PRE-proposal CONFERENCE – MINUTES OF MEETING

Assignment Name: RFP for Provision of Consulting Services –United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Atlas Consortium: Next Generation Atlas ERP, UNDP/BMS/OIMT/RFP/2017/001

Date & time: Thursday, 27 April 2017 at 11:00 am; Conference Call

Closing Date of RFP: Monday 18 May 2017 [5:00p.m. New York Time]

UNDP Participants:
- **Nick Pavlakos, Chief, HQ/BMS/OOLTS/OIMT**
- **Bertrand Frot, Chief Portfolio Management Office**
- **Shadi Hussein, Procurement Analyst**
- **Emmanuel Maliganya, Procurement Associate**

TO ALL INTERESTED COMPANIES

SUBJECT: **RFP for Provision of Consulting Services –United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Atlas Consortium: Next Generation Atlas ERP, UNDP/BMS/OIMT/RFP/2017/001**

INFO: The bid conference was opened with following agenda:

1. Brief explanation on RFP document – administrative issue (closing date, submission form & method, delivery place for submitting proposal, etc).
2. Brief explanation on submission and requirements for separate envelopes for Technical and Financial offers.
3. Brief explanation provided on evaluation stages and how proposals should correspond to the evaluation criteria
4. Clarifications provided to Bidders' Technical Questions and Administrative Questions.

Instruction to Bidders of RFP document provides detailed explanation on all above brief requirements. Bidders are encouraged to underline carefully read the Request for Proposal (RFP) document before preparing the proposal.

Here below are Answers to Questions raised regarding the above assignment:

1. Will the meeting notes from the Proposer's Conference contain the names of the companies on this call?

   A: Questions submitted by vendors on the Proposer's Conference will be anonymized when written up and shared with any other vendors not on the Proposer's Conference call.

2. UNDP has launched an RFP for an ERP strategy twice before. What is different this time that leads you to think the implementation will go ahead?

A: At this point in time, the intention of the organization and the Consortium to chart the course of the ERP. Organizational variables and contexts may change that can alter the current course though. At this level, we very little control over these variables.

3. Which consultant/company completed the 2016 Consortium Study referenced in section 3.3 of the RFP on page 30/62?

    A: Once the contract is awarded, the deliverable submitted by the consultant/company will be shared with the awardee.

4. Is the consultant/company that completed the 2016 Consortium Study precluded from bidding on this RFP?

    A: No.

5. Is the successful vendor for this RFP precluded from delivering the implementation downstream?

    A: Conflict of interest is a proscribed practice under UNDP procurement rules and it is in the best interest of the Organization to ensure that all bidders have a level playing field. As this process refers to the planning, UNDP has not made a determination on how down-stream work will be handled, and a decision on this will be closely related to the needs of the Organization and the outcomes of this phase in developing the eligibility criteria and the TOR for the implementation phase. Nevertheless, UNDP reserves the right to prohibit or limit bidding on downstream work by any awardee in this process.

6. Page 32/62, section 3.7, bullet 3 identifies a UNDP Project Manager – which department is this individual a member of?

    A: Given the high profile and strategic nature of this initiative, the Chief of the ERP will act as Project Manager on behalf of UNDP and will be the single point of contact.

7. Page 32/62, section 3.7, bullet 4 identifies an 'Atlas Consortium Next Generation ERP Review Committee'. Would it be possible to confirm who forms this committee?

    A: The committee will be composed of executives from each of the member agencies.

8. Page 44/62 identifies '3.1 Project Manager' and '3.5 ERP Architect Expert/Analyst'. Are there other roles missing from the RFP (i.e. 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and possibly 3.6, etc.)?

    A: There are no roles missing. It's a typo in the numbering. ERP Architect Expert/Analyst should read as item 3.2.

9. By identifying these two roles, is UNDP prescribing the team structure that vendors need to follow?

    A: No. Vendors can, and are expected, to propose their own complete team structure they deem necessary to meet the objectives stated in the RFP. In the proposal response, UNDP will want to see CVs of all proposed members.

10. How will the project be managed in terms of the UNDP Project Manager or department?

    A: See answer #6.

11. RFP PAGE 44: Project manager is item 3.1 while the next item (ERP Architect Expert/Analyst) is item 3.5. Is there any item missing between?

    A: See answer #8.

12. Conflict of interest – Will the company making the recommendation be precluded from the implementation?

    A: See answer #4.

13. What are the drivers for the timing of the upcoming project to implement the Next Generation Atlas ERP system?

    A: Oracle's support policy and the timing of UNDP's commercial agreement with Oracle.

14. To what the extent the rapiditity (sic. quickness) of deploying a particular solution is favorable?

    A: "Speed to market" of a solution should be a factor in the decision making process and the consultants should discuss it with the various stakeholders during their meetings.

15. What is the UNDP doing with the trial versions of the HCM and ERP systems mentioned on page 29 of the RFP? How many staff are involved and what are the goals for the trial?

    A: There is no active use of those trial subscriptions.

16. Can you clarify and expand on the two types of benchmarking data mentioned on p.27 regarding section 1.5 of the Technical Proposal, "ERP industry" data which includes implementation costs vs. "industry consulting services" data which also includes implementation costs?

    A: Given that we are not looking at specific solution recommendations for options C and D, we need to get a sense of an order of magnitude for costs to procure, implement, and maintain solutions for these options. Also, for options A and B, we would be looking again for an order of magnitude for costs to procure, implement, and maintain these PeopleSoft based options.

17. Can you elaborate on the second sentence in RFP Section 3.3: "The outcome of the study concluded that since the **two** main drivers for upgrading are an emphasis on business value vs cost containment?"

    A: The study presented its findings within a binary framework of business value and cost containment in order to arrive to the 4 solutions we are currently evaluating.

18. What's the major distinction between options B - Modular Evolution and C - Positioned for the Future?

A: Option B involves keeping PeopleSoft the core of the solution with carving out some modules into cloud. It is a hybrid approach. Option C is taking decision of retiring PeopleSoft and pursue the procurement and implementation of a cloud solution to serve as the core of the ERP.

19. Is it fair to say all members of the consortium will be represented for making the decision on the selection?

A: Yes.

20. UNDP is looking for business case for four options. But are you looking for one solution or should the response cover all 4 options?

A: We are looking for a business case that will provide the necessary information for the executive groups to decide between the four options presented; hence the expectation of all relevant data points for all options be collected and presented.

21. **RFP page 29, section 3.1 Introduction and Background:** Is UNDP open to replace SaaS solutions already deployed, such as Oracle Taleo, Fusion Performance Management, and Oracle Cx as part of the Next Generation Atlas? If so, which SaaS solutions?

A: No.

22. **RFP page 30, section 3.3 Foundation and Starting Point:** For option C. Position for the Future, which cloud-based solutions are being considered by UNDP? (Since there are many competing SaaS solutions in the marketplace, it is important to know which packages are in scope for this study, so that respective skillsets can be proposed and staffed.)

A: We would like to make clear that for option 3, we are not looking for a specific package recommendation but rather for business case purposes, all relevant cost elements and range of costs needed for a decision by the executives.

23. **RFP page 30, section 3.3 Foundation and Starting Point:** For option C. Position for the Future, does UNDP has a preferred SaaS solution? If so, what is it?

A: No. Any cloud solution purchases would have to go through a procurement process.

24. **RFP page 30, section 3.3 Foundation and Starting Point:** For option D. U.N. Alignment, will the project team have access to respective UN agency's resources and documentation required for the delivery of Next Generation Atlas study services?

A: The engagement modalities with the Secretariat are currently under discussion.

25. **RFP page 30, section 3.3 Foundation and Starting Point:** For option D. U.N. Alignment, is UMOJA SAP the only alignment alternative to be considered?   If not, what are the other alternatives?

A: UMOJA is the only alignment in scope.

26. **RFP page 31, section** 3.4 ERP Replacement Approach: For 2. Analysis, can UNDP further clarify which deliverables need to cover all 4 options, and which only need to cover the proposed/recommended option? For instance, clarify whether deployment strategy and approach and project plan are only required to be developed for the proposed option or are required for all 4 options.

    A: Page 31 references activities and not deliverables.

27. **RFP page 32, section** 3.5 Next Generation ERP Deliverables: Similar to the above, can UNDP further clarify which deliverables need to cover all 4 options, and which only need to cover the proposed/recommended option?

    A: Deliverables under point 1 need to be considered for the 4 options. In regards to expectations around deliverables under point 2, the term "Strategy" for Deployment and Transition was used deliberately since the path will be a high level strategic one hence it is expected only for the path chosen by the executive group.

28. Does UNDP have a budget already established/approved for this study? Please share the range or the ceiling for the project budget.

    A: The budget is established and we are not able to share it.

29. Please provide UNDP resources planned to be staffed to support this study.

    A: The project will be supported by Systems Analysts and colleagues in the business community.

30. Would you consider firms who worked on UMOJA design/implementation as conflicted for this opportunity?

    A: No.

31. Are you able to further clarify the timing of this project? When is the estimated start and end date?

    A: Estimated start date is 1 July 2017 with final deliverables being submitted by 31 October 2017.