type="checkbox"/> One or more Service Providers, depending on the following factors:
Contract General Terms and Conditions ⁵	<input type="checkbox"/> General Terms and Conditions for contracts (goods and/or services) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Terms and Conditions for de minimis contracts (services only, less than \$50,000) Applicable Terms and Conditions are available at: http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/procurement/business/how-we-buy.html
Annexes to this RFP ⁶	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Form for Submission of Proposal (Annex 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed TOR <input type="checkbox"/> Others ⁷ [pls. specify]
Contact Person for Inquiries (Written inquiries only) ⁸	Yona Samo Procurement Specialist Yonah.samo@undp.org Any delay in UNDP's response shall be not used as a reason for extending the deadline for submission, unless UNDP determines that such an extension is necessary and communicates a new deadline to the Proposers.
Who can apply	Proposals are invited from institutions/organizations only. Proposal submitted by Individuals will not be accepted.

⁴ Minimum of one (1) year period and may be extended up to a maximum of three (3) years subject to satisfactory performance evaluation. This RFP may be used for LTAs if the annual purchases will not exceed \$150,000.00.

⁵ Service Providers are alerted that non-acceptance of the terms of the General Terms and Conditions (GTC) may be grounds for disqualification from this procurement process.

⁶ Where the information is available in the web, a URL for the information may simply be provided.

⁷ A more detailed Terms of Reference in addition to the contents of this RFP may be attached hereto.

⁸ This contact person and address is officially designated by UNDP. If inquiries are sent to other person/s or address/es, even if they are UNDP staff, UNDP shall have no obligation to respond nor can UNDP confirm that the query was received.

Other Information <i>[pls. specify]</i>	
--	--

Annex 2

FORM FOR SUBMITTING SERVICE PROVIDER'S PROPOSAL⁹***(This Form must be submitted only using the Service Provider's Official Letterhead/Stationery¹⁰)***

[insert: Location].

[insert: Date]

To: [insert: Name and Address of UNDP focal point]

Dear Sir/Madam:

We, the undersigned, hereby offer to render the following services to UNDP in conformity with the requirements defined in the RFP dated [specify date] , and all of its attachments, as well as the provisions of the UNDP General Contract Terms and Conditions :

A. Qualifications of the Service Provider

The Service Provider must describe and explain how and why they are the best entity that can deliver the requirements of UNDP by indicating the following :

- a) Profile – describing the nature of business, field of expertise, licenses, certifications, accreditations;*
- b) Business Licenses – Registration Papers, Tax Payment Certification, etc.*
- c) Latest Audited Financial Statement – income statement and balance sheet to indicate its financial stability, liquidity, credit standing, and market reputation, etc. ;*
- d) Track Record – list of clients for similar services as those required by UNDP, indicating description of contract scope, contract duration, contract value, contract references;*
- e) Certificates and Accreditation – including Quality Certificates, Patent Registrations, Environmental Sustainability Certificates, etc.*
- f) Written Self-Declaration that the company is not in the UN Security Council 1267/1989 List, UN Procurement Division List or Other UN Ineligibility List.*

B. Proposed Methodology for the Completion of Services

The Service Provider must describe how it will address/deliver the demands of the RFP; providing a detailed description of the essential performance characteristics, reporting conditions and quality assurance mechanisms that will be put in place, while demonstrating that the proposed methodology will be appropriate to the local conditions and context of the work.

⁹ This serves as a guide to the Service Provider in preparing the Proposal.

¹⁰ Official Letterhead/Stationery must indicate contact details – addresses, email, phone and fax numbers – for verification purposes

C. Qualifications of Key Personnel

If required by the RFP, the Service Provider must provide :

- a) *Names and qualifications of the key personnel that will perform the services indicating who is Team Leader, who are supporting, etc.;*
- b) *CVs demonstrating qualifications must be submitted if required by the RFP; and*
- c) *Written confirmation from each personnel that they are available for the entire duration of the contract.*

D. Cost Breakdown per Deliverable*

	Deliverables <i>[list them as referred to in the RFP]</i>	Percentage of Total Price <i>(Weight for payment)</i>	Price <i>(Lump Sum, All Inclusive)</i>
1	Deliverable 1		
2	Deliverable 2		
3		
	Total	100%	

**This shall be the basis of the payment tranches*

E. Cost Breakdown by Cost Component [This is only an Example]:

Description of Activity	Remuneration per Unit of Time	Total Period of Engagement	No. of Personnel	Total Rate
I. Personnel Services				
1. Services from Home Office				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
2. Services from Field Offices				
a . Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
3. Services from Overseas				
a. Expertise 1				
b. Expertise 2				
II. Out of Pocket Expenses				
1. Travel Costs				
2. Daily Allowance				
3. Communications				
4. Reproduction				
5. Equipment Lease				
6. Others				
III. Other Related Costs				

[Name and Signature of the Service Provider's Authorized Person]
[Designation]
[Date]

Appendix I.

UNITED NATIONS COUNTRY TEAM SIERRA LEONE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR MICRO ASSESSMENT

1.0 Background

- 1.1 In February 2014, the United Nations Development Group (UNDG) formally released the second version of the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (2014 UNDG HACT Framework¹) which supersedes the previous framework, adopted in 2005. Sierra Leone, in response, has been making progress towards the adoption and rollout of the new HACT Framework pursuant to the UN General Assembly Resolution 56/201 on the triennial policy review of operational activities for development of the United Nations system, UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA and WFP (UNDG Ex-Com Agencies). An affirmative action in that regard was the establishment of an inter-agency Task Force, Direct Programme Support Task Force (DiPS) by the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) in Sierra Leone to coordinate and implement the HACT roll-out plan. The Taskforce provides technical support and oversight of all agency specific or inter-agency micro assessments, spot checks, field visits, scheduled audits and other assurance functions.
- 1.2 UNDP Sierra Leone conducted a micro assessment of 38 partners in January 2014 in preparation for the Country Programme Document (CPD) cycle 2015-18. The second round of assessment was conducted for 30 partners in 2017. This is a third round of assessment for mostly existing but unassessed, new and potential partners. This assessment will help in the identification and planning to address IP capacity gaps through direct assistance by UNDP or through other development partners. The results of the HACT assessment will be used in determining the Cash Transfer Modality (CTM) as well as help focus future capacity development activities in key thematic and mandated areas of development, and on developing the financial management capacity necessary for any IP.
- 1.3 This is a move towards the adoption of a common operational framework for transferring cash to government and non-government Implementing Partners. The adoption of the new harmonized approach is a further step in implementing the Rome Declaration on Harmonization and Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, which call for a closer alignment of development aid with national priorities and needs. The approach allows efforts to focus more on strengthening national capacities for management and accountability, with a view to gradually shift to utilizing national systems. It will also help UNDP shape its capacity development interventions and provide support to new aid modalities.

2.0 Relevancy of Micro Assessment

- 2.1 The HACT Framework designates significant entity responsible and accountable for the proper use of agency-provided resources and implementation and management of the intended programme as defined in the national and UNCT development support frameworks. The assessment and implementation of its findings will significantly reduce transaction costs and lessen the burden that the multiplicity of UN procedures and rules creates for its partners.
- 2.2 The current micro assessment will target **35** implementing partners (IPs) mostly Government partners and civil society organizations (CSOs) as a follow up to the 2017 micro assessment (30 partners). Through the same procurement process, UNDP will seek to engage the services of (one or more) third party firms on a

long-term agreement (LTA) for provision of HACT related support. It is envisaged that the same agreement framework will be used to provide inter-agency HACT support

3.0 Purposes and Scope of Assignment

3.1 The purpose of this assessment is to identify and manage risk of cash transfers derived from project level controls. It is meant to reaffirm a shift from a control-based to a risk-based management approach. On the high side, it is to ensure a closer alignment of development aid with national priorities and strengthen national capacities for management and accountability, with the ultimate objective of gradually shifting to national systems.

3.1.1 Accordingly, the two primary outputs of the micro-assessment are:

(a) An overall risk rating related to cash transfers to IPs (low, moderate, significant, or high); and (b) The appropriate type and frequency of assurance activities and cash transfer modality

3.2. The Micro Assessment will be conducted for 35 Implementing Partners to provide an overall assessment of each IP financial and program management capacity. The review should include but not limited to the following: (i) Funds flow, (ii) Staffing (iii) Accounting policies and procedures (iv) Internal audit (v) External audit (vi) Reporting and monitoring (vii) Information systems; etc.

4.0 Methodology, Procedures and Management Arrangements

4.1 The Micro-assessment includes one or more site visits to the IP. The assessment primarily consists of interviews with IP personnel and a review of relevant documentation sufficient to complete Annex 2 “the Micro Assessment Questionnaire”. The questionnaire provides an overall risk rating based on responses provided, as follows:

- Low Risk – indicates a well-developed financial management system and functioning control framework with a low likelihood of potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan.
- Medium Risk – indicates a developed financial management system and control framework with moderate likelihood of potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan.
- Significant Risk – indicates an underdeveloped financial management system or control framework with a significant likelihood of potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan.
- High Risk – indicates an underdeveloped financial management system and control framework with a significant likelihood and potential negative impact to the IP’s ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan.

4.2 The micro assessment procedures are as follows:

- To prepare for the assessment, the third-party service provider will receive general information regarding the IP and the programme from the UNDP HACT Focal Point in preparation for the assessment. Refer to Annex 2 “Programme-specific information” for details.
- The third-party service provider will review this documentation in advance of performing a site visit to the IP.
- The third-party service provider should provide the IP with an advance request of the documents and interviews they would like to have while on site, to ensure efficient use of time while on on-site.

- The third-party service provider will complete the Micro Assessment Questionnaire (Annex 2, with instructions) based on the procedures performed during the assessment period.
- The third-party service provider will discuss the results of the questionnaire with the UNDP Programme Management Support Unit (PMSU) and the HACT Focal Point before finalizing it.
- The third-party service provider should have full and complete access to all records and documents (books of account, legal agreements, minutes of committee meetings, bank records, invoices and contracts, etc) and all employees of the IP that provide answers to the questions in Annex 2. If the access to any records, persons or locations during the course of the assessment is restricted, this restriction should be clearly defined, with reasons, in the report.
- The service provider should give special attention to records and documents relating to the IP's issues, experiences and lessons with regard to the implementation and management of programmes/projects that are funded by official development assistance in general and technical assistance in particular.

4.3 Management Arrangement

- The micro assessment should be completed within four weeks, including site visits. The HACT focal point will introduce the service provide and the IP to aid coordination of the required site visit.
- The service provider will report to Head of the Planning and Support Unit (PSU) in close consultation with UNDP HACT Focal Points.
- The Third Party service provider should assess the partner's control system with equal emphasis on: (1) the effectiveness of the system in providing the partner's management with useful and timely information for the proper management of the partner; (2) the general effectiveness of the internal control system in protecting the assets and resources of the partner.
- Once draft reports are provided by the consulting firm, UNDP will review the draft report and send their official comments to the consulting firm so that the consulting firm can finalize the report. Such a review should include (i) IP Management's comments/clarifications on each of the consulting firm's findings and (ii) their suggested follow-up actions to improve the IP's financial management capacity generally. Upon the final approval, the final report will be officially shared with the IPs for appropriate follow-up actions when required.

5.0 Deliverables

5.1 The micro-assessment deliverables are as follows:

- An inception report, which will provide an overview of the work at hand with clear timelines of each stage of the entire assessment process
- The Draft and Final Report including the following: Overall risk rating and risk rating of funds flow, staffing, accounting policies and procedures, internal audit, external audit, reporting and monitoring and information systems; a description of implementing partners, standards applied, specific internal control concerns and recommendations (both for monitoring and assurance activities and to resolve/eliminate the internal control weaknesses)
- An executive summary, detailing the overall risk rating and specific identified risks
- The completed Micro Assessment Questionnaire.
- A briefing, organized by PSU and made by the service provider on the results of the micro-assessment to UNDP Senior Management

5.2 UNDP Sierra Leone will share the micro assessment reports with the involved UN Agencies, the IPs and the Government Coordinating

6.0 Qualifications of the consulting firm

6.1 General expertise and qualifications of the consulting firm should be as follows:

- Strong and relevant expertise and recognized professional qualifications and experience
- be experienced in performing assessments similar to a micro assessment and assessing risks related to organizational financial management capacity (i.e. accounting, reporting, procurement and internal controls).
- Good internal quality assurance system.
- Proven record of the firm's human resources including number for each level of professional staff, partner/staff ratio.

CVs of all members of the assessment team should be provided and should include details on engagements carried out by relevant staff, including ongoing assignments indicating responsibilities assumed by them and their qualifications and experience in undertaking similar assessments

- The third-party service provider should have a good public reputation in the area of business.
- Familiarity with the policies, rules and procedures of the agencies of United Nations and the Government of Lao PDR respectively is an asset.

6.2 The consulting firm must be completely impartial and independent from all aspects of management or financial interests in IPs being micro-assessed or those of its implementing/supervising agency or directly related entities. The consulting firm should not, during the period covered by the assessment nor during the undertaking of the assessment, be employed by, or have any financial or close business relationships with any senior participant in the management of the entity. CV of all members of the assessment team should be provided, with details on assessments or audits carried out by the relevant staff, including on-going assignments indicating responsibilities assumed by them, and their qualifications and experience in undertaking audits.

7.0 Duration of Assignment and Payment terms

7.1 The duration of the assessment should be a maximum of four weeks for the completion of assessments. Assessments of different partners can be done simultaneously during this time frame depending on the capacity of the Assessment team.

7.2 The successful service provider will commence the assignment as soon as the procurement process is completed, and the contract is signed. Submissions will be accepted from both National and International service providers. The terms of payment for the consultancy will be as follows:

- 20 % upon presentation and adoption of the Inception Report
- 50 % upon presentation of Draft Reports
- 30% - final payment upon satisfactory completion of work and approval of the Final Report.

Annexes

Annex 1 - List of Implementing Partners for micro assessment

Annex 2 - Programme-specific Information

Annex 3 Financial Management Capacity Questionnaire

Annex 1**List of Implementing Partners for micro assessment**

SN	Implementing Partner (IP) name	Partner type	Shared IP?	If it is shared IP, identify which Agency
1	Independent Media Commission (IMC)	Govt	No	N/A
2	Ministry of Internal Affairs	Govt	No	N/A
3	Law Officers' Department at the Ministry of Justice	Govt	No	N/A
4	Judiciary of SL	Govt	No	N/A
5	Parliament	Govt	No	N/A
6	Human Rights Commission SL	Govt	No	N/A
7	West African Network for Peace Building (WANEP-SL)	NGO	No	N/A
8	Campaign for Good Governance	CSO	No	N/A
9	Prisons Watch (PW-SL)	CSO	No	N/A
10	Justice Sector Coordination Office (JSCO)	CSO	No	N/A
11	Centre for Accountability and Rule of Law	CSO	No	N/A
12	Media Reform Coordination Group (MRCG)	NGO	No	N/A
13	Disaster Management Department (DMD)	Govt	No	N/A
14	Ministry of Energy	Govt	No	N/A
15	University of Sierra Leone (Faurah Bay College)	Govt	No	N/A
16	Ministry of Youth Affairs	Govt	No	N/A
17	One Family People	NGO	No	N/A

18	Community Empowerment for Peace & Agricultural Development SL (CEPAD)	CSO	No	N/A
19	Restless Development	NGO	No	N/A
20	National Protected Area Authority	Govt	No	N/A
21	Public and Private Partnership Unit (PPP)	Govt	No	N/A
22	Ministry of Mines and Marine Resources	Govt	No	N/A
23	Ministry of Agriculture	Govt	No	N/A
24	Bonthe District Council	Govt	Yes	UNICEF
25	Port-Loko District Council	Govt	Yes	UNICEF
26	Kailahun District Council	Govt	No	N/A
27	Kambia District Council	Govt	Yes	UNICEF&UNFPA
28	Moyamba District Council	Govt	No	N/A
29	Pujehun District Council	Govt	No	N/A
30	W/A District Council	Govt	Yes	UNICEF&UNFPA
31	Falaba District Council	Govt	No	N/A
32	Ministry of Planning and Economic Development	Govt	Yes	UNICEF
33	Statistics Sierra Leone	Govt	No	N/A
34	Fambul Tok International - SL	NGO	No	N/A
35	National Water Resource Management Agency	Govt	No	N/A

Annex 2**Programme-specific Information**

The following information should be completed at the start of the micro assessment.

Implementing partner name:	
Programme name:	
Programme number:	
Programme background:	
Programme location:	
Programme contact person(s):	
Location of records:	
Currency of records maintained:	
Period of transactions covered by micro assessment:	
Funds received during the period covered by the attestation engagement:	
Expenditures incurred/reported during the period covered by the attestation engagement:	
Intended start date of micro assessment:	
Estimated number of days required for visit to IP:	
Any special requests to be considered during the micro assessment:	
Cash transfer modality used by the IP:	

Annex 3

Micro Assessment Questionnaire

Implementing Partner: _____ Date: _____

Instructions: This questionnaire contains various questions related to seven subject areas, summarized further below. Please answer each question by indicating your response as 'Yes', 'No' or 'N/A' (for 'not applicable'). Also, use the 'Comments' section next to each question to provide details of your assessment or to highlight any important matters. This document will be referenced subsequently by the agency when performing additional assurance activities related to the IP. Sufficient details should be provided in this document for the agency to understand the details of each response.

Assign a risk rating (high, significant, moderate or low) for each question based on the response obtained. (For example, if the question addresses an item that should ideally be marked 'Yes' but was marked 'No', it should be assessed for the level of risk it presents to the IP's financial management system). Assigning risk ratings to each question requires judgment by the assessor as to how the response will affect the IP's financial management system. The risk ratings to be used are:

- **High** – Response to question/subject matter provides a risk to the overall financial management system that has both a high likelihood of occurring and a potentially negative impact on the IP's ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan¹¹ and stated objectives. Additionally, this risk has not been mitigated by any other controls/process that have been implemented by the IP;
- **Significant** – Response to question/subject matter provides a risk to the overall financial management system that has either a significant likelihood of occurring or a potentially negative impact on the IP's ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan and stated objectives;
- **Medium** – Response to question/subject matter provides a risk to the overall financial management system that has a moderate likelihood of occurring and a potentially negative impact on the IP's ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan and stated objectives; or
- **Low** – Response to question/subject matter provides a risk to the overall financial management system that has a low likelihood of occurring and a potentially negative impact on the IP's ability to execute the programme in accordance with the work plan and stated objectives.

Kindly note, in determining the risk assessment for subject matter section. (e.g., Section 1. Implementing Partner), and the overall Risk rating, the formatted questionnaire will automatically assign points that correlate with the level of risk selected. Questions that are not applicable to the IP (marked as 'N/A') should not be assigned a risk rating.

Upon finalization, the service provider delivers an executive summary, detailing the overall risk rating and specific identified risks, and the completed questionnaire.

Micro-assessment workbook						
Subject area (key questions in bold)	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
1. Implementing Partner						
1.1 Is the IP legally registered? If so, is it in compliance with registration requirements? Please note the legal status and date of registration of the entity.						
1.2 If the IP received United Nations resources in the past, were significant issues reported in managing the resources, including from previous assurance activities.						
1.3 Does the IP have statutory reporting requirements? If so, are they in compliance with such requirements in the prior three fiscal years?						
1.4 Does the governing body meet on a regular basis and perform oversight functions?						
1.5 If any other offices/ external entities participate in implementation, does the IP have policies and process to ensure appropriate oversight and monitoring of implementation?						
1.6 Does the IP show basic financial stability in-country (core resources; funding trend) Provide the amount of total assets, total liabilities, income and expenditure for the current and prior three fiscal years.						
1.7 Can the IP easily receive funds? Have there been any major problems in the past in the receipt of funds, particularly where the funds flow from government ministries?						
1.8 Does the IP have any pending legal actions against it or outstanding material/significant disputes with vendors/contractors?						

<i>If so, provide details and actions taken by the IP to resolve the legal action.</i>						
1.9 Does the IP have an anti-fraud and corruption policy?						
1.10 Has the IP advised employees, beneficiaries and other recipients to whom they should report if they suspect fraud, waste or misuse of agency resources or property? If so, does the IP have a policy against retaliation relating to such reporting?						
1.11 Does the IP have any key financial or operational risks that are not covered by this questionnaire? If so, please describe. <i>Examples: foreign exchange risk; cash receipts.</i>						
Total number of questions in subject area:	11					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	11					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	5					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Subject area <i>(key questions in bold)</i>	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
2. Programme Management						
2.1. Does the IP have and use sufficiently detailed written policies, procedures and other tools (e.g. project development checklist, work planning templates, work planning schedule) to develop programmes and plans?						
2.2. Do work plans specify expected results and the activities to be carried out to achieve results, with a time frame and budget for the activities?						

2.3 Does the IP identify the potential risks for programme delivery and mechanisms to mitigate them?						
2.4 Does the IP have and use sufficiently detailed policies, procedures, guidelines and other tools (checklists, templates) for monitoring and evaluation?						
2.5 Does the IP have M&E frameworks for its programmes, with indicators, baselines, and targets to monitor achievement of programme results?						
2.6 Does the IP carry out and document regular monitoring activities such as review meetings, on-site project visits, etc.						
2.7 Does the IP systematically collect, monitor and evaluate data on the achievement of project results?						
2.8 Is it evident that the IP followed up on independent evaluation recommendations?						
Total number of questions in subject area:	8					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	8					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	2					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Subject area (key questions in bold)	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
3. Organizational Structure and Staffing						
3.1 Are the IP's recruitment, employment and personnel practices clearly defined and followed, and do they embrace transparency and competition?						
3.2 Does the IP have clearly defined job descriptions?						

3.3 Is the organizational structure of the finance and programme management departments, and competency of staff, appropriate for the complexity of the IP and the scale of activities? Identify the key staff, including job titles, responsibilities, educational backgrounds and professional experience.						
3.4 Is the IP's accounting/finance function staffed adequately to ensure sufficient controls are in place to manage agency funds?						
3.5 Does the IP have training policies for accounting/finance/ programme management staff? Are necessary training activities undertaken?						
3.6 Does the IP perform background verification/checks on all new accounting/finance and management positions?						
3.7 Has there been significant turnover in key finance positions the past five years? If so, has the rate improved or worsened and appears to be a problem?						
3.8 Does the IP have a documented internal control framework? Is this framework distributed and made available to staff and updated periodically? If so, please describe.						
Total number of questions in subject area:	8					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	8					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	3					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Subject area <i>(key questions in bold)</i>	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
--	------------	-----------	------------	------------------------	--------------------	-------------------------

4. Accounting Policies and Procedures

4a. General

4.1 Does the IP have an accounting system that allows for proper recording of financial transactions from United Nations agencies, including allocation of expenditures in accordance with the respective components, disbursement categories and sources of funds?						
4.2 Does the IP have an appropriate cost allocation methodology that ensures accurate cost allocations to the various funding sources in accordance with established agreements?						
4.3 Are all accounting and supporting documents retained in an organized system that allows authorized users easy access?						
4.4 Are the general ledger and subsidiary ledgers reconciled at least monthly? Are explanations provided for significant reconciling items?						

4b. Segregation of duties

4.5 Are the following functional responsibilities performed by different units or individuals: (a) authorization to execute a transaction; (b) recording of the transaction; and (c) custody of assets involved in the transaction?						
4.6 Are the functions of ordering, receiving, accounting for and paying for goods and services appropriately segregated?						
4.7 Are bank reconciliations prepared by individuals other than those who make or approve payments?						

4c. Budgeting system

4.8 Are budgets prepared for all activities in sufficient detail to provide a meaningful tool for monitoring subsequent performance?						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

4.9 Are actual expenditures compared to the budget with reasonable frequency? Are explanations required for significant variations from the budget?						
4.10 Is prior approval sought for budget amendments in a timely way?						
4.11 Are IP budgets approved formally at an appropriate level?						
4d. Payments						
4.12 Do invoice processing procedures provide for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copies of purchase orders and receiving reports to be obtained directly from issuing departments? • Comparison of invoice quantities, prices and terms with those indicated on the purchase order and with records of goods/services actually received? • Checking the accuracy of calculations? 						
4.13 Are payments authorized at an appropriate level? Does the IP have a table of payment approval thresholds?						
4.14 Are all invoices stamped 'PAID', approved, and marked with the project code and account code?						
4.15 Do controls exist for preparation and approval of payroll expenditures? Are payroll changes properly authorized?						
4.16 Do controls exist to ensure that direct staff salary costs reflects the actual amount of staff time spent on a project?						
4.17 Do controls exist for expense categories that do not originate from invoice payments, such as DSAs, travel, and internal cost allocations?						
4e. Policies and procedures						
4.18 Does the IP have a stated basis of accounting (i.e. cash or accrual) and does it allow for compliance with the agency's requirement?						
4.19 Does the IP have an adequate policies and procedures manual and is it distributed to relevant staff?						

4f. Cash and bank						
4.20 Does the IP require dual signatories / authorization for bank transactions? Are new signatories approved at an appropriate level and timely updates made when signatories depart?						
4.21 Does the IP maintain an adequate, up-to-date cashbook, recording receipts and payments?						
4.22 If the partner is participating in micro-finance advances, do controls exist for the collection, timely deposit and recording of receipts at each collection location?						
4.23 Are bank balances and cash ledger reconciled monthly and properly approved? Are explanations provided for significant, unusual and aged reconciling items?						
4.24 Is substantial expenditure paid in cash? If so, does the IP have adequate controls over cash payments?						
4.25 Does the IP carry out a regular petty cash reconciliation?						
4.26 Are cash and cheques maintained in a secure location with restricted access? Are bank accounts protected with appropriate remote access controls?						
4.27 Are there adequate controls over submission of electronic payment files that ensure no unauthorized amendments once payments are approved and files are transmitted over secure/encrypted networks?						
4g. Other offices or entities						
4.28 Does the IP have a process to ensure expenditures of subsidiary offices/ external entities are in compliance with the work plan and/or contractual agreement?						
4h. Internal audit						
4.29 Is the internal auditor sufficiently independent to make critical assessments? To whom does the internal auditor report?						

4.30 Does the IP have stated qualifications and experience requirements for internal audit department staff?						
4.31 Are the activities financed by the agencies included in the internal audit department's work programme?						
4.32 Does the IP act on the internal auditor's recommendations?						
Total number of questions in subject area:	32					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	32					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	19					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Subject area <i>(key questions in bold)</i>	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
5. Fixed Assets and Inventory						
5a. Safeguards over assets						
5.1 Is there a system of adequate safeguards to protect assets from fraud, waste and abuse?						
5.2 Are subsidiary records of fixed assets and inventory kept up to date and reconciled with control accounts?						
5.3 Are there periodic physical verification and/or count of fixed assets and inventory? If so, please describe?						
5.4 Are fixed assets and inventory adequately covered by insurance policies?						
5b. Warehousing and inventory management						
5.5 Do warehouse facilities have adequate physical security?						
5.6 Is inventory stored so that it is identifiable, protected from damage, and countable?						

5.7 Does the IP have an inventory management system that enables monitoring of supply distribution?						
5.8 Is responsibility for receiving and issuing inventory segregated from that for updating the inventory records?						
5.9 Are regular physical counts of inventory carried out?						
Total number of questions in subject area:	9					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	9					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	2					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Subject area <i>(key questions in bold)</i>	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
6. Financial Reporting and Monitoring						
6.1 Does the IP have established financial reporting procedures that specify what reports are to be prepared, the source system for key reports, the frequency of preparation, what they are to contain and how they are to be used?						
6.2 Does the IP prepare overall financial statements?						
6.3 Are the IP's overall financial statements audited regularly by an independent auditor in accordance with appropriate national or international auditing standards? If so, please describe the auditor.						
6.4 Were there any major issues related to ineligible expenditure involving donor funds reported in the audit reports of the IP over the past three years?						

6.5 Have any significant recommendations made by auditors in the prior five audit reports and/or management letters over the past five years and have not yet been implemented?						
6.6 Is the financial management system computerized?						
6.7 Can the computerized financial management system produce the necessary financial reports?						
6.8 Does the IP have appropriate safeguards to ensure the confidentiality, integrity and availability of the financial data? <i>E.g. password access controls; regular data back-up.</i>						
Total number of questions in subject area:	8					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	8					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	3					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Subject area <i>(key questions in bold)</i>	Yes	No	N/A	Risk Assessment	Risk points	Remarks/comments
7. Procurement and Contract Administration						
7a. Procurement						
7.1 Does the IP have written procurement policies and procedures?						
7.2 Are exceptions to procurement procedures approved by management and documented ?						
7.3 Does the IP have a computerized procurement system with adequate access controls and segregation of duties between entering purchase orders, approval and receipting of goods? Provide a description of the procurement system.						

7.4 Are procurement reports generated and reviewed regularly? Describe reports generated, frequency and review & approvers.						
7.5 Does the IP have a structured procuremet unit with defined reporting lines that foster efficiency and accountability?						
7.6 Is the IP's procurement unit resourced with qualified staff who are trained and certified and considered experts in procurement and conversant with UN / World Bank / European Union procurement requirements in addition to the a IP's procurement rules and regulations?						
7.7 Have any significant recommendations related to procurement made by auditors in the prior five audit reports and/or management letters over the past five years and have not yet been implemented?						
7.8 Does the IP require written or system authorizations for purchases? If so, evaluate if the authorization thresholds are appropriate?						
7.9 Do the procurement procedures and templates of contracts integrate references to ethical procurement principles and exclusion and ineligibility criteria?						
7.10 Does the IP obtain sufficient approvals before signing a contract?						
7.11 Does the IP have and apply formal guidelines and procedures to assist in identifying, monitoring and dealing with potential conflicts of interest with potential suppliers/procurement agents? If so, how does the IP proceed in cases of conflict of interest?						
7.12 Does the IP follow a well-defined process for sourcing suppliers? Do formal procurement methods include wide broadcasting of procurement opportunities?						
7.13 Does the IP keep track of past performance of suppliers? E.g. database of trusted suppliers.						

7.14 Does the IP follow a well-defined process to ensure a secure and transparent bid and evaluation process? If so, describe the process.						
7.15 When a formal invitation to bid has been issued, does the IP award the contract on a pre-defined basis set out in the solicitation documentation taking into account technical responsiveness and price?						
7.16 If the IP is managing major contracts, does the IP have a policy on contracts management / administration?						
7b. Contract Management - To be completed only for the IPs managing contracts as part of programme implementation. Otherwise select N/A for risk assessment						
7.17 Are there personnel specifically designated to manage contracts or monitor contract expirations?						
7.18 Are there staff designated to monitor expiration of performance securities, warranties, liquidated damages and other risk management instruments?						
7.19 Does the IP have a policy on post-facto actions on contracts?						
7.20 How frequent do post-facto contract actions occur?						
Total number of questions in subject area:	20					
Total number of applicable questions in subject area:	20					
Total number of applicable key questions in subject area:	5					
Total number of risk points:	0					
Risk score	0					
Area risk rating	Low					

Totals	
Total number of questions:	96

Total number of applicable questions:	96
Total number of applicable key questions:	39
Total number of risk points:	0
Total risk score	0
Overall risk rating	Low