

## Questions & Answers

### *Request for Applications (RfA)*

### *Capacity-building course on the future of migrant remittances*

***The FAQ is based on the queries received from potential applicants and has been updated frequently to respond to incoming queries. This is the final version of the FAQ and no further updates are expected.***

#### **QUESTIONS ABOUT ELIGIBILITY**

**1) Are there any restrictions on geographies or nationalities?**

No. Qualified academic institutions from any United Nations member state will be considered for the capacity-building coursework provided the proposal reflects the required expertise.

**2) The RfA states that you want English-language correspondence and content delivery in French and English. Does this mean that applications from Portuguese-speaking African countries (e.g., Mozambique) are not contemplated?**

No. Provided that a qualified institution can meet the project's language requirements, the official language(s) of that institution's home country are irrelevant.

**3) The RfA explicitly seeks an “educational organization.” We would like to know if the interpretation of educational organization is restricted to Universities, training centres, and institutions whose only mission is education. Our organization has relevant experience in remittances and is recognized as a global leader in the space. We also have significant experience in providing training and capacity building to regulators, regional standard-setting bodies and private-sector players, but we are not an educational organization per se. Can we apply?**

Yes, you are encouraged to apply. As outlined in section 3.1 of the RfA, commercial for-profit firms, educational institutions, non-profit organizations, universities can apply to this RfA.

**4) The RfA stipulates that partnerships are not allowed unless they predate this RfA. What is the reason for that? Does that imply institutions cannot partner to complement skills in a consortium?**

UNCDF intends to limit our contractual and fiduciary relationship under this RfA to a performance-based agreement with one party. We want to avoid any situation where the work is divided among multiple, separate entities in such a way as would require us to issue, and then manage, multiple contractual relationships. If an organization submits a strong proposal which envisions that organization delegating some portion of the work to subcontractors or consultants, UNCDF has no objection in principle to such an arrangement provided, however, that the lead organization—not UNCDF—manages those relationships, contractually and financially.

### ***QUESTIONS ABOUT THE APPLICATION PROCESS AND CRITERIA***

**5) What is the allowable overhead rate?**

Please note that the candidate selected under this Request for Applications will be awarded with a grant. Overhead fees are not included in a grant. UNCDF will be entitled to cover the costs the partner institution incurs to deliver the agreed-upon results as described in the RfA, but not to finance or defray any costs other than those specifically enumerated in the grant agreement. The key principle to assign a grant includes the contribution to a development result, and the assignment of the grant focuses on four elements: (i) partnership, (ii) capacity, (iii) development and (iv) accountability.

**6) We are a US-based university, and as is standard practice for all academic institutions, we are required to include finance and administrative overhead rates into our proposed budgets. As such we wanted to clarify if this is allowed under the terms of the RFA?**

Please see above. If any institution's internal procedures require listing its overhead rate as a separate line item, that institution is of course welcome to do so for its internal planning or disclosure purposes. Please note, however, that for grant-issuance purposes, the costs to deliver each of the requested services should be provided on a blended basis, with each line item incorporating, as necessary, your internal overhead requirements and any and all other relevant sub-costs.

### ***QUESTIONS ABOUT WHO PAYS FOR WHAT, AND WHO OWNS WHAT***

**7) One of the deliverables, the offline in-person training, is not included in the budgeted deliverables (Section 4.4). Will the hard costs (e.g., venue, catering, accommodations**

**and travel for facilitator team and participants) be covered separately by UNCDF directly, or do they need to be included as part of the proposal budget?**

Yes, UNCDF will directly manage, and pay for, the hard costs associated with offline in-person training and similar events. Please note that United Nations travel policies regarding class of travel will apply.

- 8) We may wish to use intellectual property (e.g., our methodology) that was created prior to this RfA. Can you confirm that any such intellectual property would remain under our ownership?**

Yes. UNCDF supports and adheres to all relevant law regarding intellectual property.

#### **QUESTIONS ABOUT PROJECT DELIVERY**

- 9) Do you already have any countries/regions in mind for this project (on the sending and receiving side of remittances)?**

We do not contemplate any specific regions or countries on the send side. On the receiving side, our current programming focuses on sub-Saharan Africa, Southeast Asia, and South Asia.

- 10) Why limit the training to 100 people? Do you already have in mind who the stakeholders will be from and can these be shared with us?**

We stipulated 100 participants based on the budget resources currently allocated which can be reviewed at a later stage to allow for more participants. This will be done in discussion with the selected institution. We anticipate that both the private-and public-sector participants will be drawn from the senior executive ranks of their respective fields. The participant roster will be shared with the selected institution 60 days in advance. *(See also questions 17 and 18.)*

- 11) How many participants are expected to attend the in-person session? What is the expectation of holding the in-person session given the travel restrictions due to the COVID-19 pandemic? How is this “offline/in-person” session expected to build on the online component?**

The numbers are estimates, but we anticipate two in-person cohorts of approximately 30 participants each. UNCDF is committed to the health and safety of all project stakeholders. We do not expect anyone to travel to, or attend, in-person gatherings of

any kind unless and until all relevant travel restrictions have been lifted and the issuance of any necessary travel visas again becomes practical. The manner in which the in-person sessions (assuming those become possible) build upon the offline learning is a question which UNCDF looks to the teaching/capacity-building team to propose. We imagine it would involve experiential trust- and relationship-building between public- and private-sector players who may not have previously had direct exposure to the priorities and the challenges that each other face. But the ways in which the offline and in-person instruction complement each other is an issue we imagine will be addressed during the course-design phase, for which time has been provided at the beginning of the engagement.

**12) What is the distinction between offline and offsite courses, and expectations on their inclusion, in the current COVID-19 pandemic situation?**

“Offline” refers to break-out cohorts (assigned or self-selected study groups, pairs, or other arrangements) which may occur. “Offsite” refers to retreats, “boot camps” for learning, or other in-person sessions (“Offsite” in this context referring to “away from the attendee’s regular workplace, be that a central bank or a corporate office.”) Please see above for the response to the plans for in-person gatherings given the COVID-19 pandemic: we will not expect in-person gatherings of any kind until restrictions on such events have been lifted.

**13) In section 2.4 of the RfA, the language of instruction is described as “Content Delivery: English and French.” What is meant by content delivery? For example, for an institution with English as its primary language of instruction, would it be acceptable to ensure that lectures include closed captions in French and provide a course site in French, but provide all written materials in English (as well as require that all assignments and groupwork be completed in English)?**

The languages of instruction are English and French. Yes, it would be acceptable to provide one language in closed captioning (if, for example, a given instructor is a native English speaker, to provide French-language closed captions, or vice versa). It would also be acceptable to provide written materials in English, and to request that course participants’ assignments and groupwork also be in English.

UNCDF is actively seeking applications from highly qualified academic institutions to deliver coursework that will advance the strategic objectives enumerated in the RfA. We do not wish for the dual-language approach to discourage otherwise qualified applicants and depending on the quality and quantity of applications received, UNCDF may make

budget available for English-French or French-English translation that may in time become necessary.

- 14) In the RfA, section 2.1 identifies two groups of participant stakeholders (policymakers/ regulators and private sector financial institutions) as two separate cohorts. For the sake of cross-collaboration and best-practice sharing, would it be acceptable to run the course as one complete course with differentiated individual and group materials for the respective cohorts? Or at the very least recognition that the two cohorts are different but might be paired strategically at different points throughout the course? The RfA denotes different learning objectives for each cohort; these could be addressed both in live sessions and differentiated asynchronous material. However, could the overall course be considered one course?**

Yes, we agree to run the course as one with differentiated individual and group materials as appropriate for respective cohorts. We understand that the learning objectives for respective stakeholders can be addressed through live sessions and differentiated material. As already noted, the Request for Applications describes different target audiences which have distinct roles to play in expanding effective remittances for migrants—but also common objectives and concerns. Provided that the course design is one which will advance the stated goals, we will look forward to working with the successful applicant to determine optimal course design.

- 15) Will UNCDF be looking to the selected educational organization to make recommendations about all curriculum and course details, or do you have certain expectations, specifically about: number of curricular hours for participants, breadth vs. depth of relevant topics covered, relative prioritization of different topics to be covered related to digital remittances? Also, are there any constraints/limitations we should be aware of, such as not requiring more than a certain amount of time of the participants?**

The selected organization is expected to make recommendations about all curriculum and course details. Pursuant to section 4.4, UNCDF will provide inputs to the selected organization on the curricula and the breadth and depth of relevant topics covered. Since the expectation is for senior policymakers/regulators/executives to engage, the rule of thumb is that each session or case study should ideally require no more than two hours of advance preparation time.

- 16) The RfA mentions that course participants will receive a certification. Will UNCDF issue this certificate, or will the selected educational institution do so? Does UNCDF have specific curricular or other expectations/requirements related to certification?**

Such certificates are not mandatory but are highly appreciated by the participants as visible evidence and acknowledgement of their many hours of engagement in the coursework. UNCDF would look to the institution to provide such certificates; if they choose to do so, we would expect the certificates to follow whatever standard form and practice that institution follows for similar executive-education course offerings.

- 17) Can you please confirm whether the UNCDF will be identifying, recruiting, and engaging course participants from both cohorts or whether any of those activities will be in the scope of the selected educational institution? If the former, would you be willing to share what criteria will be used to identify and recruit participants to help the selected educational organization understand the participants' base knowledge of related topics, participants' operating environments, etc.?**

UNCDF will be identifying, recruiting, and engaging course participants. Both the public- and the private-sector participants will be drawn from the senior levels of their respective fields (e.g., heads of line ministries among the policymakers and regulators; C-level executives from the industry side). We will share their names, titles, and professional backgrounds with the academic institution in advance, but all participants will start the course already possessing strong technical knowledge of the subject matter.

- 18) When will the course participants be confirmed (i.e. how far in advance of the course starting)?**

Course participants will be confirmed 60 days in advance.

- 19) Will the selected educational institution have an opportunity to gather information on and/or communicate with course participants prior to launching the course?**

Yes

- 20) Is there an expectation that the selected educational organization will evaluate participant learning outcomes as part of this engagement?**

Yes, that is UNCDF's expectation. Please note: UNCDF will look to the institutions to propose how best to structure and carry out this evaluation rather than UNCDF prescribing an approach in advance.