

Tenderer [REDACTED]

Assessment Sheet
Short-listing

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 **63**

53 ✓

Strengths:

- Appears to be a good partnership with [REDACTED]. Is there a letter of association with [REDACTED]
- Good understanding of (potential) issues across Pillars.
- Good recognition of local understanding and management.
- Planning Pillar Guides – sounds like a good idea.
- Performance feedback loop sounds good.
- Intelligent loop sounds good.
- Mobilisation plan provides good information – and fills in gaps with respect to financial accountability.

Weaknesses:

- Lacks specific examples and case studies in support of propositions.
- No clear sense with respect to the strategy to strengthen local expertise.
- Not convinced [REDACTED] experience and outcomes will translate into the SI context.
- Mobilisation plan perhaps overstates the Australian context and understates the local i.e. SI context and relationships.
- Need further clarity how the partners adds value to the Facility.

• lack of local knowledge & expertise is obvious

Overview Comments for this Criterion:

- Lots of theory – little application and examples.
- Don't have a sense that [REDACTED] has a full appreciation of the SI context – they will need their partners.

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 ~~52~~

48 ✓

101

Strengths:

- Good use of annual audits
- Model describing monitoring and measuring sounds interesting – but needs expansion.
- Risk management analysis appears appropriate – not sure if adds any more value than that provided in the RFT/Design

Weaknesses:

- Do not get a sense that there is 'demonstrated ability' in managing across such a complex environment i.e. the multidimensional and competing needs of the three pillars.
- Monitoring strategies appear fine – but weak with respect to evaluation.
- Successful implementation outcomes could be expanded upon.
- SI context and understanding appears weak.

Overview Comments for this Criterion:

- Generally weak – needed more information confirming that they have a demonstrated ability to support the development and implementation of periodic plans.
- Do not have a sense that there is a full understanding of the complexity of the SI context – particularly with respect to the diverse roles and mechanics of each of the Pillars.

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 ~~69~~
52 ✓

153

Strengths:

- The team appears well balanced – with respect to [REDACTED]. ~~At least compared to many tenders.~~
- Good to have a [REDACTED]
- The team has considerable experience and appears well placed to manage and implement the Facility. – *but no/little SI experience*
- Administrative options appear appropriate – heavy emphasis on data entry.

Weaknesses:

- Lots of experienced and ‘professional’ consultants – not sure if they are offering anything new.
- [REDACTED] – *some* concerns re his experience and ability to manage such a complex program within the SI context. [REDACTED] | [REDACTED] could be an advantage and/or a disadvantage – but still good.
- Some concern re the [REDACTED] and the [REDACTED] experience. [REDACTED] not necessarily well regarded or creditable in the SI context.

Overview Comments for this Criterion:

- ~~A sense that the team would be well positioned (and experienced) in the management of the Facility.~~
- Good supportive documentation
- *Did not function as a team at interview
not a team – but individual knowledge*

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 57.5 ✓

205

52 ✓
but limited in SI context

Strengths:

- Good demonstrated expertise. Some good examples given – but not sure how they will apply in the SI context.
- Good understanding of lessons learned and the principles of capacity building. – although weak in SI approach.
- Good use/understanding of technology – web based methodology.

Weaknesses:

- Perhaps understating the importance of the dissemination of information and the sharing of lessons learned in the SI context.
- Large emphasis on monitoring – not as much on evaluation and learning.
- No substantive examples (or examples) of building upon and using stakeholder/partner engagement in the process.
- Understating or perhaps misunderstanding the difficult situation with respect to how the three pillars work.

Overview Comments for this Criterion:

- Generally weak – probably due to lack of awareness of the SI context.
- Under estimating the importance of data management and the dissemination of information in a complex development context.

Summary for Tenderer

Strengths:

- A fair/good effort to address and provide services as outlined in the RFT – given a lack of experience in the SI context. *Poorly performance of interview*
- Strong developmental, financial and administrative experience.
- Lots of good theory – and experience outside of the SI. *SI experiential poor*
- Proposed partnership looks good – has the potential to build upon broader needs within the SI.
- Good to see a [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED] *weak*

Weaknesses:

- Tends to state the obvious
- Unclear re roles and responsibilities of the partners within the partnership.
- Nothing innovative or unique with respect to managing a complex environment.
- Understating the roles of partner organisation – need to know how they can add further value.
- An experienced team – but all are professional consultants.
- Unclear how the contractor will 'localise' the Facility over time.

Overview Comments for Tenderer:

- A satisfactory proposal – but lacking an understanding of the SI context.

barely → *but marked down at interview*

Presented poor – no sense of team crit's & understand of Facility context