

# **GETS Review**

---

**A review conducted for the Ministry of Economic Development  
Government Procurement Development Group**

**December 1 2008**

**Appendix D: System selection: Option/criteria analysis**

**Azimuth<sup>®</sup>**

### D.1 Introduction

---

#### Introduction

This section presents an evaluation for the establishment of an NGG web site.

- identifying options for 'closing the gap' between current GETS and NGG, i.e. potential web-based technology solutions
- identifying criteria used to evaluate these options
- matching criteria to options to derive a short-list of potential solutions.

---

#### Approach

The evaluation of the options for providing the web components of the Next Generation GETS was undertaken with:

- a set of assumptions about the strategic contribution, governance and management of NGG and service's user community (coverage)
- a set of requirements describing the web site's usability and functionality
- a list of evaluation criteria
- a list of options to evaluate

These are set out in the following sections.

---

## D.2 Assumptions

---

### Assumptions

#### Strategic contribution

1. 'Next Generation GETS' (NGG) will be positioned as a **strategic procurement support service**.
2. NGG will be 'future proofed' in order to accommodate growth in usage, changes in the political and legislative landscape and strategic moves to improve government procurement outcomes
3. NGG will provide a web-based tendering service to central and local government buyers and suppliers that:
  - supports potential strategic developments in government procurement
  - supports two-way communication between the public and private sector
  - supports low transactional costs for buyers and suppliers
  - builds capability in both the buyer and supplier communities
  - helps buyers get the best possible result when they're tendering for products and services
  - ensures suppliers get the best possible chance to sell their products and services on a 'level playing field'
  - provides staff in MED and government agencies with information about business and procurement trends.

#### Governance

1. Governance and management structures will be established to set direction for NGG and monitor its progress and performance.

#### Management

1. The re-positioning of GETS as a strategic procurement support service will generate new requirements for content management, functionality and usability; both for procurement and tendering.
  2. There will be a policy of supporting limited, low-risk investment delivering enhanced value from GETS until the requirements for the 'Next Generation GETS' are mature.
  3. An appraisal – a technology audit – of the current GETS will be undertaken to investigate its capability to support (a) enhancements to functionality (b) growth in transactional volumes and (c) increased demand for data extraction and analysis.
-

- 
4. This will inform decisions about the lifecycle of GETS and the timings of (1) any enhancements and components of the web site's service operations and technology infrastructure and (2) replacements or alternatives.
  5. An NGG service management plan will be developed capturing customer service and operational efficiency and effectiveness goals.
  6. A technology plan will be developed covering the ICT technology standards and ICT services management required for any iterative development of the web site.

#### **NGG User Community**

1. The user community will be significantly large than GETS, creating greater transactional volumes and more demand on support services.
  2. A new set of users in state sector agencies will make use of both the procurement functionality and features. Public sector bodies will make more use of tendering functionality.
  3. Other bodies may be included in the user community, such as Not For Profit organisations.
-

### D.3 Summary of requirements for usability and functionality

---

#### Usability requirements

This usability requirements for a web-based tendering service can be summarised as:

- Ease of registering and keeping organisational profile and user details up to date
- 24 x 7 x 52 availability
- Support for the inexperienced user and the infrequent user
- 'User-friendly' design that makes the site easy and pleasant to use for both frequent and occasional users
- Consistent 'look and feel', branding and navigation
- Advanced search facilities
- A 'portal' approach capable of recognising and adapting to specific users.

---

#### Functional requirements

The gaps presented in the report's **2.14 Key Gaps in GETS basic and extended functionality** can be used to represent the gaps in tendering functionality between current GETS and NGG. NGG tendering support requirements can be summarised as:

- A 'one stop shop' ability to view all central and local government tenders and annual procurement plans
  - A workflow process that prompts and guides users to comply with a set tendering lifecycle
  - An online library of templates, guides, etc. that can be used in the preparation of tenders
  - Access to step-by-step process guidance for buyers and sellers
  - Online help facilities
  - An ability to view the outcomes of tenders
  - An ability to post and view 'news' such as advance notification of tenders
  - The capability to facilitate collaboration between buyers
  - The capability to facilitate collaboration between sellers
  - An optional facility that allows the use of one or more electronic tender boxes
  - 'Additional' modules such as electronic evaluation tools and contract administration/management.
-

## D.4 Evaluation Criteria

A set of 13 standard decision support criteria have been used to evaluate attributes of the proposed options. These are described below.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Evidence sought in evaluation</b>
<b>1. Definitional Certainty</b>	The outcomes that will be achieved, or the capabilities which we will develop are well-defined. The scope of the proposed area of activity is clear and unambiguous. Appropriate targets and measures have been established. Deliverables and milestones are sufficiently well-developed and line up with outcomes. The resources required have been comprehensively identified.
<b>2. Sector Strategic Objectives</b>	The proposed initiative takes into account the full range of the strategic objectives identified by the sector. It will contribute significantly to the achievement of many objectives.
<b>3. Clear Mandate from Stakeholders</b>	We can establish a clear mandate from stakeholders to be active in this area. The extent of our commitment is consistent with stakeholder expectations.
<b>4. Lack of Alternatives and Substitutes</b>	In the event that we did not commit ourselves to the achievement of this outcome or the development of this capability, no other NZ organisation would.
<b>5. Capability to Oversee Implementation</b>	We have the organisational structure and capability, governance, knowledge and processes to provide effective leadership and control for this initiative. Our organisations have staff with, and/or access to, appropriate project management, change management and subject matter experts.
<b>6. Willingness and Ability of People Working in the Sector to Accept Change</b>	This initiative fits with our culture and sub-cultures. There will be little resistance to change. There is no residual cynicism from previous failures in this area. There will be little need to 'sell' benefits.
<b>7. Sustainability</b>	The outcome targeted is sustainable without the commitment of further resources. <i>Or</i> - the capabilities which we will develop as a result of this initiative can be maintained within our current capex and opex budgets.
<b>8. Benefits to National and International Reputation</b>	The brand will benefit positively from this initiative. There will be major improvements in the perception of the quality, efficiency and effectiveness of the services delivered, both nationally and internationally. Stakeholder perception of our brand values will be positively influenced by this activity. Compliance with international agreements and NZ government procurement policy will improve.

- 9. Benefits to Stakeholders** As a result of undertaking this activity we will have a much better quantitative and/or qualitative understanding of our stakeholders' expectations and how we can meet them.
- We will implement improved two-way communications with our stakeholders. We will undertake more effective advocacy and research for our stakeholders. Buyers and sellers will be encouraged to use the system through all the steps in the tendering process. We will make a strategic contribution to key stakeholders (in terms of purchasers getting the best solution to their needs and suppliers being given the fairest possible chance to sell their products and services).
- 10. Benefits to Financial Management** This initiative supports stakeholder revenue growth or revenue protection/retention *or* it supports efficient allocation of finite resources *or* it supports reductions in capex or opex, including cost reduction and/or cost avoidance.
- 11. Benefits to Service Delivery Management** We will be able to significantly improve our service delivery performance in core areas. We will spend less time and money on administrative, non-value-adding activities. We will benefit from improved cycle times. We will have fewer disputes and/or errors to manage. We will benchmark favourably with similar organisations. We will comply with best practice guidelines for the management of web-based services
- 12. Stakeholder Impact** Stakeholders will benefit as a result of this initiative. The overall quality of life in NZ will improve. Individuals will experience improved service. Stakeholders will see us as being easier to do business with and the site as easy to use. They will not pay more. There will be a good acceptance of proposed changes to the organisation and delivery of services.
- 13. Risk Management** We have the capability to systematically identify and manage the risk associated with this initiative. We believe that the risk profile - as we currently understand it - is acceptable for both the acquisition and ongoing maintenance of the solution. We can identify suitable review and exit points.

## D.5 Options and analysis

---

### Introduction

The NGG will most probably have procurement and tendering support functionality.

However, at this stage the scope, content, functionality and usability requirements for supporting procurement are not known (and were outside the scope of this review).

Options and evaluation must therefore primarily focus on tender support functionality.

Recognising this limitation, five options have been evaluated for transitioning to the NGG:

1. Do Nothing
  2. Make incremental improvements to the existing GETS System
  3. Develop a New System
  4. Acquire an Off-The-Shelf Solution
  5. Acquire a system operated by another jurisdiction
-

## Option 1: Do nothing

---

**Description**

This is the 'base' option. It assumes that the GETS web site stays 'as is' and responsibility for operation of the service resides with the current team.

---

**1 Definitional Certainty**

Definitional certainty is high: nothing changes.

---

**2 Sector strategic objectives**

This option will not help the sector achieve its objectives.

---

**3 Clear Mandate from Stakeholders**

Stakeholders will be dissatisfied with a 'do nothing' option.

---

**4 Alternatives and Substitutes**

A commercial alternative to GETS already exists in New Zealand. (Many alternatives exist overseas.)

---

**5 Capability to Oversee Implementation**

Not relevant.

---

**6 Willingness and Ability of People Working in the Sector to Accept Change**

Not relevant.

---

---

**7 Sustainability**

The current system can be maintained with existing sources. This may not be the case if use of the service continues to grow but additional cost will be low.

Growth in the number of users could exacerbate issues and increase dissatisfaction with the existing system.

---

**8 Benefits to National and International Reputation**

Retention of the existing service will increasingly work against GETS and the government's reputation within New Zealand and overseas.

---

**9 Benefits to Stakeholders**

This option produces no benefits to stakeholders and would be seen as a very poor response to stakeholder needs. It is likely that more buyers would use alternatives to GETS such as the commercial Tenderlink system.

---

**10 Benefits to Financial Management**

This option has no financial benefits

---

**11 Benefits to Service Delivery Management**

This option offers no benefits.

---

**12 Stakeholder Member Impact**

This option offers no new benefits.

---

**13 Risk Management**

This option carries no implementation risk.

---

## Option 2: Incremental improvement to the existing service

---

### Description

This option is based on retention of the GETS web site with low-level, incremental development of, for example, look and feel and user assistance features. Other improvements could be made over time to meet most of the user requirements. New features would be released as a series of time boxes (at, say, three or six monthly intervals). The functional requirements identified during the GETS Review (and listed in Appendix A) and the Service Architecture put forward in this document could act as a base for incremental development.

Some improvements could be made to the service through the introduction of a new governance structure, user consultation groups and so on.

---

### 1 Definitional Certainty

Definitional certainty would be high as requirements for each time box could be well defined.

---

### 2 Sector strategic objectives

This option could meet sector objectives for electronic tendering over time. However, it might be at risk from the demands of a future 'over-arching government procurement-related strategy' as the solution would be based on the existing software base, which may not be compatible with more modern solutions.

---

### 3 Clear Mandate from Stakeholders

A clear mandate from buyers and sellers for this option could be developed through a governance or reference group. It is possible that stakeholders such as MED and agencies such as Treasury and SSC would not approve as the software development could lock GETS into what may be an obsolete platform.

---

### 4 Alternatives and Substitutes

A commercial alternative to GETS already exists in New Zealand. (Many alternatives exist overseas.) It is possible that the development option would produce a better solution than any offered by local competitors in terms of:

- eventual integration with an 'over-arching government procurement-related strategy'
  - delivery of strategic information to central crown agencies.
- 

### 5 Capability to Oversee Implementation

MED has the capability to implement this option, (in conjunction with its technology partners).

---

### 6 Willingness and Ability of People Working in the Sector to

This option could attract some cynicism from stakeholders, especially buyers and sellers, who might not readily accept that it would represent a development from the current, functionally poor system.

This solution would need to offer buyers compelling reasons (such as lower cost or better functionality) to attract those who

---

---

**Accept Change**

currently use other solutions such as Tenderlink.

---

**7 Sustainability**

This option would require the establishment of a new governance and management structure. Greater levels of user self-service could avoid any need to increase staffing. System maintenance costs would increase, but not greatly.

---

**8 Benefits to National and International Reputation**

This option would produce some gradual improvements to GETS' (and the government's) reputation in New Zealand and overseas. Much would depend on whether the enhanced service would bring about improvements in compliance with mandatory procurement rules.

---

**9 Benefits to Stakeholders**

This option will bring a moderate level of benefits to stakeholders from improved functionality and process efficiency over two to three years.

---

**10 Benefits to Financial Management**

This option could produce financial benefits for the new Zealand government and taxpayers, in time, by improving the quality of tendering outcomes for public service agencies.

---

**11 Benefits to Service Delivery Management**

There would be an incremental improvement in service delivery. As noted above, it would be a challenge to 'close the gap' in functionality (in reality or perception) between GETS and commercial competitors like Tenderlink. This option would, over time, benefit MED in terms of improved information about stakeholder behaviour and trends (improved 'customer satisfaction').

---

**12 Stakeholder Member Impact**

Stakeholders will benefit in time from this option but may be less likely (in comparison to other options) to view it positively. It is assumed that they will not, however, need to pay for the service (based on the precedent set by the current service).

---

**13 Risk Management**

Customised development is usually a higher risk option than acquiring an off-the-shelf solution. Compared to a solution that is already widely used, customised development brings with it an increased potential for 'runaway projects' – with time and cost 'actuals' exceeding 'budget' – and failure of developed components

Development risk can be mitigated by sound governance (monitoring cost and risk) and using a time box approach to development and implementation: if something does go wrong, it will be relatively easy to contain the problem or 'back out' a solution. This option carries a moderately low risk of stakeholder resistance.

---

## Option 3: Develop a new GETS system

---

### Description

This option is based on:

- the development of a full user requirements specification based on the high-level functional requirements included at appendix A of this report and the Service Architecture
- the development of a set of web site requirements based on stakeholder profiles and usage requirements
- an incremental development programme, based on a series of time box (say, three month) projects spread over a number of years.

It is assumed that development would be overseen by MED's System Development and Support team and would probably be outsourced to a third party.

---

### 1 Definitional Certainty

Definitional certainty – though it might take time to mature - would be high as requirements for each time box could be well defined.

---

### 2 Sector strategic objectives

This option could meet sector objectives for electronic tendering over time.

This option is attractive in terms of the 'over-arching government procurement-related strategy'. Pursuing development against an 'open' architecture would reduce the risk that the solution would not meet the future demands of the strategy.

---

### 3 Clear Mandate from Stakeholders

A clear mandate from all buyers and sellers for this option could be developed through an appropriate governance structure. Incremental implementation could be seen as an advantage by stakeholders as the change would be easier to adapt to than a 'big bang' implementation.

---

### 4 Alternatives and Substitutes

A commercial alternative to GETS already exists in New Zealand. (Many alternatives exist overseas.) It is possible that the development option would produce a better solution than any offered by local competitors in terms of:

- eventual integration with an 'over-arching government procurement-related strategy'
  - delivery of strategic information to central crown agencies.
- 

### 5 Capability to Oversee Implementation

MED has the capability to implement this option in conjunction with its technology partners.

---

---

**6 Willingness and Ability of People Working in the Sector to Accept Change**

With the right type of marketing/promotion, this option could be acceptable to all stakeholders.

It is possible that this solution would eventually convert buyers who currently use other solutions such as Tenderlink but this is by no means certain.

---

**7 Sustainability**

This option would require the establishment of a new governance and management structure. Day-to-day staffing could stay much the same as at present, thanks to an increase in user self-service. System maintenance costs would increase.

---

**8 Benefits to National and International Reputation**

This option would produce gradual, but significant, improvements to GETS' (and the government's) reputation in New Zealand and overseas. The enhanced service should be designed to bring about improvements in compliance with mandatory procurement rules.

---

**9 Benefits to Stakeholders**

This option will bring an increasing level of benefits to stakeholders over two to three years in terms of improving outcomes and reducing compliance costs.

---

**10 Benefits to Financial Management**

This option could produce financial benefits, over time, by improving the quality of tendering outcomes for public service agencies.

---

**11 Benefits to Service Delivery Management**

There would be an incremental improvement in service delivery. With careful planning, this could 'close the gap' in functionality (in reality and perception) between GETS and commercial competitors like Tenderlink.

This option would, over time, benefit MED in terms of improved information about stakeholder behaviour and trends (improved 'customer satisfaction').

---

**12 Stakeholder Member Impact**

Stakeholders will increasingly benefit from this option and it is assumed that they would not need to pay for the service (based on the precedent set by the current service).

---

**13 Risk Management**

As with the previous option, this may be a higher risk approach than acquiring an off-the-shelf solution, bringing with it an increased potential (compared to off-the-shelf solutions) for 'runaway projects' and failure of developed components.

Development risk can be mitigated through sound governance and by using a time box approach to development and implementation. The option carries a moderately low risk of stakeholder resistance.

---

## Option 4: Acquire and operate an off-the-shelf solution

---

### Description

The locally-developed system Tenderlink could be acquired and used to replace GETS. Alternatively, a number of other jurisdictions run electronic tendering services based on 'off the shelf' software products. The advanced Wales, Scotland, Northern Ireland and Canada services, for example, use software provided by BravoSolution. The BravoSolution product is more sophisticated and functionally richer than Tenderlink. This kind of software can be operated in two ways:

- as an in-house solution: this would involve purchasing or licencing a software package and managing and operating it within MED. (In practice, it can be assumed that 'within MED' involves system operation by the Ministry's outsourcing partner, Fujitsu.)
  - licencing a software package that is operated by the package owner, an approach known as 'Software as a Service' (SaaS). Most of the BravoSolution clients use this approach.
- 

### 1 Definitional Certainty

The definitional certainty associated with this option is high from a systems viewpoint but medium in terms of the overall service and the strategic contribution to other crown agencies and the government. The potential solutions are all working in practice somewhere in the world. In the case of the BravoSolution option, existing users are prepared to assist with advice and guidance.

---

### 2 Sector strategic objectives

This option would meet the objectives of buyers and sellers.

There is a possibility that it would not meet the future demands of an 'over-arching government procurement-related strategy'.

---

### 3 Clear Mandate from Stakeholders

A clear mandate for this option could be developed.

---

### 4 Alternatives and Substitutes

Not applicable.

---

### 5 Capability to Oversee Implementation

In technical terms, MED has the capability to implement this option, (in conjunction with its technology partners), although implementation of an overseas system - such as BravoSolution - as an in house solution would be a larger and more complex task than any of the alternatives, as this is a more sophisticated and complex system. Implementing a SaaS solution would probably be easier in technical terms but more difficult if problems arose and it was necessary to seek help from a supplier in a different country (or hemisphere).

This option involves a 'big bang' approach to implementation which would be a larger and more difficult task than the incremental approach of the previous two options.

The change management challenge would be significant, especially as we do not fully understand the sector's readiness for

---

---

such a significant change.

---

**6 Willingness and Ability of People Working in the Sector to Accept Change**

This 'big bang' approach would put more pressure on stakeholders (that is, buyers and sellers) than the incremental approach of the previous two options. This approach, then, would require more careful planning and a larger implementation effort, including user training.

There may be resistance at government level to the concept of 'handing over' a core function to a third party.

---

**7 Sustainability**

The additional costs of operating the off-the-shelf solution would need to be budgeted. Although firm costs are not yet known, initial estimates imply that an additional cost of (at least) \$1 million per annum would need to be absorbed. This cost would almost certainly be considerably higher than the cost of maintaining a 'home grown' system. Some or all of the increased costs could be passed on to stakeholders.

---

**8 Benefits to National and International Reputation**

As a rule, adopting a best-of-breed package would produce improvements to the reputation of both the GETS service and the government.

However, some 'internal' stakeholders (in key crown agencies) may have concerns over whether they can gain access to strategic information as readily as if NGG was processed 'in house'.

---

**9 Benefits to Stakeholders**

This option would produce considerable benefits (major, in the case of a solution like that offered by BravoSolution) to stakeholders. Benefits would be reduced operational costs and improved outcomes.

---

**10 Benefits to Financial Management**

This option would cost more than precious options. There would be no direct financial benefits to MED (although there would be financial benefits to the government accruing from the 'benefits to stakeholders'.)

---

**11 Benefits to Service Delivery Management**

This option would benefit MED in terms of improved information about stakeholder behaviour and trends (improved 'customer satisfaction').

---

**12 Stakeholder Member Impact**

This option will produce major benefits to stakeholders through improved 'help' functions, reduced costs and better outcomes. Stakeholder direct costs would obviously increase if the operating costs of this option were passed on by way of user charges.

---

**13 Risk Management**

This option carries a lower 'development' risk than the previous two options, as the solution would involve software that is already running elsewhere. On the other hand, the option involves a 'big bang' approach, which means that there is a greater risk of something going wrong during implementation (compared to an incremental approach). If something does go wrong, it will have wider consequences and be harder to fix.

---

## Option 5: Acquire a system operated by another jurisdiction

---

### Description

This option involves GETS system requirements being met through another country or state's software.

There is an overlap between this option and option 4. If GETS NZ were to use, say, Wales or Scotland's system it would, effectively, be 'buying in' to a BravoSolution system. Consequently these solutions are not considered as part of this option.

Also as with option 4, it is possible that this option could be achieved through use of an 'in house' system or one operated externally. The in-house solution involves purchasing or licencing a system developed by another jurisdiction and managing and operating it within MED (and, as appropriate, Fujitsu.)

The most likely solution in this category would be 'AusTender', which was originally developed by the New South Wales state government and is now also used by the Australian federal government. Early discussions with representatives of both governments indicate that they would be willing to negotiate an arrangement that would see New Zealand using their solution. (This would probably mean that they would process the solution on behalf of the New Zealand government.)

*For the purposes of this evaluation, AusTender is assumed to be the default solution.*

---

### 1 Definitional Certainty

Definitional certainties with this option would be high as the system is already in operation and existing users could be visited and engaged in the evaluation process.

---

### 2 Sector strategic objectives

This option would meet the objectives of buyers and sellers.

There is a distinct possibility that it would not meet the future demands of an 'over-arching government procurement-related strategy'. The solution would need to be acquired on the basis that its life (as a solution to the needs of the New Zealand government) might be limited to, say, two or three years.

---

### 3 Clear Mandate from Stakeholders

A clear mandate for this option could be developed. AusTender is functionally inferior to, say, the BravoSolution system but would meet basic requirements. (### This assumption still need to be tested!!!! ###)

---

### 4 Alternatives and Substitutes

The previous three options are reasonable alternatives to this solution.

---

### 5 Capability to Oversee Implementation

MED has the capability to implement this option, with assistance from the Australian owners of the existing service. However, this is still a 'big bang' approach and the magnitude of the change would be easy to underestimate.

---

---

**6 Willingness and Ability of People Working in the Sector to Accept Change**

As with the previous option, implementation would be a 'big bang' and would need to be part of an overall implementation that included change management and user training. There may be some minor resistance from users.

There may be some minor resistance to using a solution operated by an Australian agency.

---

**7 Sustainability**

The costs of having an Australian agency run a solution on behalf of New Zealand have not been explored but are expected to be lower than those associated with option 4.

Once implemented, the New Zealand service could probably be maintained with existing staffing levels.

---

**8 Benefits to National and International Reputation**

This option would improve the reputation of both the GETS service and the government.

---

**9 Benefits to Stakeholders**

This option would bring considerable benefits to stakeholders in terms of reduced (direct and indirect) transactional costs and improved outcomes.

---

**10 Benefits to Financial Management**

The cost of this option would be less than option 4 and possibly less than options 2 and 3.

There would be no other direct financial benefits to MED (although there would be financial benefits to the government accruing from the 'benefits to stakeholders'.)

---

**11 Benefits to Service Delivery Management**

This option could benefit MED in terms of improved information about stakeholder behaviour and trends (improved 'customer satisfaction').

---

**12 Stakeholder Member Impact**

This option would produce a reasonable level of benefits to stakeholders through improved functionality.

Stakeholder direct costs might increase if the operating costs of this option were passed on by way of user charges.

---

**13 Risk Management**

This option carries a lower 'development' risk than options 2 and 3, as the solution would involve software that is already running elsewhere. On the other hand, the option involves a 'big bang' approach, which means that there is a greater risk of something going wrong during implementation (compared to an incremental approach). If something does go wrong, it will have wider consequences and be harder to fix.

---

## D.6 Confirming preferred options

---

### Introduction

A planning session involving senior staff of GPDG and this report's writers reviewed the evaluation of the five options for transitioning to the NGG.

It was agreed that selection of the ideal option would be difficult in view of uncertainties over the strategic direction of public service procurement and the new government's attitude towards investment and return in this area.

Consequently, it was deemed advisable to select two options:

1. a 'best case' option representing an "ideal way forward", assuming that the government is prepared to commit to an investment of some millions of dollars to yield short-term results and counter high investment, development, implementation and change management risk.
  2. a lower-cost option that represents the best way forward if financial and/or strategic considerations make the 'best case' option untenable.
- 

### Eliminated options

It was agreed that the following options were unacceptable:

- Option 1 - 'do nothing' - which would do nothing to close the gaps in functionality between current GETS and the functionality required for NGG.
  - Option 5 – 'overseas jurisdiction system' – on the grounds that none of the systems surveyed had a good match to NGG functional requirements, and that response from the operators of AusTender was less than enthusiastic.
- 

### Recommendations

It was decided that preferred options for the system component of NGG would be:

1. The development of a local system through enhancement of the existing GETS site (Option 2) upon completion of a technical audit of GETS to confirm the web site's capability to support (a) enhancements to functionality (b) growth in transactional volumes, and (c) increased demand for data extraction and analysis.
  2. The development of a new system (Option 3) if the technical audit finds that GETS cannot be enhanced without significant revision of its technology architecture and delivery components.
  3. Option 4 (acquisition of an off-the-shelf solution) - the 'best case' option This should be pursued only if:
    - a. Options 2 and 3 are not feasible or cannot deliver benefits of the scale required in the time required
    - b. there is a good fit with tactical initiatives associated with emerging government procurement strategy
    - c. there is evidence that there would be political commitment to this option despite the high implementation risk and high cost risk.
-