**Annex 2**

**FORM FOR SUBMITTING SERVICE PROVIDER’S PROPOSAL[[1]](#footnote-1)**

***(This Form must be submitted only using the Service Provider’s Official Letterhead/Stationery[[2]](#footnote-2))***

[insert: *Location]*.

[insert: *Date]*

To: [*insert: Name and Address of* *Ministry of Tourism, Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development focal point]*

Dear Sir/Madam:

We, the undersigned, hereby offer to render the following services to Ministry of Tourism, Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development in conformity with the requirements defined in the RFP dated *[specify date]*, and all of its attachments, as well as the provisions of the General Contract Terms and Conditions:

1. **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 Ministry by indicating the following:*

1. *Profile – describing the nature of business, field of expertise, licenses, certifications, accreditations;*
2. *Business Licenses – Registration Papers, Tax Payment Certification, etc.*
3. *Latest Financial Statement – income statement and balance sheet to indicate its financial stability, liquidity, credit standing, and market reputation, etc;*
4. *Track Record – list of clients for similar services as those required by Ministry, indicating description of contract scope, contract duration, contract value, contact references;*
5. *Certificates and Accreditation – including Quality Certificates, Patent Registrations, Environmental Sustainability Certificates, etc. if any.*
6. **Proposed Methodology for the Completion of Services**

|  |
| --- |
| *The Service Provider must describe* ***how it will address/deliver the demands of the RFP****;* ***detailed description of the technologies*** *that will be used,* ***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.*** |

1. **Qualifications of Key Personnel**

*The Service Provider must provide:*

1. *Names and qualifications of the key personnel that will perform the services indicating who is Project Manager/Team Leader, who are Programmers, Product owners, etc.;*
2. *CVs demonstrating requred qualifications must be submitted; and*
3. *Written confirmation from each personnel that they are available for the entire duration of the contract.*
4. **Cost Breakdown per Deliverable\***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Deliverables**  ***[list them as referred to in the RFP]*** | **Percentage of Total Price *(Weight for payment)*** | ***Payment schedule*** | **Price**  ***(Lump Sum, All Inclusive)*** |
| 1 | Deliverable 1: Submission of Micro Assessment report with required annexes. | 100,00 % | Upon submission and approval of the Micro Assessment Report. |  |
|  | Total | 100% |  |  |

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

1. **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 |  |  |  |  |
| **II. Other expenses** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Travel Costs |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Communications |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Others |  |  |  |  |
| **III. Other Related Costs** |  |  |  |  |

*[Name and Signature of the Service Provider’s Authorized Person]*

*[Designation]*

*[Date]*

**Annex 4**

**Micro Assessment Report Format**
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1. **Background, Scope and Methodology**

**Background**

The micro assessment is part of the requirements under the Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT) Framework. The HACT framework represents a common operational framework for Ministry transfer of cash to government and non-governmental implementing partners.

The micro-assessment assesses the IP’s control framework. It results in a risk rating (low, moderate, significant or high). The overall risk rating is used by the Ministry, along with other available information (e.g. history of engagement with the agency and previous assurance results), to determine the type and frequency of assurance activities as per each UN’s guidelines and can be taken into consideration when selecting the appropriate cash transfer modality for an IP.

**Scope**

The micro-assessment provides an overall assessment of the Implementing Partner’s programme, financial and operations management policies, procedures, systems and internal controls. It includes:

* A review of the IP legal status, governance structures and financial viability; programme management, organizational structure and staffing, accounting policies and procedures, fixed assets and inventory, financial reporting and monitoring, and procurement;
* A focus on compliance with policies, procedures, regulations and institutional arrangements that are issued both by the Implementing Partner.

**Methodology**

We performed the micro-assessment from [date] to [date] at [describe locations].

Through discussion with management, observation and walk-through tests of transactions, we have assessed the Implementing Partner’s and the related internal control system with emphasis on:

* The effectiveness of the systems in providing the Implementing Partner’s management with accurate and timely information for management of funds and assets in accordance with work plans and agreements with the United Nations agencies;
* The general effectiveness of the internal control system in protecting the assets and resources of the Implementing Partner.

We discussed the results of the micro assessment with Project Manager in front of the Ministry and the IP prior to finalization of the report. The list of persons met and interviewed during the micro-assessment is set out in Annex III.

1. **Partner summary information (taken from “Information” tab of the assessment Excel document)**



1. **Summary of Risk Assessment Results**

***[Executive summary of the overall risk assessment]***.

The table below summarizes the results and main internal control gaps found during application of the micro-assessment questionnaire (in Annex IV). Detailed findings and recommendations are set out in section 3. below.

| **Subject area** | **Risk assessment\*** | **Brief justification for rating (main internal control gaps)** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Organisation** |  |  |
| **2. People and behaviours** |  |  |
| **3. Activities** |  |  |
| **4. Reporting and accountability** |  |  |
| **5. Assets and Inventory** |  |  |
| **6. Procurement** |  |  |
| **7. Sub-partners** |  |  |
| **8. Systems** |  |  |
| **Overall Risk Assessment** |  |  |

*\*High, Significant, Moderate, Low*

1. **Detailed Internal Control Findings and Recommendations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Description of Finding** | **Recommendation and IP Management Response** |
| **1.** | ***Example: Insufficient staff training***  ***Priority rating: (High / Medium / Low)***  *We noted that staff employed in the accounts department, who were primarily bookkeepers / administrators, had not received training on UN requirements for financial management and reporting, and had received only informal “on the job” training on the GABS accounting system.*  *Lack of sufficient training increases the risk of error and failure to comply with the UN financial reporting requirements.* | *Example:*  *The organisation should ensure staff are properly trained and aware of UN financial reporting requirements.*  ***IP Management Response***  *A training session with the assistants of the UN Agency HACT Focal Point will be organized within the next month.* |
|  | **Etc** |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Annex I. Micro Assessment Questionnaire**

Include here the completed questionnaire.

**Annex II. IP and Programme Information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Implementing partner name:** |  |
|  |  |
| **Implementing partner contact details (contact name, email address and telephone number):** |  |
| **Main programmes implemented with the applicable Ministry:** |  |
| **Key Official in charge of the Ministry:** |  |
| **Programme location(s):** |  |
| **Location of records related to the Ministry:** |  |
| **Currency of records maintained:** |  |
| **Expenditures incurred/reported to Ministry (as applicable) during the most recent financial reporting period (in US$);** |  |
| **Cash transfer modality/ies used by the Ministry to the IP** |  |
| **Intended start date of micro assessment:** |  |
| **Number of days to be spent for visit to IP:** |  |
| **Any special requests to be considered during the micro assessment:** |  |

**Annex III. Implementing Partner Organizational Chart**

**Annex IV. List of Persons Met**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Unit/organization** | **Position** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Annex 5**

**Technical Evaluation Criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of Technical Proposal Evaluation Forms** | | **Points Obtainable** |
| 1. | Bidder’s qualification, capacity and experience | 500 |
| 2. | Proposed Methodology, Approach and Implementation Plan | 200 |
| 3. | Management Structure and Key Personnel | 300 |
|  | **Total** | **1000** |

1. *This serves as a guide to the Service Provider in preparing the Proposal.*  [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Official Letterhead/Stationery must indicate contact details – addresses, email, phone and fax numbers – for verification purposes*  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)