**DUE DILIGENCE SERVICES PANEL (DFAT-272)**

**Category 1: Comprehensive Assessment of Commercial Partners**

**GROUP DEBRIEF – ORGANISATIONS**

**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:

* Suppliers demonstrated strong organisational capacity with mature systems in place.
* Suppliers possess good resourcing schedule and surge capacity.
* Suppliers are global companies and have the ability to leverage off existing networks to provide the services required.
* A strong understanding of due diligence policies and processes to meet DFAT’s requirements.
* Demonstrated extensive experience in undertaking due diligence assessments for a range of complex organisations/entities in Australia and overseas.
* Demonstrated a good breadth of experience including in international development with favourable referee reports.

Weaknesses:

* Suppliers did not demonstrate how they would source personnel with the thematic skill set (i.e. child protection etc.) required to fulfil DFAT’s requirements.
* Suppliers did not directly address industry standards for preparing quality reports.
* Suppliers did not reference DFAT and more broadly Commonwealth policies as well as legislative requirements to demonstrate how these would be applied to due diligence assessments.

**Technical Assessment Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenderers’ | Highest | Lowest |
| Final Technical Score | 90.33 | 65.67 |

**Commercial Assessment Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenderers’ | Highest | Lowest |
| Management Fees (average) | 10% | 7% |
| Daily Rates | 2,182.00 | 750.00 |

**Value for Money Assessment Summary**

Some suppliers were found technically suitable but not Value for Money due to high management fees and/or daily rates.

**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:

* Suppliers provided a wide range of experience and expertise, some relevant to the services required.
* Suppliers demonstrated sound awareness of DFAT’s due diligence policies and procedures.
* Suppliers provided a sound resourcing schedule.

Weaknesses:

* Varied and overall insufficient experience undertaking due diligence assessments on complex commercial organisations.
* Suppliers did not demonstrate an understanding of the process to deliver due diligence assessments in an international development environment.
* Suppliers lacked an understanding of how DFAT’s Due Diligence assessments apply to downstream partners.
* Written references varied in supporting supplier’s claims.
* The resourcing schedule did not sufficiently capture the appropriate experience and skills to carry out complex due diligence assessments.
* Proposals did not provide confidence that systems, standards or practice for quality assurance was in place.

**Technical Assessment Summary**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tenderers’ | Highest | Lowest |
| Final Technical Score | 60 | 2.67 |

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.