

AGENT 3 – BID SUBMISSION CRITICAL EVALUATOR

# Case Management & Workflow Platform — Submission Review

Pinnacle Software Group · National Regulatory Standards Authority · Ref: BCE-2026-0003 · EXEMPLAR

*This report is an illustrative exemplar. The organisation, opportunity, and all data are fictional. Agent outputs are critical reviews for human consideration; all submission decisions remain the responsibility of the bid team.*

EXECUTIVE / SENIOR TEAM READINESS JUDGEMENT

## Borderline — Do Not Submit Without Remediation

This submission has genuine strengths — pricing is highly competitive, the delivery timeline is credible, and the core win themes are present. However, one issue carries reputational and compliance risk that is currently unresolved, and two structural weaknesses are sufficiently visible to experienced evaluators that they are likely to suppress the score below what the strongest sections deserve.

**BORDERLINE**  
**6.4**  
Overall · out of 10

### 01 Compliance and Scoring Risk Analysis

Pricing and Commercial Position	Highly competitive pricing with well-evidenced cost model	<b>8.5</b>	STRONG	Wt 20%
Delivery Outcomes and Timeline	Well-structured milestones, realistic phasing, strong alignment to contractual requirements	<b>8.0</b>	STRONG	Wt 20%
Technical Capability and Approach	Capability evident; response lacks differentiation from likely competitor field	<b>6.0</b>	MODERATE	Wt 25%
Track Record and Client Evidence	Client base relevant; post-implementation success stories underdeployed	<b>5.5</b>	MODERATE	Wt 15%
Organisational Values and Governance	Values aligned; partner tax conduct issue inadequately addressed	<b>4.5</b>	AT RISK	Wt 10%
Win Themes and Strategic Positioning	Themes present and broadly sound; not consistently threaded through submission	<b>6.5</b>	MODERATE	Wt 10%

Weighted score: 6.4 / 10. The pricing and delivery sections are performing at a level that would typically support a shortlist position. They are being held back by a governance risk that an experienced evaluator panel will probe, and by a technical section that is broadly competent but not competitive.

### 02 Critical and High-Severity Issues — Mandatory Remediation

**CRITICAL**      **Partner Tax Conduct — Unresolved Governance Exposure**      **MANDATORY REMEDIATION**

**FINDING**

The submission acknowledges that questions have been raised about tax avoidance practices involving two consortium partners. The current response describes the issue as "under review" without directly addressing the partner conduct. A national regulatory authority will have a professional obligation to scrutinise any declared governance concern. The current framing — partial disclosure without resolution — is worse than either full transparency with a clear resolution narrative, or a pre-submission clarification request.

**REQUIRED ACTION**

Take one of the following positions before submission: (1) Resolution confirmed — the concern is investigated, resolved, and can be evidenced; state this clearly. (2) Structural separation — the implicated partners are not involved in this contract; set out the governance boundary and contractual protections. (3) Pre-submission clarification — if the situation is genuinely unresolved, seek dialogue with the contracting authority before submitting.

HIGH

**Technical Differentiation — Capability Stated, Not Distinguished**

MANDATORY REMEDIATION

**FINDING**

The technical capability sections (Q2, Q3, Q5) establish that Pinnacle can do what the contract requires. They do not establish why Pinnacle's approach is preferable to the likely competitor field. Features are listed, methodology is described, and compliance is demonstrated — but the response does not make the evaluator's choice clear.

**REQUIRED ACTION**

Revisit Q2, Q3, and Q5 with one editorial instruction: for every capability claimed, add one sentence explaining what this means for the evaluator compared to a generic alternative. Example: "Our open-architecture API model means NRSA is not locked into Pinnacle's infrastructure post-implementation." That is differentiation. A feature list is not.

HIGH

**Client Success Evidence — Present but Underdeployed**

MANDATORY REMEDIATION

**FINDING**

Three clients are named in Q4 (Track Record); none of the three references includes a post-implementation outcome — what happened after go-live, at what scale, and what measurable improvement was achieved.

**REQUIRED ACTION**

For each of the three client references, add: (1) a specific performance metric at six and twelve months post go-live; (2) a statement on scale — how many users, how many cases processed; (3) where available, an attributed quote from the client's named contact regarding operational impact.

MEDIUM

**Win Theme Threading — Present at Section Level, Absent in Detail**

**FINDING**

The three stated win themes are clearly articulated in the executive summary. They do not consistently appear in the body of the technical responses. Q3 and Q5 address the relevant content areas without explicitly connecting to the themes.

**REQUIRED ACTION**

In Q3 and Q5, insert a bridging sentence per win theme where it is most evidenced. Ensure the three win themes are named explicitly at least once in Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5.

03

**Competitive Weaknesses**

W1	<b>No proprietary methodology claim.</b> The submission describes a sound implementation methodology but does not present it as Pinnacle's own developed approach.	HIGH
W2	<b>Data migration capability not evidenced.</b> Q3 states that Pinnacle has delivered complex data migrations from legacy systems. No specific example is provided with scale or outcome data.	HIGH
W3	<b>User adoption strategy is implicit.</b> The submission references training and change management support but does not present a structured user adoption plan.	MEDIUM
W4	<b>Accessibility compliance not addressed.</b> No reference to WCAG 2.1 AA compliance. For a body whose registrants may include individuals with accessibility requirements, this is likely to be a scored element.	MEDIUM

04 **Win Theme Assessment**

<b>Regulatory-grade security by design</b>	Well evidenced in Q6; ISO 27001 and Cyber Essentials Plus both cited with specifics. Strong — retain and reinforce in Q2 and Q3.	STRONG
<b>User-centred implementation methodology</b>	Described in Q3 but not evidenced with outcome data. The theme is asserted; it is not yet demonstrated. Client outcome evidence would transform this from assertion to proof.	DEVELOP
<b>Total cost of ownership advantage</b>	Strongest theme in the submission — pricing section makes this case compellingly. Partially undermined by absence of post-implementation data showing sustained cost performance at clients.	DEVELOP
<b>Theme consistency across submission</b>	All three themes visible in the executive summary. Not consistently threaded through Q2–Q5. An evaluator scoring individual questions without cross-referencing the summary will undervalue the strategic positioning.	INCONSISTENT

05 **Question-Level Scores**

Q1	Executive Summary and Strategic Overview	<b>7.2</b>	Win themes well positioned; governance gap casts a shadow
Q2	Technical Architecture and Platform Capability	<b>6.0</b>	Competent but not differentiated; feature list without comparative positioning
Q3	Implementation Approach and Methodology	<b>6.2</b>	Sound methodology; data migration evidence absent; user adoption implicit
Q4	Track Record and Client References	<b>5.5</b>	Three relevant clients named; no post-implementation outcomes provided
Q5	Support, Maintenance and Continuous Improvement	<b>6.5</b>	SLA commitments clear; win theme threading absent

Q6	Security, Data Protection and Compliance	8.5	Best response in submission — specific, evidenced, and appropriately detailed
Q7	Governance, Ethics and Social Value	4.2	Partner tax issue inadequately resolved — highest risk in submission
Q8	Commercial Proposal and Pricing	8.7	Highly competitive — clearest point of advantage in the submission
Q9	Mobilisation Plan and Delivery Milestones	8.0	Well-phased and realistic; milestone structure maps to contractual requirements

06 **AI Voice Assessment**

**Estimated AI Marker Presence: 38% of submission.** Approximately a third of the submission carries language patterns consistent with AI generation — formulaic sentence openings, generic transitional phrases, and evidence claims that are structurally sound but tonally flat. Q2 and Q3 carry the highest AI voice concentration, correlating with the lowest-scoring technical questions. Q6 (Security) and Q8 (Pricing) show the lowest AI marker presence, correlating with the highest question scores. Common markers: "In order to ensure...", "We are committed to...", "Our approach is designed to...". Recommendation: redraft Q2 and Q3 body paragraphs instructing the writer to describe their own practice as a practitioner, not as a writer describing a service.

07 **Targeted Improvement Actions — Priority Order**

IMMEDIATE	<b>Resolve and rewrite the partner tax conduct response in Q7.</b> Agree an internal position today. Write a clear, factual resolution or separation narrative. Do not submit with the current framing.	Q7
BEFORE SUB	<b>Add post-implementation outcome data to all three client references.</b> Gather performance metrics, user adoption figures, and attributed quotes. This directly addresses the track record score (5.5/10) and provides evidence for both win themes requiring development.	Q4
BEFORE SUB	<b>Revise Q2 and Q3 to add differentiation statements and evidence.</b> For every major capability claim, add one sentence positioning it against the generic alternative. Add a data migration case example. Add a named user adoption framework.	Q2 · Q3
BEFORE SUB	<b>Thread win themes explicitly through Q2, Q3, Q4, and Q5.</b> Editorial pass — insert one named win theme reference per relevant question. 30-minute task once Q4 evidence gaps are closed.	Q2–Q5
ENHANCE	<b>Add WCAG 2.1 AA compliance statement to Q2 or Q6.</b> One paragraph — state compliance level, how achieved, and how maintained. Low effort; addresses a likely scored element currently absent.	Q2 · Q6

ENHANCE

**Name and diagram the implementation methodology in Q3.**

Q3

Give it a name. A named methodology signals proprietary thinking; an unnamed process signals generic delivery.

08

**Post-Remediation — Independent Review Recommendation**

**Document Quality Evaluator — Recommended Next Step.** Once mandatory remediation items have been completed and the submission has been redrafted, an independent evaluation using the Document Quality Evaluator (DQE) is recommended before final sign-off. The DQE assesses the submission as a standalone document — without knowledge of the development conversation — and provides a perspective that mirrors an external evaluator's reading experience. This is particularly valuable for this submission, where the internal team will be close to the Q7 governance narrative and may not read it with the same critical distance as the evaluation panel. Access the DQE at [dqe.dynes-insights.com](https://dqe.dynes-insights.com).