

# DUE DILIGENCE SERVICES PANEL (DFAT-272)

## Category 2: Comprehensive Assessment of Multilateral Organisations

### GROUP DEBRIEF – INDIVIDUALS

#### Preferred Tenderer Assessment

##### Technical Evaluation

Key technical strengths and weaknesses identified by the tender Evaluation Committee (EC) for the **Successful** Tenderers were as follows:

##### Strengths:

- Demonstrated experience in conducting a range of Due Diligence ‘type’ assessments for DFAT across a variety of delivery partners, particularly accreditation related due diligence for ANCP partners.
- Proposals were well structured and succinct with good use of examples.
- Positive approach to relationship management through active engagement and communication with stakeholders, which were validated through the written references.
- Demonstrated understating of DFAT safeguard policies giving DFAT the confidence in their ability to undertake Due Diligence assessments against these policy criteria.
- Strong ability to lead and manage due diligence processes.

##### Weaknesses:

- Suppliers lacked experience in conducting due diligence assessments for multilateral organisations. However their skills and experience in conducting due diligence assessments for NGOs was seen as transferrable and suitable to fulfil DFAT’s requirements.
- Proposals did not demonstrate how relevant experience would be applied to the multilateral context for due diligence assessments.

#### Technical Assessment Summary

Tenderers’	Highest	Lowest
Final Technical Score	77.67	71.00

#### Commercial Assessment Summary

Tenderers’	Highest	Lowest
Management Fees (average)	10%	9.5%
Daily Rates	1,450.00	1,150.00

## Not Preferred Tenderer Assessment

### Technical Evaluation

Key technical strengths and weaknesses identified by the tender Evaluation Committee (EC) for the **Unsuccessful** Tenderers were as follows:

#### Strengths:

- Sound leadership abilities with strong communication skills.
- Effective stakeholder relationships.
- Demonstrated knowledge and experience of DFAT and the development context.

#### Weaknesses:

- The proposals were not well presented and did not effectively demonstrate they had conducted a due diligence assessment, other than accreditation reviews for ANCP partners.
- Limited demonstrated knowledge and understanding of the DFAT due diligence framework, policies and procedures or how they would be applied.
- The proposals did not demonstrate an understanding or awareness of industry standards with regards to quality assurance.

### Technical Assessment Summary

Tenderers'	Highest	Lowest
Final Technical Score	60.67	53.33

A Commercial assessment was not conducted for technically unsuitable tenderers.

Thank you for your interest in the Due Diligence Services Panel. You are encouraged to submit a tender in response to future requirements for the Australian aid program.