

UNDP's Responses to Vendors Questions
RFP/UNDP/OFRM/004/2013

1. We understand the requirements for packaging the Technical and Financial proposals, but what are the instructions for submitting Sections 4 and 5?

A: Section 4 should be submitted is part of the technical proposal. Section 5 shall also be submitted as part of the technical proposal if such form is applicable to the company submitting a proposal.

2. In DS no. 27, you ask for "at least three client references for similar projects (amount and scale) contracted as main contractor." Should this be included as an attachment to the proposal. If so, what is the instruction for submission?

A: Yes, this should be submitted as an attachment to the technical proposal.

3. Is the contractor responsible for advising the implementation of recommended capitalization threshold, policy and procedure, and system changes or are we only responsible for providing recommendations?

A: Providing recommendations.

4. Do you have an established level of effort identified?

A: No.

5. Besides the policy documents attached to the RFP, can you provide an estimate of the number of documents (procedures, guidelines and other documents) to be reviewed as part of the "end-to-end" review of the asset management framework?

A: UNDP's procedures are available on-line at:
<https://info.undp.org/global/popp/Pages/default.aspx>, with assets specifically presented at:
<https://info.undp.org/global/popp/asm/Pages/introduction.aspx>

6. Can you please share the trigger event for the capitalization threshold review? Was it operationally (i.e., the \$500 threshold is too burdensome in practical application) or was the review triggered by external or internal review comments?

A: The \$500 threshold is too burdensome and costly in practical application, and appears out of line with UN peer organisations and other organisations of similar size.

7. The analysis of the capitalization threshold is a relatively well defined analysis on the basis of general capitalization decisions made by UNDP (i.e., the capitalization decision itself is not reviewed but only the Non IPSAS capitalization threshold itself). In contrast, the "end-to-end" review of the asset management framework is relatively broad and less defined in scope. What is your expectation of the relative level of effort for the two parts of the TOR (i.e., 50%/50% or 20%/80%)?

A: The RFP is not seeking the review of the original capitalization decision for IPSAS adoption, but a subsequent assessment of what should be UNDP and UNCDF's capitalization thresholds going forwards. The scope of the review of the asset management framework seeks to identify opportunities for improvements and the application of best practices in asset management, so UNDP and UNCDF can meet our stewardship and reporting requirements for assets, whilst streamlining and improving the cost effectiveness and efficiency of the framework.

8. Can you please confirm that ATLAS implication should only be considered in the case of a change in the capitalization threshold?

A: Recommendations made as a result of this engagement that relate to the ERP system must be feasible within Atlas. The aim here is to avoid a scenario where recommendations made cannot be configured reasonably within the ERP system, or require intense customization.

9. Related to #8 can you please confirm the level of effort expected in determining the impact on ATLAS? For example, are you looking for general accounting-type comments or detailed IT-specific set-up recommendations?

A: For recommendations made and accepted, the effort required should be detailed enough to constitute the business requirements for the necessary changes to the ERP system. The aim here is to avoid a scenario where recommendations made cannot be configured reasonably within the ERP system, or require intense customization.