

## **Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management Period Offer**

### **Generic Debrief to Tenderers**

#### **1. Overview**

1.1 AusAID wishes to thank all who tendered for the Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management Period Offer which was advertised on Saturday 30<sup>th</sup> April and closed on Tuesday 31 May 2005.

1.2 The tender proved very productive for AusAID attracting 23 conforming tenders from individuals and organisations, nominating 115 individuals across both categories.

1.3 The high overall quality of tenders provided a very competitive field, giving AusAID a valuable opportunity to identify much needed expertise in the field of Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management. AusAID, with the assistance of the Technical Assessment Panel (TAP), was able to rank the individual candidates on the basis of their potential to provide the best quality expertise for each category.

1.4 A total of 11 Period Offer Deeds have been negotiated representing a good cross section of personnel across categories A, B and A & B; as well as a reasonable spread of firms (7) and individuals (4). 41 consultants in total represent the full range of skills and experience necessary to meet the broad objectives of this Period Offer.

1.5 A number of tenders (and individuals included in tenders) were not rated technically suitable by the TAP. Accordingly, many tenderers have not been awarded PO Deeds and many of the Deeds awarded do not include all of the individuals nominated.

1.6 In the Request for Tender (RFT), AusAID advised that it would provide tenderers with a generic debriefing within 30 days of Tenderers being notified of the outcome of the tender process. Accordingly, the following summary of the common strengths and weaknesses of the tenders received (as identified by the TAP) is provided to assist tenderers to formulate future AusAID tenders.

#### **2. About the Technical Assessment Panel (TAP)**

2.1 The TAP comprised appropriately qualified AusAID representatives and independent external individuals/specialists contracted for the purpose. The TAP members ranked tenders and individuals on the basis of their technical merit based on tender content against AusAID's specifications as set out in the Scope of Service (SoS) contained within the RFT. The following summarises TAP member comments on the common strengths and weaknesses of the tenders received.

#### **3. Inclusions Which Strengthened Or Weakened Tenders**

##### **General Comment**

##### **Strong Tenders**

3.1 The TAP found that tenders which rated well in the technical assessment demonstrated clarity, relevance and originality in form and content. Successful tenders:

- demonstrated a clear understanding of the tender requirements;
- were able to address *all* of these requirements in a clear and logical manner;
- only incorporated information relevant to the Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management Period Offer tender; and
- drew upon genuine experience in order to provide original insights with respect to the tender (supported by reference to specific AMC experience and/or project experience cited in CVs and Experience Data Sheets).

### **Weaker Tenders**

3.2 The TAP found that tenders which rated poorly were not well structured, lacked relevance and/or did not add value' to the SoS. Unsuccessful tenders:

- submitted responses from peace, conflict/logistics/other specialists rather than actual Humanitarian Emergency/Disaster specialists.
- did not demonstrate a clear understanding of the tender requirements;
- failed to address all selection criteria;
- did not maintain a quality standard across the entire proposal;
- used generalised statements that lacked direct relevance;
- did not provide specific details to support claims (for example, “advised on disaster relief”); and
- “mirrored” the tender requirements, rather than expanding or adding original insights.

### **Comments Against Selection Criteria**

#### **Selection Criterion A**

- (i) **Demonstrated capacity to provide appropriate office, administrative and financial support for contracted personnel; as well as a demonstrated capacity to prepare and produce high quality documents;**
- (ii) **Experience in operational management of, and/or knowledge of issues associated with, humanitarian emergencies, particularly managing disasters by national disaster organisations and/or field operations; and**
- (iii) **Demonstrated sound understanding of:**
  - (A) **AusAID’s policies on Gender and Development, HIV/AIDS and Environment (refer to Clauses 14.3 and 14.4, Part 3);**
  - (B) **The principles underpinning AusAID’s Humanitarian Action Policy;**

- (C) **International management of natural and complex emergencies, especially in the United Nations, NGO and in relation to national government responsibilities;**
- (D) **The core principles of international humanitarian law and contemporary initiatives to operationalise these within protection frameworks;**
- (E) **The IASC Plan of Action on Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Humanitarian Crises; and**
- (F) **Ability to adhere to relevant and acceptable codes of conduct within the sector, such as the Code of Conduct for The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief.**

3.3 Tenders which rated well against this criterion were able to:

- demonstrate the compatibility of their systems with AusAID's systems and demonstrate a fully equipped office describing the management, administration and finance systems in place along with back-up arrangements;
- demonstrate capacity to:
  - prepare, format, structure and present information to high standards;
  - follow tender instructions clearly; and
  - use plain English and grammatically sound approaches;
- demonstrate previous general mobilisation experience and relate this experience to the context of the administration of Period Offers; and
- connect experience to a demonstrated understanding of at least two or three of the more important and current development issues.

3.4 Tenders which did not rate well:

- Discussed a general 'awareness' of, rather than a 'demonstrated' understanding of points of development issues.
- made generalised statements about capacity to mobilise without providing supporting evidence;
- included information extraneous to the tender requirements;
- appeared to shift administrative responsibilities to consultants;
- lacked structured levels of support/interaction with personnel;
- did not comply with tender requirements;
- lacked coherence in terms of submission styles; and

- merely cited experience in development countries without demonstrating how this leads to an understanding of development issues.

### **Selection Criterion B**

- (iv) **Appropriate qualifications and/or training and/or experience in the nominated work categories and up-to-date professional skills and knowledge in the nominated work categories;**
- (v) **Demonstrated capacity to provide analytical and strategic thinking skills;**
- (vi) **Demonstrated capacity to provide sound and appropriate advice in the context of conditions prevailing in developing countries. (Professional experience in developing countries or in development situations in Australia would be an advantage, but is not a prerequisite for selection.); and**
- (vii) **Demonstrated capacity to provide leadership and/or participate as a team member in design, monitoring and evaluation teams.**

#### 3.5 Personnel who rated well against this criterion:

- held completed/current qualifications which were appropriate/inclusive of the appropriate units or topics for the Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management Period Offer;
- linked experience to the details set out in the Scope of Services;
- demonstrated a balance between experience with activity or research, design and management and the practical application of Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management techniques; and
- gave examples or experience in leadership of and/or participation in design, monitoring and evaluation teams.

#### 3.6 Personnel who did not rate as well against this criterion:

- claimed to have studied but without the courses (or depth of studies) making this apparent or did not fully describe their qualification/s (example: Master of Arts, but no other detail);
- failed to explain or did not explain adequately how professional skills and knowledge were being kept up-to-date. Many tenders did not relate the nominated people's experience to the nominated work categories at all, or did so in an unconvincing way;
- failed to explain the role of nominated members and their experience in leadership of and/or participation in teams.
- confused Humanitarian Emergency & Disaster Risk Management with Community Development; and

- lower scoring tenders did not verify claims against this criterion in their CV/Experience Data Sheets.