

**Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Design & Implementation of
Resident Coordinator Assessment Centre
Ref. # UNDP/BMS/OHR/RFP/2017/005**

**Questions and Answers – Round 1
13 July 2017**

1. Do you need the CVs of role players in the format provided or will a biography be more appropriate?

Response: The CVs of the role players may be presented in the form of a biography.

2. Is there a preferred location for holding the RCAC – e.g. Europe, North America, Africa? The pricing may vary – would you consider options?

Response: OHR prefers a city or location that has broad access from all parts of the world. Cost and accessibility will be important factors.

3. Is there any flexibility on the dates in case the preferred venue is not available?

Response: Flexibility can be offered measured in weeks, but not in months.

4. Would audited accounts suffice? Is it necessary to send Dunn and Bradstreet report as well?

Response: As indicated in the RFP document, either a Dunn & Bradstreet report or Audited Financial Statements would be acceptable

5. We understand the current scope is to include job analysis and review of the existing competency behavioral indicators. Does the current scope include a more wholesale re-design of the criteria (i.e. of the competencies themselves) for the RC role? Is there scope to refine or expand on the criteria to include, for example, experience with specific leadership challenges relevant to the RC role?

Response: The referenced job analysis is for the benefit of the selected firm in order to ensure a thorough understanding of the RC role that is being assessed. The competency framework and behavioral indicators are expected to remain unchanged for the initial iteration of the RCAC.

6. To what extent does the UN anticipate participating in the RCACs – either as observers and/or assessors?

Response: It is not anticipated that the UN will participate in the RCAC as assessors. Some limited observation may be required for oversight purposes.

7. What lessons learned can be shared from previous RCACs that should be considered in the proposed design and administration of future RCACs?

Response: Key lessons learned include the following:

- There is ongoing concern about the fact that candidates from the Global South do less well than candidates from the North. Close attention is paid to this by all concerned stakeholders.
- A high level of success in the RCAC calls for the bar being set higher to ensure that only the highest caliber of candidates pass the Assessment.
- Despite the commitment to confidentiality of the candidates, the content of the RCAC tends to become known to some extent over time.
- Unanticipated expenses are difficult to manage given the need to pro-rate and bill all costs evenly across the sponsoring agencies.

8. Can you confirm the level of refresh that you wish to have carried out on an AC to AC basis and on an annual basis?
Response: We anticipate refreshed scenarios to be developed over time so that they can be rotated, possibly on an annual basis.
9. Can you confirm that you would like a single bi-annual report as opposed to what the RFP suggests are multiple different such reports?
Response: Yes, what is required is a single, comprehensive bi-annual report (price schedule has been adjusted accordingly).
10. Can you confirm the difference between simulations and exercises?
Response: "exercise" refers to each individual activity designed to assess the candidate's competency, e.g. interview, presentation, in-tray, meeting role-play, etc. "Scenario" should replace "simulation" refers to the contextual backdrop against which the exercises take place.
11. Please clarify the balance between assessor diversity (e.g. national identity and work in the "south") and cost of travel – will there, in effect, be a penalty for using assessors from multiple international locations, thereby increasing the cost of the assessment? Might it be possible for assessor travel to be recovered separately, provided adherence to UN travel rules?
Response: We would prefer to adhere to a per candidate cost, and expect the firm to achieve the necessary balance of diversity and cost.
12. With respect to the various reports identified in Table 4, is it acceptable to propose a single report covering all the components identified, with one report being generated after each set of RCACs, with the second in a cycle reporting on full-year experience?
Response: Yes, this is acceptable and the submission template has been updated accordingly.
13. In case of Joint Venture, which of the two vendor companies should sign Form A: Technical Proposal Submission Form? Should form B: Bidder Information Form, be filled in separately by each vendor company, so that there are two separate Form Bs? Should all of Form D: Eligibility and Qualification Form be filled in separately by each vendor company so that there are two Form Ds?
Response: As indicated in the RFP document under Section 2, clause 9, the Bidder shall submit only one Proposal. The information to be provided in the proposal are explained in detail under clause 19 of Section 2
14. We assume that the Form H: Performance Security Form does not require signature at this stage. Is that correct?
Response: Please refer to RFP document, Section 2, clause 40.