

Sample bid assurance review

This example shows how Article6 reviews a substantially complete tender before submission.

The fictional bidder has a credible response and an experienced internal team. The main risk is not poor writing. It is that important commitments are not consistently evidenced across the submission.

Illustrative Sample - Not a Client Engagement

All buyer, bidder, response, evidence and finding material in this document is fictional and provided only to demonstrate the review method.

Tender	Illustrative Public-Sector Facilities Services Tender
Stage	Final pre-submission review
Status	Substantially complete
Overall view	AMBER

What we found

P1	Mobilisation timing is not fully evidenced.
P1	The Mobilisation Manager commitment conflicts across documents.
P2	Relevant experience is claimed but not supported by a measurable outcome.
P2	Risk controls are described but ownership is unclear.

The submission is credible, but these issues could make it harder for the evaluator to award stronger marks with confidence.

Example: the six-week mobilisation commitment

What the buyer asked for

Provide a mobilisation plan covering governance, staffing, transition activities, milestones, dependencies, risk controls and readiness for service commencement.

What the bidder said

“Our mobilisation team will begin immediately following contract award. We have extensive experience transitioning comparable services and will use our proven mobilisation methodology. A dedicated mobilisation manager will coordinate workstreams, weekly governance meetings and readiness checks. We expect mobilisation to be completed within six weeks.”

What Article6 noticed

The response sounds credible, but the six-week commitment is asserted rather than demonstrated.

- No comparable mobilisation is identified.
- No measurable previous outcome is given.
- The six-week period is not mapped to clear milestones.
- The timing is not explicitly reconciled with the buyer's required commencement date.

Why this matters

The evaluator may believe the bidder understands mobilisation but still have insufficient evidence to award stronger marks for credibility and deliverability.

What we would ask the team to do

1. Add one relevant comparable mobilisation example.
2. Include the measurable delivery outcome.
3. Show the main milestones and dependencies behind the six-week plan.
4. Map the six-week plan directly to the buyer's required commencement date and reconcile the same dates and commitments across the supporting documents.

What resolved looks like

The evaluator can see why the six-week commitment is credible without having to infer the link between the claim, the evidence and the buyer's required date.

One strong answer can still be undermined elsewhere

Tender evaluation happens across the whole submission. A commitment can look credible in the main response and still conflict with a schedule or appendix.

Commitment	Main response	Implementation plan	Resource schedule	Finding
Mobilisation duration	6 weeks	42 days	-	Consistent
Mobilisation Manager	Full-time	Named lead	0.5 FTE	Conflict
Governance meetings	Weekly	Weekly	-	Consistent
Go-live date	1 Nov	1 Nov	8 Nov	Conflict

Neither conflict is dramatic on its own. Together, they make the evaluator less certain about which commitment represents the actual delivery plan.

This is why Article6 reviews the full submission rather than individual answers in isolation.

The bidder should not require the evaluator to decide which of two conflicting commitments is the real one.

What we would prioritise before submission

MUST DO

- Resolve the Mobilisation Manager contradiction.
- Reconcile the go-live dates.
- Support the six-week mobilisation commitment with evidence.
- Verify mandatory submission requirements.

DO IF TIME ALLOWS

- Quantify the relevant previous delivery outcome.
- Make ownership of risk controls explicit.
- Improve signposting to supporting evidence.

DO NOT SPEND TIME ON

- Stylistic rewriting of already compliant sections.
- Terminology changes made only for tone.
- Polishing low-impact narrative while P1 findings remain unresolved.

The purpose of the review is not to create more work. It is to identify the work that matters most before the deadline.

How Article6 gets there

Behind the simple findings is a consistent assurance process.

01	Requirement extraction
02	Evaluation mapping
03	Coverage
04	Evidence
05	Compliance
06	Consistency
07	Scoring leakage
08	Prioritised remediation

Have a substantially complete tender that needs an independent final challenge?

Send the current draft, tender name or reference, buyer documents and deadline. Article6 will first confirm whether the scope and review window are workable.