

Tenderer [REDACTED]

**Assessment Sheet  
Initial Scoring – for Shortlisting**

**Tenderer:** [REDACTED]

**Project:** SIG RAMSI Support Facility (SRSF)

**NOTE:**

- 1. **Ratings:** Each criterion should be scored out of a maximum of 100 points in accordance with the notes in the letter to TAP members. The following indicative scoring scale is provided to assist TAP members with the scoring of tenders:

%	
0	Unacceptable
20	Poor
50	Satisfactory
70	Good
85	Very Good
100	Excellent

As well as scores, TAP members should include comprehensive comments as described in Attachment 1 **Terms and Conditions of Technical Assessment Panel Participation.**

**Criterion 1**

**Organisational Capacity**

**35%**

**Demonstrated ability, preferably in a Melanesian context, to provide management, financial and administrative support, for complex development programs to deliver agreed outcomes:**

- a) to work with partners to determine effective capacity development strategies that build on country systems and de-emphasise the use of international long term advisors;
- b) to provide successful, cost effective management support to a range of long and short term capacity development modalities including technical specialists, training, and research and analysis;
- c) to develop and implement equitable, inclusive and accountable systems, particularly management of procurement including recruitment and performance management of technical specialists; and
- d) to provide effective security and administrative and logistical support to an offshore based team and office in a developing country.

**Score 69**

**Strengths:**

- partnership (provision of TL) seems to add value to the tender. However uncertain what additional value adding is taking place.
- Good summary of potential issues/barrier - collocation sounds good - depends upon how each of the pillars will respond.
- Recognition of recent AusAID TA reviews is good.
- Recognition that 'adaptation' is important is good.
- Good examples and case studies provided
- Capacity building strategies appear appropriate and relevant in the SI context
- PNG examples are good and possibly relevant
- Mobilisation strategy appears sound
- Security and administrative arrangements seem sound.

**Weaknesses:**

- beyond providing the TL - unsure what additional value [REDACTED] provides to the facility.
- whilst the forestry/land Administration experience may be relevant - not sure it will easily translate into the circumstances of the facility
- performance issues are not really addressed

**Overview Comments for this Criterion:**

- good understanding of the context and the design - probably a function of the nominated TL being involved in the design process.
- Acknowledgement of the AusAID TA reviews is relevant - must apply outcomes/recommendations where possible.

**Criterion 2**

**Development of Periodic Plans**

**20%**

**Demonstrated ability to articulate and implement agreed approach to developing and executing RAMSI program plans. Such plans must address the priorities of relevant strategic Partnership Frameworks and include appropriate and effective resourcing, monitoring and evaluation systems, and risk management required for successful implementation. (In implementation of this activity, the relevant framework is the SIG-RAMSI Partnership Framework.)**

The response should also identify risks and management responses to these risks and also include innovative approaches to the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation systems in a Solomon Islands context.

**Score 71**

**Strengths:**

- excellent understanding of the complexity of the facility i.e. working across three very diverse pillars and their requirements.
- Steps to support the development and execution of the pillar plans seem appropriate.
- Good transition strategies outlined in the mobilisation plan
- Good recognition of the importance and roles of stakeholders and partners
- Development plans are explained well in the mobilisation plan
- Good understanding of the importance of the strategic partnership framework
- Good understanding of the SI context
- Case studies good and relevant.

**Weaknesses:**

- Evaluation opportunities and strategies are perhaps understated
- Perhaps understating the fact that the three pillars will want/need different services.

**Overview Comments for this Criterion:**

- Generally a good understating of the context and needs of the facility.

**Criterion 3**

**Personnel**

**30%**

**Demonstrated appropriate skills, experience and team balance, including management strategies and recruitment strategies for engaging long term national and international personnel including project office administration staff and technical specialists.**

Tenderers are required to nominate Specified Personnel as per the table below **Clause 6.6 (b)** of this Part 1 and annex CVs for those Personnel.

Tenderers are required to provide a staff structure including position titles and numbers of positions for the SRSF Office.

**Score 75.5**

**Strengths:**

- Good mix and balance of team
- Nominated TL has a good understanding of the design context – experienced and able to manage the needs of the program. *appears*
- Very experienced team – will need to confirm appropriateness of DTL in the SI context given he was past [REDACTED]
- Good strategies for recruitment and deployment – recognition of the importance of localisation.
- Understanding and application of ‘inclusive’ policies is good.

**Weaknesses:**

- Gaps in nominated positions – assumes (probably quite rightly) that appropriate personnel (ex current Facility) will be available
- Not a lot of information provided with respect to establishing the administration/office needs of the program.
- Recognise importance of recruiting/using SIers and PIers – but strategy for success not really clear.
- Mostly professional consultants.

**Overview Comments for this Criterion:**

- Well balanced and experienced team – should meet the needs of the facility. Will need to confirm some of the nominees using referee checks.

**Criterion 4**

**Analysis and Dissemination of Data**

**15%**

**Demonstrated expertise in building bodies of evidence around best practise, sharing lessons learned, and communicating and implementing approaches that improve the effectiveness of aid delivery.**

In framing their response to this criterion, Tenderer's should consider their approach to stakeholder engagement and providing information that can be utilised by stakeholders.

**Score 60**

**Strengths:**

- Case studies provided appear relevant and appropriate
- The CLC model sounds interesting – may be what is needed to address MoG and EcoGov support – as highlighted in the RFT.
- The recognition of 'change' and the 'management of change' are good.
- Good understanding of the contextual challenges.

**Weaknesses:**

- Possibly understates and/or under recognises the importance the importance of data management *=> refined document*
- Not a strong emphasis on the value of information to stakeholders – not the involvement of stakeholders/partners.
- No examples given as to how we can work in the local context.
- More information would be good on communication strategies.

**Overview Comments for this Criterion:**

- Not as well presented or understood as other sections in the proposal.
- Weak on stakeholder engagement.

Tenderer [REDACTED]

## Summary for Tenderer

### Strengths:

- A good understanding of the context and the challenges that will be faced once the facility is mobilised.
- Good organisational and team structures – need to be confirmed through referee checks.
- Modelling proposed appears sound – subject to application.

### Weaknesses:

- Poor with respect to data analysis and the application of lessons learned within the context of the facility.

### Overview Comments for Tenderer:

Generally a satisfactory/good tender – probably because of an intimate knowledge of the design  
Preliminary observations would suggest the tenderer would deliver the services required.