

**TENDER EVALUATION BOARD REPORT**

**AZ[NUMBER], PROJECT [NUMBER]
[PROJECT TITLE], [LOCATION, STATE]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Sponsor** | **[Insert Here]** |
| **Project Value** | **$[X.YYm]** |
| **Pre-Tender Estimate****[OR] PDDP Estimate** | **$[X.YYm]** |
| **Preferred Tenderer Price** | **$[X.YYm]** |
| **Recommendations** | 1. The Tender Evaluation Board recommends that:
	1. [COMPANY NAME] be [*accorded Preferred Tenderer Status for the purpose of negotiations* OR *be awarded the Contract for the lump sum {or indicative} amount of* ] for [TENDER NUMBER AND TITLE] for Project [NUMBER AND TITLE].
	2. [COMPANY NAME] be accorded Second-Preferred Tenderer Status, and be approached for negotiations if negotiations with [PREFERRED TENDERER] fail.
	3. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE AND/OR REPEAT FOR THIRD-PREFERRED TENDER, IF NEEDED]
	4. The offers from [COMPANY NAMES] be declined.
 |
| **Director Clearance** I have reviewed this Tender Evaluation Board Report and recommend that it proceed for Executive Review and Approval. | **Name** | [eg COL AB Bloggs] | **Position** | [eg DN] |
| **Sign** |  | **Date** | [DD MMM YY] |
| **EXECUTIVE REVIEW AND APPROVAL** |
| **Endorsement**I have reviewed and endorse/do not endorse this Tender Evaluation Board Report. | **Name** |  | **Position** |  |
| **Sign** |  | **Date** | [DD MMM YY] |
| **Approval**I approve/do not approve the recommendations made by the Tender Evaluation Board. | **Name** |  | **Position** |  |
| **Sign** |  | **Date** | [DD MMM YY] |
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## Executive Summary

1. This summary should comprise of one to two pages outlining the tender evaluation process and outcomes.

## Detailed Report

References**:**

1. Project Development and Delivery Plan (PDDP) approved [DD Mmm YY] ([OBJ Reference])
2. [CFI/Project] Evaluation Protocols approved [DD Mmm YY] ([OBJ Reference])
3. AZ[NUMBER] Registration Evaluation Board Report [DD Mmm YY] ([OBJ Reference]) [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
4. AZ[NUMBER] Request for Tender [DD Mmm YY] ([OBJ Reference])

### Project Aim and Description

*[IF THE PDDP IS INCLUDED AS AN ENCLOSURE TO THE TEBR, INSERT AS FOLLOWS:]*

1. The Delegate is referred to Reference A included as Enclosure 1 for information regarding the Project Aim and Description.

*[OR - IF PDDP IS NOT ENCLOSED:]*

1. Reference A is the approved PDDP which identifies the aims of the project as:
	1. [AIMS].
2. [FROM APPROVED/AMENDED PDDP, BRIEFLY IDENTIFY THE AIMS OF THE PROJECT.]
3. [DESCRIBE ANY BACKGROUND ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THIS PROPOSAL INCLUDING PRIORITY OR TIMING REQUIREMENTS.]
4. [IDENTIFY ANY OTHER FACTORS, WHICH MAY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THIS PROPOSAL SUCH AS THE AGE OF THE FACILITY OR CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS.]

### Scope of Work

 *[IF THE PDDP IS INCLUDED AS AN ENCLOSURE TO THE TEBR, INSERT AS FOLLOWS:]*

1. The Delegate is referred to Reference A included as Enclosure 1 for information regarding the Scope of the Work.

*[OR - IF PDDP IS NOT ATTACHED:]*

1. Reference A identifies the scope of the project as:
	1. [SCOPE ITEMS].

### Source Selection

1. In accordance with Reference A, the [Project Manager/Contract Administrator/Head Contractor/Managing Contractor/DSC/other] is to be engaged through a [NOMINATE SELECTION PROCESS].

*[IF TWO STAGE]*

1. Reference B details the methodology for conducting the selection process and Reference C documents the first stage of the selection process. This Board Report documents the second stage of the selection process.

*[IF SINGLE STAGE]*

1. Reference B details the methodology for conducting the selection process. This Board Report documents the selection process.

### Invitation to Register

*[REPLACE PARAGRAPH WITH NOT APPLICABLE IF SINGLE STAGE PROCUREMENT PROCESS WAS USED]*

1. The Invitation to Register Interest (ITR) was advertised on AusTender on [DD Mmm YY] with a closing date and time of [XXXXh (AEDT/ AEST), Ddd Mmm YY]. In addition, the Invitation to Register Interest was advertised in the following media:
	1. [INSERT RELEVANT MEDIA/ NATIONAL PRINT/REGIONAL PAPERS AND THE DATE OF ADVERTISEMENT OR DELETE PARAGRAPH IF NOT USED].
2. [NUMBER] of companies requested the tender documentation before the closing date.
3. The companies shortlisted in Reference C and invited to tender for these works were:
	1. [Company Name]
	2. [Etc].

### Request for Tender [if a two stage process was used] – delete if not applicable

1. Reference D, was issued to the shortlisted companies identified in Reference C on [DD Mmm YY].

[OR]

### Request for Tender [if a single stage process was used] – delete if not applicable

1. Reference D was advertised on AusTender on [DD Mmm YY] with a closing date and time of [XXXXh (AEDT/AEST), Ddd Mmm YY]. The RFT was also advertised in the following media:
	1. [INSERT RELEVANT NEWSPAPER(S) AND THE DATE OF ADVERTISEMENT/OR DELETE PARAGRAPH/OR DELETE].
2. [INSERT NUMBER] of companies requested the tender documentation before the closing date.

*[NOTE: IF PROCURING FROM A PANEL FOR THE PM/CA, ENVIRONMENTAL/HERITAGE CONSULTANT ETC. AS A SINGLE STAGE PROCUREMENT, ADD TO OR AMEND THE ABOVE SECTIONS TO REFLECT THE RFP ENGAGEMENT PROCESS, AS APPLICABLE]*

### Tender Briefings/Site Inspections

1. No tender briefings or site inspections were conducted [STATE WHY - OR]. The Project Manager / Contract Administrator (PM/CA) conducted a [tender briefing/site inspection] on [DD Mmm YY]. The following companies attended the [tender briefing/site inspection]:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES].

### Addenda and Information Documents

1. [NUMBER] [INSERT EITHER “No” Or The Number] [Information Documents / Addenda] were issued during the tender period and [is/are] attached to this Report at Annex A.
2. The Probity Adviser [cleared/did not clear] all Information Documents and Addenda. [DELETE IF NONE ISSUED]

### Tender Receipt and Opening

1. Tenders were received and opened in accordance with the Tender Evaluation and Probity Protocol. A copy of the Tender Closing Register is at Annex B.
2. [NUMBER] late tenders were received. [INSERT EITHER “No” OR THE NUMBER OF LATE TENDERS. PROVIDE DETAIL OF THE MANAGEMENT OF ANY LATE TENDERS]
3. Tenders were received from [NUMBER] companies, these being:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES].

### Tender Conformance

1. In accordance with Reference C, prior to distributing tenders to the Board, the Chair conducted a conformance check to ensure that each submission complied with the conformance requirements set out in the RFT (except for departure or qualification to the Contract in Part 5) before admitting the tenders to evaluation. The Chair checked that each submission:
	1. submitted by the closing time and date
	2. met all minimum form and content requirements (except for departure or qualification to the Contract in Part 5)
	3. met all conditions for participation.
2. Only those submissions that satisfied the conformance requirements were admitted to evaluation, unless the failure to satisfy a requirement fell within the allowable discretion provided in the Commonwealth Procurement Rules.
3. Where the Board Chair found that there was doubt over conformance of any tender, it was noted to all members of the Board and referred to [the Probity Advisor or DPA], [AMEND AS APPROPRIATE] in accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan. In consultation with the [Probity Advisor or DPA], [AMEND AS APPROPRIATE] the Chair determined the conformance of the subject tender(s) and this was recorded for tabling at the Board meeting. [INSERT DETAILS REGARDING ANY SUSPECTED NON-CONFORMANCES, AND ANY ADVICE RECEIVED]
4. In accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan, all conforming tenders were distributed by the Chair to the remaining Board members for the commencement of individual detailed evaluation. Accordingly, the tenders from the following companies were admitted to Detailed Evaluation Stage:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES].

### Assessment of Tenders

1. The Board members are detailed in Table 1 and are in accordance with Reference C.

*[NOTE: If the Board composition changed between approval of the Evaluation Plan and the Board meeting, note here that Delegate approval was sought and obtained for this amendment to the Board’s composition and identify Reference (e.g. B-1).]*

Table : Board Members

| **Description** | **Organisation/Position** | **Name** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Chairperson |  |  |
| Member |  |  |
| Independent Member |  |  |
| PM/CA Representative |  |  |

1. The Probity Advisor, Observers and Scribes are detailed in Table 2. [STATE IF NO PROBITY ADVISOR WAS USED, REMOVE OBSERVERS IF NONE PRESENT]

Table : Probity Advisors, Observers and Scribes

| **Description** | **Organisation/Position** | **Name** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Probity Advisor |  |  |
| Observer |  |  |
| Scribe |  |  |

1. Specialist advice was sought from [INSERT NAME AND TITLE] on [INSERT] aspects of the tenders. [E.g. Staff from Program Support with regard to advice and interpretation of Financial Statements during the evaluation of tenders.] [DELETE PARAGRAPH IF NO SPECIALIST ADVICE SOUGHT]
2. After conducting individual evaluations, the Board convened on [DD Mmm YY] to discuss and evaluate the tenders in accordance with the Reference C.

### Convening the Board

1. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the Evaluation Principles of Reference C.
2. Prior to conducting the Tender Evaluation, the [Probity Adviser OR Chairperson – INSERT CORRECT ONE] provided a Probity Briefing and distributed the agreed Probity Protocols. [DELETE IF PROBITY ADVISER WAS NOT REQUIRED FOR THIS EVALUATION]
3. Prior to discussing the tenders received at the Tender Evaluation Board meeting, the Chair confirmed that all members had no conflict of interest in relation to the tenders and that they had been provided sufficient time to complete their individual assessments. [NOTE: If a conflict was disclosed, identify the conflict here, along with any advice provided by the Probity Adviser/DPA, and any management strategy that was implemented]
4. The individual non-weighted scores and non-financial ranking are summarised in Table 3 through Table 6.

Table : Individual Scores of Chairperson

| **[NAME OF CHAIRPERSON]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

Table : Individual Scores of Member

| **[NAME OF MEMBER]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

Table : Individual Scores of Independent Member

| **[NAME OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

Table : Individual Scores of PM/CA Representative

| **[NAME OF PM/CA REPRESENTATIVE]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** | **[Insert Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

### Detailed Evaluation

1. The Board commenced the detailed assessment of tenders with a discussion of each submission by each evaluation criterion. Each submission was discussed in its entirety against all evaluation criteria prior to moving on to subsequent tenders. This process was repeated for each tender.
2. All Board members, by reference to prior written comments, discussed the strengths and risks inherent in the tender submissions against each evaluation criterion. Having regard to the individual scores and the detailed discussion, the Board reached consensus on a Preliminary Board Agreed Score for each tender. [Where there was a dissenting score, that dissenting score is to be recorded here and the wording above is to be amended to indicate that a dissenting score was recorded]

### Referee’s Reports

1. [SUMMARISE THE REFEREE REPORTS SOUGHT AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS.] The referee reports can be found at Annex D.
2. [DETAIL IF ANY REFEREE COMMENTS IMPACTED ON THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF VFM.]

*[NOTE: Ensure that Probity/DPA advice has been sought with regard to such impacts.]*

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not consider it necessary to obtain referee reports to confirm information contained in submissions.

### Clarifications

1. [SUMMARISE ANY CLARIFICATIONS SOUGHT FROM TENDERERS AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS.] The clarifications and associated responses can be found at Annex E.
2. [DETAIL HOW THE CLARIFICATIONS IMPACTED ON THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF VFM.]

*[NOTE: Ensure that Probity/DPA advice has been sought with regard to such impacts.]*

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not identify any matters that required clarification during the evaluation process.

### Key Personnel Interviews

1. [SUMMARISE IF ANY KEY PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS.] The outcome can be found at Annex F.
2. [DETAIL HOW THE INTERVIEWS IMPACTED ON THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT]

*[NOTE: Ensure that Probity/DPA advice has been sought with regard to such impacts.]*

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not identify any matters that required key personnel interviews during the evaluation process.

### Summary of Detailed Evaluation

1. [SUMMARISE BOARD DISCUSSIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS, THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF EACH TENDER AND THE OUTCOMES OF THE DETAILED EVALUATION STAGE.]
2. Table 7below details the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores by evaluation criterion. Detailed narratives of the strengths, weaknesses and risks by evaluation criterion, and by reference to the Ten-Point Evaluation and Risk Scoring Guide of Reference C, are provided at Annex C. Annex C also includes detail of the Board’s consideration of relevant information regarding the clarifications, points for negotiation and referee reports for each tender. [REMOVE IF NO CLARIFICATIONS/REFEREE REPORTS WERE SOUGHT, AND/OR IF THERE ARE NO POINTS FOR NEGOTIATION]

Table : Preliminary Board Agreed Scores

| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

###

### Comparative Assessment

1. In accordance with Reference C, the Board conducted a comparative assessment to determine a Board Agreed Ranking, after finalising the Board Agreed Scores. Submissions were compared to reduce the likelihood of any imbalance between relative scores.
2. [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS AND OUTCOMES OF THE COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT STAGE. NOTE: It is at this stage that the comments should begin to argue the differentiation on technical merit between tenders, the probability of success and the risks to Defence for each submission.]
3. Table 8 shows the Board Agreed Scores against the Evaluation Criteria while Table 9 shows the Board Agreed Overall Score for each tender and the resulting Board Agreed Rankings.

Table : Board Agreed Scores Against Evaluation Criteria

| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

Table : Board Agreed Overall Scores and Ranking

| **Company** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** | **[Insert Criterion & Weighting]** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | X |

 *[NOTE: Report all reasons behind the changes from the Preliminary Score to the Final Score for each Tenderer by evaluation criteria.]*

### Tender Exclusion

1. In accordance with the Tender Evaluation Plan, the Board determined it was clear at the conclusion of the comparative assessment that on technical merit [INSERT TENDER] was clearly uncompetitive and was excluded from further consideration. In the case of this tender, the technical merit weighted score of [INSERT], demonstrated a fundamental lack of understanding of project requirements and had a limited likelihood of success, and accordingly the Board agreed to exclude it from further consideration.

*[NOTE: Exclusion of tenders from evaluation should only be used where the Detailed Assessment Rating is “Marginal” or less. Justification must be included to support the Board’s decision.]*

*[OR – ALTERNATIVE WORDING]*

1. All tenders were found to be competitive and no submissions were excluded from consideration at this stage.

### Value for Money Assessment

1. Having finalised the Board Agreed Overall Scores and Ranking on technical merit, in accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Board conducted a value for money (VFM) assessment. The VFM assessment entailed evaluating the relative price offered by each Tenderer in relation to the technical merit.
2. **Financial Model.** [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]
3. **Commercial Position.** [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]
4. **Local Industry Capability**. [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]
5. **Indigenous Procurement Policy.** [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]
6. **CPR Compliance.** [If applicable and to the extent permitted by Australia’s obligations under international agreements and procurement policies (e.g. no discrimination on certain grounds), value for money also relates to the economic benefit of the procurement to the Australian economy.]
7. [INSERT OTHERS AS APPLICABLE.]

### Summary of VFM Assessments

1. [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS AND OUTCOMES OF THE VALUE FOR MONEY ASSESSMENT STAGE.]

*[NOTE: It is at this stage that the comments should begin to argue the differentiation on the price offered and the technical merit of the tenders. Note the objective of this stage is to determine the best value for money solution for the Commonwealth and to reach a preferred Tenderer list and source selection recommendation.]*

Table : Tendered Price and VFM Ranking

| **Company** | **Tendered Price** | **VFM Ranking** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X |
| [Company Name] | X | X |

### Consideration of Alternative Proposals

1. In accordance with Reference C, Tenderers must submit a conforming tender for an alternate proposal to be considered.
2. [INSERT DETAIL OF ASSESSMENT OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE METHODOLOGY SET OUT IN THE APPROVED EVALUATION PLAN]

*[NOTE: Assess the Alternative Proposal on its technical merit and then compare against all conforming bids to determine if it provides greater value for money.]*

### Compliance Assessment

1. **Information Security.** [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS AND INDICATE YES/NO OUTCOME – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]

### Tender Evaluation Board Outcome

1. After considering the Alternative Proposals, the Board has determined that the best VFM solution for [INSERT PROJECT] is [INSERT COMPANY].

*[NOTE: Provide supporting argument behind recommendation.]*

### Funds Availability

1. The Board considered the recommended tenderers price against the budget to confirm funding sufficiency.
2. The financial estimates are listed in Table 11.

Table : Financial Estimates

| **Item** | **Value** |
| --- | --- |
| Budget | $[X.YYm] |
| PDDP Allocation | $[X.YYm] |
| Pre-Tender Estimate (if applicable) | $[X.YYm] |
| Tendered Price (prior to negotiation) | $[X.YYm] |

1. [ADVISE IF ADDITIONAL FUNDING IS REQUIRED.]

### Negotiation

1. [ADVISE IF NEGOTIATIONS ARE REQUIRED – NOTE: Key negotiation points should be flagged in the individual assessments of each tender.] The negotiation plan can be found at Enclosure 2.

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not identify any matters for negotiation.

### Financial Reports

1. [SUMMARISE ANY FINANCIAL REPORTS SOUGHT IN RELATION TO ANY TENDERERS.] The Financial Report can be found at Enclosure 3.
2. [DETAIL HOW THE FINANCIAL REPORTS IMPACTED ON THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF VFM].

*[NOTE: Ensure that Probity/DPA advice has been sought with regard to such impacts.]*

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not identify any financial risks.

### Probity Advice

1. [DESCRIBE HOW PROCESS WAS MANAGED IF NO PROBITY ADVISER, INCLUDE ALL PROBITY ISSUES AND ADVICE SOUGHT.]
2. The Probity Communication Log is attached at Annex G. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

*[OR]*

1. The Probity Adviser’s Report is attached at Enclosure 4. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

### Recommendation

1. The Board confirms that the evaluation of tenders was conducted in accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan.
2. The Tender Evaluation Board recommends that:
	1. [COMPANY NAME] be [*accorded Preferred Tenderer Status for the purpose of negotiations* OR *be awarded the Contract for the lump sum/indicative price*] for [TENDER NUMBER AND TITLE] for Project [NUMBER AND TITLE].
	2. [COMPANY NAME] be accorded Second-Preferred Tenderer Status, and be approached for negotiations if negotiations with [PREFERRED TENDERER] fail.
	3. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE AND/OR REPEAT FOR THIRD-PREFERRED TENDER, IF NEEDED]
	4. The offers from [COMPANY NAMES] be declined.

*[NOTE: Ensure that this recommendation matches the recommendation on the front of the report.]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg MRS]Appointment [eg Chairperson]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 18] | **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg FLTLT]Appointment [eg Member]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 18] |
|  |  |
| **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg MRS]Appointment [eg Independent Member]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 18] | **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg MRS]Appointment [eg PM/CA Representative]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 18] |

Annexes:

1. Information Documents and Addenda
2. Tender Closing Register
3. Detailed Board Comments
4. Referee Reports [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
5. Clarifications [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
6. Key Personnel Interviews [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
7. Probity Communications Log [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

Enclosures:

1. [PROJECT NUMBER] PDDP
2. AZ[NUMBER] Negotiation Plan
3. AZ[NUMBER] Financial Report
4. AZ[NUMBER] Probity Adviser’s Report