

**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.
	5. The Delegate note how conflicts of interests declared by [INSERT NAME/S] were managed.
 |
| **EXECUTIVE REVIEW AND APPROVAL (ERA)**The below endorsement and approval must align with the ERA thresholds as defined within the Business Rule. |
| **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] |
| NoteFor Projects valued below $250m DGCFI is to NOTE the outcome  | **Sign** |  | **Date** | [DD MMM YY] |
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## Executive Summary

1. *[This summary must be high level and should comprise of one to two pages outlining the tender evaluation process and recommended outcomes]*

## Detailed Report

References**:**

1. Project Development and Delivery Plan Part 2 (PDDP) approved [DD Mmm YY] ([OBJ Reference])
2. CFI Tender Evaluation and Probity Protocol (April 2025) available from ERIK
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])
5. [NAME OF PROJECT] Probity Plan approved [DD Mmm YY] ([OBJ Reference]) *[DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE, I.E. WHEN ONLY REFERENCE B APPLIES]*

### Project Aim and Description

*[IF THE PDDP IS INCLUDED AS AN ENCLOSURE, 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. [FROM APPROVED/AMENDED PDDP, BRIEFLY IDENTIFY THE AIMS OF THE PROJECT.]
2. [DESCRIBE ANY BACKGROUND ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THIS TENDER PROCESS INCLUDING PRIORITY OR TIMING REQUIREMENTS, AGE OF THE FACILITY OR CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS.]

### Scope of Works

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

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

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

1. Reference A identifies the scope of the works as:
	1. [INSERT SCOPE ITEMS TO BE DELIVERED BY SUCCESSFUL TENDERER].

### 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 TYPE OF TENDER PROCESS].

*[IF TWO STAGE]*

1. Reference B details the methodology for conducting the tender evaluation process and Reference C documents the earlier first stage Invitation to Register Interest process. This Board Report documents the second stage of the tender process.

*[IF SINGLE STAGE]*

1. Reference B details the methodology for conducting the tender evaluation process. This Board Report documents that 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 (local [City] time), DD Mmm YY].
2. The companies shortlisted in Reference C and invited to tender for these works were:
	1. [Company Name]
	2. [Etc].

### Request for Tender

*[USE FOR TWO STAGE TENDER PROCESS, OTHERWISE 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

*[USE FOR SINGLE STAGE TENDER PROCESS, OTHERWISE DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE. IF PROCURING FROM A PANEL FOR THE PM/CA, ENVIRONMENTAL/HERITAGE CONSULTANT ETC. AS A SINGLE STAGE PROCUREMENT, ADD TO OR AMEND THESE SECTIONS TO REFLECT THE APPLICABLE RFP ENGAGEMENT PROCESS]*

1. Reference D was advertised on AusTender on [DD Mmm YY] with a closing date and time of [XXXXh (local [City] time), DD Mmm YY]. The RFT was also advertised in the following media:
	1. [INSERT RELEVANT SOCIAL MEDIA / NATIONAL / REGIONAL PRINT MEDIA AND OTHER MEDIA, AND THE DATE OF ADVERTISEMENT, OR DELETE PARAGRAPH IF NOT USED].
2. [INSERT NUMBER] of companies [downloaded/requested] the tender documentation before the closing date.

### Tender Briefings/Site Inspections

*[IF NO TENDER/INDUSTRY BRIEFINGS OR SITE INSPECTIONS HELD DURING OR BEFORE THE ATM OPEN PERIOD:]*

1. No tender briefings or site inspections were conducted [STATE WHY].

*[IF TENDER/INDUSTRY BRIEFINGS OR SITE INSPECTIONS HELD DURING OR BEFORE THE ATM OPEN PERIOD:]*

1. The Project Manager / Contract Administrator (PM/CA) conducted a [tender briefing/site inspection] on [DD Mmm YY] [INCLUDE IN PERSON/VIRTUAL ATTENDANCE DETAILS]. The following companies attended the [tender briefing/site inspection]:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES].

### Addenda and Information Documents

1. [No/NUMBER] [Information Documents / Addenda] [was/were] issued during the tender open period [and [is/are] attached to this Report at Annex A].
2. The Probity Adviser [reviewed OR did not review – *if not reviewed by the Probity Advisor you must include reasons why*] draft versions of all Information Documents and Addenda. *[DELETE IF NONE ISSUED]*

### Tender Receipt and Opening

1. Tenders were received and opened in accordance with Reference B by [INSERT INDEPENDENT PERSON WHO CONDUCTED THE RECEIPTING PROCESS]. A copy of the Tender Closing Register is at Annex B.
2. [No / NUMBER] late tenders were received. [PROVIDE DETAIL OF THE MANAGEMENT OF ANY LATE TENDERS INCLUDING SUMMARY OF ANY PROBITY ADVICE RECEIVED]
3. Tenders were received from the following [NUMBER] companies:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES].

### Tender Conformance

*[UPDATE THIS SECTION IF THE CHAIR DELEGATED THE CONFORMANCE CHECK TO A PERSON INDEPENDENT OF THE BOARD]*

1. In accordance with Reference B, 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 from 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. *[DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]* The Chair found that there was a question or issue regarding the conformance of the tenders from the following companies, which were noted to all members of the Board and referred to [*the Probity Adviser* OR *DQAC*] for advice in accordance with Reference B:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES AND INSERT DETAILS REGARDING ANY SUSPECTED NON-CONFORMANCE/S, ANY PROBITY/DQAC ADVICE RECEIVED AND CLARIFICATION SOUGHT]
4. *[DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]* The Chair formed the view that the following tenders were non-conforming and obtained agreement from the Director DQAC that they be excluded from further evaluation for the following reasons:
	1. [INSERT NAME OF TENDERER, REASON/S FOR NON-CONFORMANCE]
5. The Tenderers that submitted non-conforming Tenders were notified of their exclusion via the Tender Administrator by email on [DD Mmm YY].

### Lodgement Tenderer Presentations

*[DELETE SECTION IF NOT USED]*

1. In accordance with Reference A and Reference B, each conforming Tenderer was invited to deliver a Lodgement Tenderer Presentation of its submission. These were received by the Tender Evaluation Board (and conducted under the supervision of the Probity Adviser) on the following dates, with each Tenderer given equal time and opportunity to present:
	1. [INSERT NAME OF TENDERER, DATE AND TIME OF PRESENTATION]
2. The Lodgement Tenderer Presentations occurred **before** each individual Board member received access to the submissions.
3. [INSERT DETAILS OF ANY ISSUES OR CONCERNS ARISING FROM THE LODGEMENT TENDERER PRESENTATIONS]

### Assessment of Tenders

1. In accordance with Reference B, all conforming tenders [and the non-financial aspects of the alternative proposal/s] were distributed by the Chair to the other Board members for the commencement of individual detailed evaluation on [DD Mmm YY]. Accordingly, the conforming tenders from the following companies were admitted to Detailed Evaluation Stage:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES].
2. The Board members are detailed in Table 1 and are in accordance with Reference B.

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

Table : Board Members

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

1. The other Evaluation Board attendees are detailed in Table 2 and are in accordance with Reference B. [REMOVE ROWS IF PERSON WAS NOT PRESENT AT BOARD MEETING, EVEN IF THEY WERE NAMED IN PDDP]

Table : Other Evaluation Board Attendees

| **Description** | **Organisation/Position** | **Name** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Probity Adviser |  |  |
| Technical Adviser |  |  |
| Legal Adviser |  |  |
| Price Analyst / Quantity Surveyor |  |  |
| Scribe / Stenographer |  |  |
| Observer [INCLUDE REASON FOR ATTENDANCE AND DATE APPROVED BY CHAIR] |  |  |

1. During the evaluation process, specialist advice was sought from:
	1. [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, technical advisors on environmental or heritage matters, fuel experts from Fuel Services Branch.]. This specialist advice was received at the [INSERT STAGE OF EVALUATION, e.g. before individual detailed evaluation, during the Board Detailed Assessment but before any comparative assessment occurred, before individual VFM assessment] in order to inform the [*Board’s* OR *Board members’*] consideration of [INSERT REASON WHY SPECIALIST ADVICE WAS SOUGHT, THEN BRIEFLY EXPLAIN HOW IT INFLUENCED THE BOARD’S DECISION].
	2. *[REPEAT FOR EACH ADVISER OR DELETE PARAGRAPH IF NO SPECIALIST ADVICE SOUGHT]*
2. Copies of all specialist advice sought and relied upon by the Board are saved in Objective [INSERT OBJ REF].

### Convening the Board

1. After each Board member completed their Individual Board Member Assessments, the Board convened on [DD Mmm YY] to discuss and evaluate the Tenders.
2. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with Reference B and Reference E [DELETE REFERENCE TO PROJECT-TAILORED PROBITY PLAN IF NOT APPLICABLE].
3. Prior to conducting the Tender Evaluation and discussing any Tender:
	1. the [Probity Adviser OR Chair OR DQAC] provided a Probity Briefing to all Tender Evaluation Board members [INSERT DATES AND TIMES OF PROBITY BRIEFING]
	2. the Chair confirmed that all members had been provided sufficient time to complete their individual assessments [OR IF A MEMBER HAD NOT YET COMPLETED INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT, EXPLAIN ACTION/S TAKEN NEXT]
	3. the Chair confirmed that all Board members that are Defence personnel had completed an AF220 Conflict of Interest Declaration Form in accordance with Defence Instruction AG5 prior to commencing evaluation *[NOTE: If a conflict was identified, the probity advice sought should be briefly summarised here, and it should be noted that the Director or Executive Director provided final endorsement on any actions required]*
	4. the Chair confirmed that all non-APS/ADF Board members completed a Conflict of Interest Declaration using the template found on ERIK or otherwise prescribed by the Probity Adviser prior to commencing evaluation *[NOTE: If a conflict was identified, the probity advice sought should be briefly summarised here, and it should be noted that the Director or Executive Director provided final endorsement on any actions required]*
	5. the Chair confirmed that records of all Conflict of Interest Declarations have been saved in [INSERT OBJ REF] and that no Board member had since identified an undeclared interest or relationship that may constitute a conflict of interest in relation to the tenders [OR IF A CONFLICT WAS DECLARED DURING THE BOARD MEETING, IDENTIFY WHAT IT WAS HERE AND SUMMARISE PROBITY ADVISER / DQAC ADVICE ON MANAGEMENT]
	6. the Chair confirmed that no Board member had had any visibility of pricing response schedules (including pricing of any alternative proposal)
	7. the Chair confirmed that any non-APS or non-ADF persons in attendance had completed, signed and returned a Confidentiality Deed to the Chair.

### Board Detailed Assessment – weighted evaluation criteria

1. Each individual Board member’s scores (using whole numbers only from the Ten Point Evaluation and Risk Scoring Guide in Reference B) for the weighted evaluation criteria are summarised in Table 3 through Table 6.

Table : Individual Scores of Chair

| **[NAME OF CHAIR]** |
| --- |
| **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 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 |

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 |

1. The Board discussed each submission across all weighted evaluation criteria before moving onto the next submission. Each Board member, by reference to their own written comments, contributed to this discussion analysing the strengths and weaknesses in each tender submission against each weighted evaluation criterion. No comparisons between the submissions took place at this stage.
2. The Board reached consensus on Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage) for the submissions which are summarised in Table 7. [UPDATE TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPHS IF THERE WERE ANY DISSENTING SCORES, INCLUDING WHO DISSENTED, THE DISSENTING SCORE/S AND THE REASONS FOR THOSE SCORE/S]

Table : Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage)

| **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 |

1. Detailed Board agreed narratives describing the strengths, weaknesses and risks, by reference to each weighted evaluation criterion, are provided at Annex C, and will form the basis for any debrief provided to a Tenderer (if requested).
2. The following paragraphs summarise and reflect the Board’s discussions and consensus views regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each submission based on the evaluation against the weighted evaluation criteria:
3. **[TENDERER A] –**
	1. **[Insert Criterion 1] – [Insert Preliminary Board Agreed Score (1st Stage)].** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION ENSURING ALIGNMENT TO THE 10 POINT EVALUATION AND RISK SCORING GUIDE].
		1. **Strengths:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
		2. **Weaknesses and Risks:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
	2. **[Insert Criterion 2] – [Insert Preliminary Board Agreed Score (1st Stage)].** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION ENSURING ALIGNMENT TO THE 10 POINT EVALUATION AND RISK SCORING GUIDE].
		1. **Strengths:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
		2. **Weaknesses and Risks:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
4. **[TENDERER B] –**
	1. **[Insert Criterion 1] – [Insert Preliminary Board Agreed Score (1st Stage)].** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION ENSURING ALIGNMENT TO THE 10 POINT EVALUATION AND RISK SCORING GUIDE].
		1. **Strengths:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
		2. **Weaknesses and Risks:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
	2. **[Insert Criterion 2] – [Insert Preliminary Board Agreed Score (1st Stage)].** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION ENSURING ALIGNMENT TO THE 10 POINT EVALUATION AND RISK SCORING GUIDE].
		1. **Strengths:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
		2. **Weaknesses and Risks:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY NARRATIVE AGAINST THIS CRITERION]
5. [*REPEAT FOR ALL TENDERERS AND ALL WEIGHTED EVALUATION CRITERIA*]

### Board Detailed Assessment – Yes/No Evaluation Criteria (includes Information Security)

1. Prior to the Board convening, each individual Board member had assessed each submission against the non-weighted evaluation criteria which were to be evaluated with reference as to whether or not the evaluation criterion is met (‘Yes/No Evaluation Criteria’). [NOTE: *Refer to para 46 of the CFI Tender Evaluation and Probity Protocol and the PDDP to determine which non-weighted evaluation criteria are to be evaluated with reference as to whether the evaluation criterion is met.*] This is summarised in Table 8 through Table 11.

Table : Individual Assessment of Chair

| **[NAME OF CHAIR]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

Table : Individual Assessment of Member

| **[NAME OF MEMBER]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

Table : Individual Assessment of PM/CA Representative

| **[NAME OF PM/CA REPRESENTATIVE]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

Table : Individual Assessment of Independent Member

| **[NAME OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

1. The Board discussed each submission across all Yes/No Evaluation Criteria before moving onto the next submission. Each Board member, by reference to their own written comments, contributed to this discussion to raise any risks or concerns about the Tenderer’s compliance with the Yes/No Evaluation Criteria. No comparisons between the submissions took place at this stage.
2. The Board reached consensus on how each submission fared against the Yes/No Evaluation Criteria. This is summarised in Table 12. [UPDATE TO INCLUDE ADDITIONAL PARAGRAPHS IF THERE WERE ANY DISSENTING VIEWS, INCLUDING WHO DISSENTED AND THE REASONS WHY]

Table : Board Agreed Assessment of Yes/No Evaluation Criteria

| **Company** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

1. Detailed Board agreed narratives outlining any risks or concerns arise in relation to the Yes/No Evaluation Criteria for the Delegate’s awareness, for raising with the Tenderer in the debrief, or for including in negotiations if the Tenderer becomes a preferred Tenderer, are provided at Annex C.
2. The following paragraphs summarise and reflect the Board’s discussions and consensus views regarding the strengths and weaknesses of each submission based on the evaluation against the Yes/No Evaluation Criteria:
3. **[TENDERER A] –**
	1. **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A] – [Insert ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ based on Board consensus].** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY ].
		1. **Strengths:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY]
		2. **Weaknesses and Risks:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY]
	2. **Information Security – [Insert ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ based on Board consensus].** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY] [NOTE: *The narrative must detail how the Tenderer has demonstrated that it has the ability to meet its information security obligations under the Contract if it is the successful Tenderer, especially if it is not DISP accredited*].
		1. **Strengths:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY]
		2. **Weaknesses and Risks:** [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY]
4. [*REPEAT FOR ALL TENDERERS AND ALL YES/NO EVALUATION CRITERIA*]

### Preliminary Rankings [and Tender Exclusion – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

1. Based on the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage), once the published weightings from the RFT were applied, the preliminary total weighted scores and rankings were summarised in Table 13:

Table : Rankings Based on Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage)

| **Company** | **Ranking Based on Prelim BAS (1st Stage)** | **Weighted Prelim BAS (1st Stage)** **(out of 100)** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | X | X | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

1. In accordance with Reference B, the Board determined that the submissions from the following Tenderers were clearly uncompetitive and agreed they should be set aside from further evaluation:
	1. **[INSERT TENDERER NAME]** – [INSERT DETAILED REASONS JUSTIFYING WHY SUBMISSION WAS CLEARLY UNCOMPETITIVE AND SET ASIDE INCLUDING ANY SUPPORTING ADVICE]

*[OR – ALTERNATIVE WORDING]*

1. The Board agreed that all tenders were competitive based on the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage) and no submissions were excluded from consideration at this stage.

### Verification Activities – Assessment Tenderer Presentations

1. The [*Delegate* OR *Executive Director*] agreed to the Board’s recommendation that [INSERT TENDERER/S] be requested to deliver an Assessment Tenderer Presentation in accordance with Reference B in order to [INSERT PURPOSE OF PRESENTATION].
2. Before any Assessment Tenderer Presentations were conducted, the Probity Adviser delivered a briefing to the Board on [DD Mmm YY] on the applicable probity protocols. The Probity Adviser also delivered a short briefing to the Tenderer/s at the start of each Assessment Tenderer Presentation.
3. Each Assessment Tenderer Presentation was attended by [INSERT NAMES AND ROLES OF EVALUATION ATTENDEES, INCLUDING ANY OBSERVERS].
4. After each Assessment Tenderer Presentation, the Board reconvened to consider whether the presentation justified any adjustments to the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage). The notes taken by the Board Secretary of the Tenderer Presentation documents can be found at Annex D, and are summarised as follows:
	1. **[TENDERER]** ([DD Mmm YY, START AND END TIMES]) – [INSERT SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION AND REASONS FOR RESULTING ADJUSTMENT TO PRELIMINARY BOARD AGREED SCORES (1ST STAGE)]

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not consider it necessary to request any Assessment Tenderer Presentations from Tenderers.

### Verification Activities – Referee Reports

1. In accordance with Reference B, the Chair approved that requests for referee reports be made via the Tender Administrator in relation to:
	1. **[TENDERER]** – [NAME OF NOMINATED PERSON OR PROJECT] – [BRIEF REASONS FOR REQUESTING THIS REFEREE REPORT]

*[NOTE: Ensure that Probity/DQAC advice has been sought and referred to here if the Board requested referee reports from individuals* ***not*** *nominated within the tender submission.]*

1. [SUMMARISE THE REFEREE CHECKING PROCESS – E.G. WRITTEN ONLY / INTERVIEW.] The referee reports can be found at Annex E.
2. The Board [considered OR reconvened to consider] whether the presentation justified any adjustments to the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage).
3. [INSERT DETAILED REASONS IF ANY REFEREE COMMENTS LED TO AN ADJUSTMENT OF ANY PRELIMINARY BOARD AGREED SCORES (1ST STAGE)]

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not consider it necessary to obtain referee reports as part of the evaluation process.

### Verification Activities – Clarifications

1. The Chair approved the issuing of clarification questions to Tenderers by the Tender Administrator where the Board felt that the information contained in a submission was not capable of evaluation because it was uncertain, ambiguous or inconsistent.
2. The clarifications and associated responses can be found at Annex F. The Probity Adviser [was OR was not] consulted on the clarification questions asked and the responses provided by Tenderers. [INSERT SUMMARY OF ANY PROBITY ADVICE, E.G. RESPONSE DISREGARDED BECAUSE IT ATTEMPTED TO INTRODUCE NEW INFORMATION]
3. The Board [considered OR reconvened to consider] whether the Tenderer responses to clarification questions justified any adjustments to the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage).
	1. **[TENDERER]** – [DETAIL HOW EACH CLARIFICATION RECEIVED AFFECTED THE BOARD’S PRELIMINARY BOARD AGREED SCORES (1ST STAGE) (IF AT ALL)]

*[OR]*

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

### Verification Activities – Key Personnel Interviews

1. The Board invited the following Tenderer personnel to Key Personnel Interviews [INSERT WHY, OR REFER TO PDDP IF KEY PERSONNEL INTERVIEWS WERE MANDATED BY THE DELEGATE]:
	1. **[TENDERER]** – [KEY PERSONNEL NAME AND POSITION] – [DATE AND TIMES]
2. After each Key Personnel Interview, the Board reconvened to consider whether the matters raised during the interview justified any adjustments to the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (1st Stage). The notes taken by the Board Secretary of the Key Personnel Interviews can be found at Annex G, and the following adjustments to scores were made:
	1. **[TENDERER]** – [INSERT REASONS FOR RESULTING ADJUSTMENT TO PRELIMINARY BOARD AGREED SCORES (1ST STAGE)]

*[OR]*

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

### Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (2nd Stage)

1. Table 14below details the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (2nd Stage) by evaluation criterion following the conduct of Verification Activities, and Table 15 shows the updated rankings based on weighted and Yes/No Evaluation Criteria.

Table : Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (2nd Stage)

| **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 : Rankings Based on Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (2st Stage)

| **Company** | **Ranking Based on Prelim BAS (2st Stage)** | **Weighted Prelim BAS (2st Stage)** **(out of 100)** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | X | X | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

### Comparative Assessment

1. In accordance with Reference B, the Board determined that the submissions from the following Tenderers were clearly uncompetitive and agreed they should be set aside from further evaluation:
	1. **[INSERT TENDERER NAME]** – [INSERT DETAILED REASONS JUSTIFYING WHY SUBMISSION WAS CLEARLY UNCOMPETITIVE AND SET ASIDE INCLUDING ANY SUPPORTING ADVICE]

*[OR – ALTERNATIVE WORDING]*

1. The Board agreed that all tenders remained competitive based on the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (2st Stage) and no submissions were excluded from consideration at this stage.
2. In accordance with Reference B, the Board then conducted a comparative assessment to reduce the likelihood of any relative imbalance between Preliminary Board Agreed Scores (2nd Stage) and to determine a Board Agreed Ranking.
3. [SUMMARISE 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. Each adjustment by a half score **must** be supported by detailed and robust evaluation narrative directly comparing the submissions, with reference to the Ten Point Evaluation and Risk Scoring Guide in Reference B and the wording of the evaluation criterion under consideration.]
4. Table 16 shows the Board Agreed Scores against the weighted Evaluation Criteria while Table 17 shows the Board Agreed Overall Score for each tender and the resulting Board Agreed Rankings.

Table : Board Agreed Scores Against Weighted 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** | **Ranking based on Board Agreed Overall Scores** | **Weighted Board Agreed Overall Scores (out of 100)** | **Draft Project Plans [DELETE IF N/A]** | **Information Security** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |
| [Company Name] | X | X | [YES / NO] | [YES / NO] |

### Tender Exclusion

1. In accordance with Reference B, 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. The above paragraph is an example only and should be tailored based on the circumstances of the tender evaluation process.]*

*[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 – Individual Assessment

1. Having finalised the Board Agreed Overall Scores and rankings based on technical merit, the Chair distributed to Board members the tender response schedules containing pricing and financial information, including as they relate to alternative proposals.
2. The Chair suspended the Board on [DD Mmm YY] at [TIME] to allow Board members to conduct an individual VFM assessment of each submission by reference to the Pre-Tender Estimate (PTE) and having regard to the strengths and risks identified during their earlier individual technical assessment, as well as the Board discussions to date.
3. [EXPLAIN WHETHER THE CHAIR ALSO REQUESTED THAT THE QUANTITY SURVEYOR OR OTHER FINANCIAL ADVISER TO THE BOARD ALSO UNDERTAKE AN ASSESSMENT OF THE FINANCIAL RESPONSE SCHEDULES AND TO REPORT BACK TO THE BOARD, AND WHETHER BOARD MEMBERS HAD REGARD TO THE REPORT DURING THEIR INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT].

### Value for Money Assessment – Reconvening the Board

1. The Chair reconvened the Board on [DD Mmm YY] at [TIME] to discuss the Board individual VFM assessments, which are summarised in Table 18 through Table 21.

*[NOTE: Column headings below are* ***suggestions only****, the Chair should provide guidance on what elements of the tendered fee should be ‘ranked’ and/or brought to the Delegate’s attention. For example, the Chair may request that the tables below contain a ‘rank’ but also the actual total pricing for that phase, and any caveats or risks that require Board discussion or flagging for the Delegate. It is important to ensure Board members’ views on other VFM Evaluation Criteria in the RFT are captured in the tables below, for e.g. insurance details and levels (in Miscellaneous Matters for Evaluation), Commonwealth Procurement Rules compliance, and the Environmentally Sustainable Procurement criterion, if applicable.]*

Table : Individual VFM Assessment of Chair

| **[NAME OF CHAIR]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Planning Phase (lump sum)]]** | **[Delivery Phase (indicative)]** | **[Overall tendered fees]** | **[Insert other VFM Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |

Table : Individual VFM Assessment of Member

| **[NAME OF MEMBER]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Planning Phase (lump sum)]]** | **[Delivery Phase (indicative)]** | **[Overall tendered fees]** | **[Insert other VFM Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |

Table : Individual VFM Assessment of PM/CA Representative

| **[NAME OF PM/CA REPRESENTATIVE]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Planning Phase (lump sum)]]** | **[Delivery Phase (indicative)]** | **[Overall tendered fees]** | **[Insert other VFM Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |

Table : Individual VFM Assessment of Independent Member

| **[NAME OF INDEPENDENT MEMBER]** |
| --- |
| **Company** | **[Planning Phase (lump sum)]]** | **[Delivery Phase (indicative)]** | **[Overall tendered fees]** | **[Insert other VFM Criterion]** |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |
| [Company Name] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [RANK] | [SHORT NARRATIVE] |

1. The Board then discussed each Tenderer’s response to the unweighted Value For Money Evaluation Criteria. The Board Secretary’s detailed notes of this discussion (which will be used as the basis for any Tenderer debrief) reflects the Board’s consensus views and can be found at Annex H. [UPDATE IF THERE WERE ANY DISSENTING VIEWS]
2. The key points from the discussion capturing the Board’s agreed views are summarised as follows:

### Commonwealth Procurement Rules (CPR) Compliance

### *[TAILOR THIS SECTION TO REFLECT WHAT WAS REQUESTED IN THE TENDER DOCUMENTS]*

1. **[TENDERER A] –** The Board noted the following strengths and/or weaknesses regarding the Tenderer’s:
	1. practices regarding labour regulations and ethical employment practices: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	2. practices regarding achieving efficiencies and savings in whole of life costs including opportunities to maximise the WOL Objective: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	3. [DELETE IF NO AUSTRALIAN STANDARD IS APPLICABLE AS IDENTFIIED IN THE BRIEF / WORKS DESCRIPTION] capability to meet the applicable Australian standard including by providing evidence of any relevant certifications: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	4. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE] practices regarding promoting environmental sustainability in relation to the Services: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	5. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE] direct benefits expected to be generated to the Australian economy through the project, the performance of the Services or more broadly through the Tenderer's business: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
2. *[REPEAT FOR ALL TENDERERS]*

### Financial

1. The Board discussed each Tenderer’s response to the Financial schedule. The following summaries reflect the Board’s agreed narrative for each Tenderer’s fee offer.
2. *[INSERT A SUMMARY CAPTURING THE KEY POINTS OF THE BOARD’S DISCUSSION OF EACH TENDERER’S RESPONSE TO THE FINANCIAL TENDER SCHEDULE. NOTE: As this narrative will be provided as feedback to the Tenderer in a debrief, it is important that no comparative statements are made and that no other Tender/er is referred to. The Board should take the opportunity here to flag any key risks or observations that could differentiate each Tenderer from the others in the comparative VFM assessment.]*
3. At this point, the Board considered whether any Tenderer’s tendered fee alone was clearly uncompetitive and did not represent VFM. [EXPLAIN WHETHER BOARD AGREED TO CONTNUE DISCUSSION OF ALL TENDERS OR WHETHER A SUBMISSION WAS SET ASIDE BECAUSE IT WAS CLEARLY UNCOMPETITIVE BASED ON TENDERED FEE(S) ALONE.]

### Miscellaneous Matters for Evaluation (excluding Information Security)

1. **[TENDERER A] –** The Board noted the following strengths and/or weaknesses regarding the Tenderer’s:
	1. insurance details and levels: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	2. commercial-in-confidence information: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	3. proposed minimum warranty periods: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
2. *[REPEAT FOR ALL TENDERERS]*

### Environmentally Sustainable Procurement *[DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]*

1. **[TENDERER A] –** The Board noted the following strengths and/or weaknesses regarding the extent to which the Tenderer had been able to demonstrate that:
	1. its proposed approach to optimising environmental sustainability outcomes in the performance of the Contractor's Activities and the Works is satisfactory: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	2. its proposed approach to substantiating environmental sustainability claims is satisfactory: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	3. its proposed environmental outcomes in its completed Supplier Environmental Sustainability Plan are satisfactory and that they align with the Environmental Sustainability Principles: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	4. its corporate commitment to environmental sustainability is satisfactory: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	5. it will otherwise meet its obligations relating to environmentally sustainability under the Contract if it is the successful Tenderer: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
2. *[REPEAT FOR ALL TENDERERS]*

### Indigenous Procurement Policy *[DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]*

1. **[TENDERER A] –** The Board noted the following strengths and/or weaknesses regarding the extent to which the Tenderer had been able to demonstrate its commitment to increasing Indigenous participation:
	1. its proposed approach to delivering Indigenous employment and Indigenous supplier use outcomes: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	2. its Indigenous Participation Plan will meet the mandatory minimum requirements for the Indigenous Procurement Policy: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	3. its past performance and/or demonstrated commitment in relation to increasing Indigenous participation: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	4. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE] it will ensure that the Services deliver significant Indigenous employment or Indigenous supplier use outcomes in the Remote Area: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
	5. it will otherwise meet its obligations relating to the Indigenous Procurement Policy under the Contract if it is the successful Tenderer: [INSERT COMMENTS ON APPROACH, AND ANY IDENTIFIED STRENGTHS OR WEAKNESSES/RISKS]
2. *[REPEAT FOR ALL TENDERERS]*

### Value for Money Assessment – Comparative Assessment

1. During the comparative VFM assessment, the Board considered each Tenderer’s financial, price or fee offer and responses to any other non-weighted VFM evaluation criteria against the finalised Board Agreed Scores, together with any risks associated with the submission, additional value and whole of life implications.
2. The Board Secretary’s detailed notes of this discussion can be found at Annex H. However, the key points from this discussion are summarised as follows:
3. **Financial.** The Board directly compared each Tenderer’s financial response.
4. *[SUMMARISE HOW THE BOARD DIFFERENTIATED BETWEEN TENDERERS’ FINANCIAL PROPOSALS AND APPROACH, ASSUMPTIONS, LUMP SUMS, RATES ETC. NOTE: Tables should be included to highlight differences between the Tenderers’ pricing proposals. The Board may consider evaluating the relative price offered by each Tenderer in relation to the technical merit score achieved, and capturing the key points of that discussion here.]*
5. **Commonwealth Procurement Rules Compliance.** [BRIEFLY SUMMARISE ANY KEY DIFFERENCES IN TENDERERS’ ANSWERS TO CPR COMPLIANCE TENDER SCHEDULE].
6. **Miscellaneous Matters for Evaluation.** [BRIEFLY SUMMARISE ANY KEY DIFFERENCES IN TENDERERS’ ANSWERS TO INSURANCE, COMMERCIAL-IN-CONFIDENCE INFORMATION AND WARRANTY QUESTIONS AND FLAG ANY KEY RISKS].
7. **Environmentally Sustainable Procurement.** [BRIEFLY SUMMARISE ANY KEY DIFFERENCES IN TENDERERS’ PROPOSED APPROACHES, AND FLAG ANY KEY RISKS – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
8. **Indigenous Procurement Policy.** The Board reviewed each Tenderer’s Indigenous Participation Plan. [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS ESPECIALLY HIGHLIGHTING ANY KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TENDERERS’ APPROACHES – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]
9. The Board is [satisfied OR not satisfied] that these will meet the requirements of the Indigenous Procurement Policy [TAILOR FOR EACH TENDERER IF NECESSARY].
10. **Local Industry Capability**. The Board reviewed each Tenderer’s Local Industry Capability Plan. [SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS ESPECIALLY HIGHLIGHTING ANY KEY DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TENDERERS’ APPROACHES – DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE.]
11. The Board is [satisfied OR not satisfied] that these will meet the requirements of the Defence Policy for Industry Participation [TAILOR FOR EACH TENDERER IF NECESSARY].
12. **Australian Government building and construction industry Work Health and Safety Accreditation Scheme.** The Board is satisfied that the Tenderers are accredited under the WHS Accreditation Scheme. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE – IF THE BOARD IS UNSURE, ALTERNATIVELY USE: The Board considers that [TENDERER] has reasonable prospects of becoming accredited under the WHS Accreditation Scheme prior to a contract being executed.]
13. **Outstanding employee entitlements and judgements.** The Tenderers do not have any judicial decisions against them relating to employee entitlements (excluding decisions under appeal).
14. **Approach to Modern Slavery.** The Tenderers provided details regarding their approach to identifying, assessing and addressing risks of modern slavery in their operations and supply chains. The Board is [satisfied OR not satisfied] that these will meet the requirements of the Contract [OUTLINE CONCERNS IF A TENDERER FAILED TO ADDRESS THIS QUESTION IN THE TENDER FORM SATISFACTORILY]
15. [INSERT OTHERS AS APPLICABLE.]
16. The Board agreed upon preliminary VFM merit list as shown in Table 22.

Table : Preliminary Board Agreed VFM Merit List

| **Company** | **Weighted Board Agreed Overall Scores (out of 100)** | **Ranking based on Comparative VFM Assessment**  | **Tendered Price**  | **Negotiation Required? (Y/N)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | [Yes / No] |
| [Company Name] | X | X | X | [Yes / No] |

1. The Board therefore agreed that, based on the preliminary VFM merit list, **[TENDERER NAME]** submitted the highest ranked conforming Tender.

### Consideration of Alternative Proposals

1. The Board was satisfied that the following Tenderers submitted a conforming tender, and also submitted an Alternative Proposal which the Board compared against the highest ranked conforming Tender from [TENDERER]:
	1. **[TENDERER NAME]** – [BRIEF SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL]
		1. [INSERT BOARD DISCUSSIONS AS TO WHETHER ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL OFFERED ADDITIONAL BENEFITS TO DEFENCE E.G. REDUCED RISK, MORE PRODUCT, FINANCIAL SAVINGS, EARLY COMPLETION, INNOVATION, ETC.]
		2. [INSERT BOARD AGREED SUMMARY STATEMENT AS TO WHETHER THE ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL OFFERED SUPERIOR VFM WHEN COMPARED TO THE HIGHEST RANKED CONFORMING TENDER].
	2. [REPEAT FOR EACH ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL]
2. In formulating its views on Alternative Proposals, the Board had regard to advice from [SUMMARY OF EXTERNAL ADVICE, E.G. QS, DEFENCE TECHNICAL ADVISORS, DSC, DQAC/LEGAL FOR AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTRACT].

### Financial Reports

1. The Board obtained a Financial Viability Assessment for [INSERT TENDERER/S] to determine financial standing and capacity, and this is included at Enclosure 3.
2. [DETAIL ANY ADVERSE FINDINGS AND HOW THE FINANCIAL REPORTS INFLUENCED THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT OF VFM]

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

*[OR]*

1. The Board did not identify any financial risks and did not conduct Financial Viability Assessments (and this was not mandated in the PDDP Part 2).

### Tender Evaluation Board Outcome

1. After considering the Alternative Proposals, the Board has determined that the proposal that offers the best VFM for [INSERT PROJECT] is the [conforming/alternative] proposal submitted by [INSERT COMPANY] (‘Preferred Tenderer’).

*[NOTE: Provide supporting argument behind recommendation and detail which other offers are second, third (etc) preferred, and which are declined, and why.]*

1. **Shadow Economy Procurement Connected Policy.** The Chair has checked and is satisfied that the recommended Preferred Tenderer’s Statement(s) of Tax Record relevant to its entity type that were submitted as part of its [*Registration of Interest* OR *Tender*] remain and will be valid on the anticipated contract award date of [DD Mmm YY].

### Funds Availability

1. The Board considered the Preferred Tenderer’s price against the budget to confirm funding sufficiency.
2. The financial estimates are listed in Table 23.

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.
2. **Tender Validity Period.** The Board is satisfied that any negotiations required will conclude and a contract executed within the existing Tender Validity Period (which is currently due to end on [DD Mmm YY].

*[OR]*

1. The Chairperson will work with the Legal and Probity Advisers to request an extension of [DURATION] to the Tender Validity Period to enable negotiations and contract execution to occur while the Preferred Tenderer’s offer is capable of acceptance. The updated Tender Validity Period will end on [DD Mmm YY].

### Probity Advice

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

*[OR]*

1. The Probity Adviser for this tender process is [INSERT COMPANY]. The Probity Adviser implemented a tailored, project specific Probity Plan for this tender process, to complement the existing obligations under Reference B.
2. 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 Reference B.
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.
	5. The Delegate note how conflicts of interests declared by [INSERT NAME/S] were managed.

*[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 25] | **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg FLTLT]Appointment [eg Member]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 25] |
| **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg MRS]Appointment [eg Independent Member]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 25] | **Signatory Name** [eg **AB Bloggs**]Rank or Title [eg MRS]Appointment [eg PM/CA Representative]DD Mmm YY [01 Jan 25] |

### Annexes:

1. Information Documents and Addenda
2. Tender Closing Register
3. Detailed Board Comments
4. Tenderer Presentations [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
5. Referee Reports [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
6. Clarifications [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
7. Key Personnel Interviews [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]
8. Value for Money Assessment – Detailed Board Comments
9. 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