

Questions and Answers:

UNICEF-RFPS-USA-2013-501732

- What is the relationship between the role of the conveners and the role of the consultant with regard to day-to-day ownership of the Common Proposals? Will the convener or the consulting staff be accountable for delivering the finalized proposals for GMT review?
The conveners are accountable for preparing the proposed options to the GMT. The consultants will be accountable to provide support as agreed to the conveners
- In what format (prose document, PowerPoint presentation, etc.) will the GMT expect to receive proposals, and what is the guidance on proposal length?
Templates have been shared with conveners for preparing their options – an Excel workbook, a power point template and a Word executive Summary template
- What are the expected dates of the GMT presentations in November and February, and when is the project's anticipated start date after contracting?
There is a GMT meeting on November 27 and one in February 2014 (dates still to be fixed).
The selected consultants will be expected to start work in late November/early December. As such they will not be accountable for any deliverables for the November 27 GMT. The deliverables for the February 2014 GMT will form part of the contract agreement
- Will UNICEF require support from the consultancy selected for this RFPS on costing proposals to be presented in November 2013? If so, to what extent?
This is still to be defined. Not all proposals will require detailed costing. For others, the consultants might be required to support conveners with costing.
- Will the consultancy that previously supported HQ functions be eligible to bid on this work?
Yes
- Can you describe the “proven tools and methodologies” that were used to previously assess efficiency and effectiveness?
There were 4 tools used: (1) Assessment of the FTE dedicated to each function/activity (2) a feasibility assessment for offshoring functions/activities (3) a RACI analysis, and (4) an effectiveness assessment tool
- We understand that the UN has its own rules relating to relocating staff if this option is required – will these be explained to the successful bidder so that these costs can be explored?
Yes
- Is a phased work plan acceptable to you that addresses each of the 6-7 proposals in sequence or will all of these require addressing at the same time?
A phased work plan is acceptable – indeed 9 proposals are scheduled to be reviewed at the November GMT and another 9 proposals at the February 2014 GMT. (listed below at end)
- Is the scope of the consultant's work limited to Common Proposals only or does it include Division specific proposals?
Restricted to the common proposals
- Could you provide a high level description/title for each of the 19 Common Proposals?
See attached document

- How were the 19 Common Proposals selected? Were there criteria for the selection of these? If yes, then are you able to provide them. The term ‘common’ proposal implies that some (high level) assessment has already been performed to determine commonality of approach for each proposal – to what extent is the consultant expected to identify further commonality, or is the focus on identifying additional cost efficiencies, integration requirements, dependencies and sequencing considerations?
Common proposals are defined as proposals that were made by 2 or more Divisions and/or have far-reaching organizational implications. The focus will indeed be on identifying additional cost efficiencies, integration requirements, dependencies and sequencing considerations
- Could we see an example of a Common Proposal, or the standard template that is being used? On average, how long/in depth is a proposal?
We cannot share this at this moment
- What are the specific deliverables required for each Common Proposal reviewed? Is it true that UNICEF conveners and teams will be responsible for and owners of the development of plans, presentations etc. with consultant support focusing on review, feedback, additional recommendations and suggestions related to organizational change, implementation and cost as inputs to those documents?
Conveners are accountable for the proposals and preparing GMT presentations. The consultants will be accountable as per the TORs.
- Are further stakeholder interviews required for each Common Proposal or should the consultant’s focus be on the review of current proposals and provision of recommendations, leading practices, implementation considerations, synergies and dependencies etc.?
This will depend on the stage each proposal is at after November and what is still required. It is likely that most proposals will not need further stakeholder interviews, but in some cases, it may well be required.
- What is the expected level of effort required for each Common Proposal, e.g. number of consultant hours for each Common Proposal? Is there an indicative budget for the project that you are able to provide?
We are not able to provide this information at this point in time
- Were the two Common Proposals presented to the September GMT as planned?
RFPS Reference 501732
Yes, and one is to be re-presented in November
- How will the business process simplification recommendations be incorporated into the Common Proposal development process? Were these presented to the September GMT as planned? Have these recommendations already been incorporated into the current Common Proposals?
The business process simplification has its own timeline, and one of the tasks will be to identify the inter-dependencies with the HQ Functions work once the decisions to implement are being considered
- Please confirm how many Common Proposals will require detailed costing support from the consultant. How has that been decided? Of those proposals which already contain costed options, please confirm the consultant support required.
This information is not available at this point in time

- Will the consultant be required to support the development of the monitoring and assessment frameworks (baselines, indicators, targets) as part of the consultant support to Common Proposals?
Yes
- Will the consultant be required to support tracking progress once the management dashboard for all three E&E work streams is developed?
Yes, but only for the HQ Functions stream
- Will the consultant be required to develop and support monitoring through the integrated roadmap that will include all three E&E work streams?
This remains to be seen and decided
- Is the intent that UNICEF will move forward with all 19 Common Proposals? Is the purpose of the GMT to select or approve proposals to be implemented?
All 19 proposals are being developed. Decisions will be taken for each proposal eventually on whether to implement, and implementation if a decision is taken to implement will be sequenced across the 19 proposals
- What are the planned milestones?
The November 2013 and the February GMT 2014 are milestones. There will milestones for 2014 that will be defined depending on GMT discussions and on executive decisions
- Please clarify whether travel will be reimbursed per UNICEF policy ?
If travel is needed, it will be undertaken as per UN regulation.