



1. APPENDIX 1 - COMPLIANT RESPONSE EVALUATION

Section 47, Section 47G



Bright Consulting

EVALUATION CRITERIA		OVERALL EVALUATION	
Meets Requirement	Proven Capacity	Total Costs	Value for Money Assessment
<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meets our requirements Some good case studies Lacking depth? Lower cost – does this raise an issue 	<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They have provided several case studies of recent and current work. They are explicitly program management, but have led Cyber and IT projects and programs 	<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They have provided a day rate for the team of 4 of \$4,800 Which will be a total of \$648,000 exGST over the 135 work days from 11 Dec to 30 June 2021. This is a very cheap amount, not sure why it is half the amount of the other proposals. 	<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> They have provided some good case studies They are half the price of the other proposals, which is a concern

DECO



EVALUATION CRITERIA		OVERALL EVALUATION	
Meets Requirement	Proven Capacity	Total Costs	Value for Money Assessment
<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They seem to have provided a lot about their generic quality system but not much substance on what they will be doing for us. • Pinned everything on defence • High level security/cyber work • Not a lot of substance of how they would meet requirements • Only small team 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 2 people identified have good experience, I don't believe that a team of 2 people with a small secretariate support role will be enough to cover the breadth of the requirement for this program • Would the strong focus on defence mean they are narrow focused or would it be a unique perspective 	<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 47 • This is for a team of 2 plus a secretariat for less than half the time. • Their costs are in line with other proposals 	<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They seem to have provided a lot about their generic quality system but not much substance on what they will be doing for us. • The cost is approx. the same as the other proposals • They have only identified 2 people to undertake the program



Deloitte

EVALUATION CRITERIA		OVERALL EVALUATION	
Meets Requirement	Proven Capacity	Total Costs	Value for Money Assessment
<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Their proposal meets the requirements • They have identified a way forward to delivery the program • Strength in available assets • Only cyber experience with industry and air services? • Well documented proposal that outlines how they will manage program management 	<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposing a core team of 4 (I think) • They seem to have the appropriate level experience • I'm not sure what they mean by: Our fees assume supporting up to 4 large Programs for the Cyber Program Hub with a view to have an 'Account Manager' like structure across each program for tailored stakeholder engagement 	<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quote is \$175,895, or total \$1,231,262 (exGST), this is based on start of 7th Dec. • To assess the 135 days from 11th Dec to 30 June 2021, I've divided the total amount by 140 days and multiplied by 135. Giving a comparison total of: \$1,187,288.36. • I assume this is for a full time team of 4, with minimal direct support from the 2 partners 	<p>Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Well documented proposal that outlines how they will manage program management • A core team of 4 is a reasonable number • The quote is approx. comparable with the majority of the other proposals



Section 47, Section 47G



Organisations that didn't respond

- 4 Birds
- Actavium Group
- Bench 100
- Clarity Business and IT Solutions
- Focused Business Solutions
- Strategic Enterprise Services
- Project Assured
- Project Management Partners
- Projects Delivered Australia
- IMA Management & Technology
- Shearwater

Released under FOI Act

Evaluation Ratings

The evaluation criteria are weighted.

The following ratings were applied to each of the evaluation criteria:

Very Good: The Response satisfies the evaluation criterion to a very high standard and presents minimal or no risk to the Commonwealth and its claims are fully supported by the information provided.

Good: The Response satisfies the evaluation criterion to a high standard and/or presents limited risk to the Commonwealth. The Tenderer's claims are supported by the information provided.

Satisfactory: The Response satisfies the evaluation criterion to a satisfactory degree and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. There are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.

Poor*: The Response barely satisfies the evaluation criterion and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to the Commonwealth. There are major deficiencies in the information provided.

Unsatisfactory*: The Response does not satisfy the evaluation criterion and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth.

* A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more evaluation criteria will exclude the Potential Supplier from further participation in the procurement process.