

# **PANEL OF SUPPLIERS FOR THE PROVISION OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY (ICT) PROFESSIONALS**

## **Generic Debrief to Tenderers**

### **1. Overview**

- 1.1 AusAID wishes to thank all who tendered for the ICT Professionals Panel, which was advertised on 20 March 2008 and closed on 15 April 2008.
- 1.2 The tender proved very productive for AusAID, attracting 54 conforming tenders.
- 1.3 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 (as identified by the Tender Assessment Panel) of the tenders received is provided to assist tenderers to formulate future AusAID tenders.
- 1.4 Period Offer Deeds have been offered to 27 tenderers.

### **2. Inclusions which Strengthened or Weakened Tenders**

- 2.1 An AusAID Tender Assessment Panel (TAP) undertook a comparative assessment of the tenders submitted, in accordance with the RFT and the selection criteria.

#### **Stronger Tenders**

- 2.2 The TAP found that tenders which rated well, understood the nature of the services sought by AusAID and were able to offer a range of ICT Professionals against the skills categories indicated in the RFT.

#### **Weaker Tenders**

- 2.3 The weaker tenders did not seem to understand the nature of the services sought, with tenders focused more towards project management and/or delivery, or the provision of consultancy-related services.
- 2.4 A number of tenderers were not able to offer a range of ICT Professionals against the skills categories included in the RFT, and a number failed to respond to all the criteria.

### **3. Specific Comments Against Selection Criteria**

#### **Criterion (a) - Account Management Approach and Structure (20%)**

- 3.1 Tenders which rated well against this criterion nominated experienced Account Managers, detailed their internal succession planning, and demonstrated in detail how they would work closely with AusAID to understand and respond to AusAID's requirements.
- 3.2 Proposals for regular meetings with AusAID to develop relationships, the importance of understanding AusAID's requirements in order to source appropriate ICT Professionals, and solid detail on performance management added substance to the responses to this criterion.
- 3.3 Tenders which did not rate as well, provided limited detail on the reporting lines, did not appear to understand AusAID's business needs, and provided limited detail on problem resolution.

#### **Selection Criterion (b) - Skills Availability (20%)**

- 3.4 Tenders which rated well against this criterion were able to provide ICT personnel across the skills categories listed in the RFT.
- 3.5 Tenders which did not rate as well only had a limited number of ICT personnel on their books, and/or focused on a narrow range of skills.

#### **Selection Criterion (c) - Needs Matching Process (20%)**

- 3.6 Tenders which rated well against this criterion detailed how they would assess and understand skills requirements, and linked this to candidate selection processes, to ensure the provision of appropriate ICT Professionals.
- 3.7 Most tenderers referred to the sourcing of personnel through database records although this was not, in itself, considered either a positive or negative attribute. Those who matched initial searches (eg database or other means) with further assessment, such as interview and referee checking, followed by preparation of candidates for interview, rated well.
- 3.8 Tenders which did not rate as well, provided information on sourcing candidates, but little information as to how they would assess and understand AusAID's requirements. A number of tenderers did not demonstrate the ability to "add value" under this criterion.

**Selection Criterion (d) - Relevant Past Experience** (20%)

- 3.9 Tenders which rated well against this criterion provided examples to demonstrate experience and explained why these examples were relevant to AusAID's requirements.
- 3.10 Tenders which did not rate as well gave limited detail of past experience, or referred to experience which was based more around project management and/or consultancy-related services, rather than the provision of ICT Professionals to meet AusAID needs.

**Selection Criterion (e) - Standards and Processes** (20%)

- 3.11 Tenders which rated well against this criterion cited ISO9001 compliance and ITCRA membership (although neither was mandated in the RFT). They also provided solid detail in relation to change and risk management processes, and detailed how they would monitor and manage any performance issues.
- 3.12 Tenders which did not rate as well did not cover all components under this criterion, responded with limited detail, and/or did not adequately address performance monitoring.