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**Public Authority User Guide**

In accordance with the Procurement Planning Policy, an Evaluation Plan must be completed and approved for all complex and strategic procurements prior to approaching the market. This template may also be used for transactional and routine procurements, where appropriate.

Public Authority instructions

* This template is designed to assist public authorities to prepare and conduct an evaluation process.
* This template is designed to meet the requirements of *Treasurer’s Instruction 18* and the *Procurement Planning Policy and Sourcing Policy* and provides suggestions about the minimum details to be included in an Evaluation Plan.
* Your public authority may tailor this template to ensure it is fit-for-purpose and meets the requirements of your internal procurement framework.
* This Template / User Guide should be read in conjunction with the *Evaluation Planning Guideline*.

User specific instructions

* This template should be updated to reflect your specific procurement, including the evaluation methodology detailed in the Acquisition Plan.
* There are instructions highlighted in yellow and *green* text throughout the template that provide guidance on tailoring the template. The yellow highlighted text indicates where you are required to insert details relevant to the specific procurement. The green highlighted text is general guidance for your information.
* The guidance notes and suggested considerations should be used as prompts for procurement officers to help prepare and navigate the Evaluation process.
* All guidance notes and suggested considerations should be deleted before the Evaluation Plan is finalised. This User Guide text box should also be deleted before the Evaluation Plan is complete.
* The amount of detail you include in each section of the Evaluation Plan and the effort put into completing this template should be commensurate to the complexity of the procurement (considering the scope, value and risk level of the procurement).
* Parts of the template contain suggested wording or tables that can be used to input key information (e.g. evaluation criteria and evaluation scoring matrix). These are only examples. You should update or amend each section as required to suit your Evaluation Plan.
* If you would like assistance in preparing your Evaluation Plan, or a constructive peer review of your draft, please contact Procurement Services SA at procurement@sa.gov.au.
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# Purpose

This Evaluation Plan (‘Plan’) details the requirements and process for the evaluation of offers related to<insert Procurement Name> (‘this procurement’) by the Evaluation Team.

The Plan covers all tasks to be undertaken from the opening of offers, to recommendations of the preferred supplier for approval, and the debriefing of suppliers.

# Objectives

## Procurement Objectives

The objectives of this Procurement are to:

*You should describe the need as an outcome rather than a specific goods or services and summarise the key deliverables and outcomes.*

*The Procurement Objectives are those detailed in the Acquisition Plan - Section 2.1 Identified Need.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |
| 4. |  |
| 5. |  |

<insert or remove rows as required>

## Evaluation Objectives

The objective of the evaluation is to identify the best fit for purpose, value for money solution which delivers the outcome required by <insert the Public Authority>for this procurement.

The evaluation process considers the financial (quantitative) and non-financial (qualitative) elements of suppliers’ offers and has been tailored to the complexity and objectives of the procurement.

# Evaluation Team

## Evaluation Team Members

The evaluation team has been formed to evaluate all responses and make recommendations.

The evaluation team comprises of:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Position  | Responsibility (e.g. Chair [non-voting], voting member, observer) |
|  |  | Chair (person accountable for managing the evaluation process) – non-voting |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

<insert or remove rows as required>

## Steering Committee and Other Governance

Delete section if not applicable.

The following steering committee or other governance names and positions are involved in the evaluation process:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Position  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

<insert or remove rows as required>

## Specialist Advisors and Other Support

This section can be deleted if specialist advisor/other support is not required.

*A specialist advisor could include, but is not limited to, a technical subject matter expert, a probity advisor, clerical support, legal advisor, or financial assessment/modelling expert, etc.*

The following specialist advisors or support has been engaged to assist the evaluation team in making their recommendations. They are not part of the evaluation team:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Nature of Advice/Support (*e.g. probity, technical expertise, clerical support, legal advice, financial assessment/modelling)* | *Select**one.* |
|  |  | [ ]  Internal [ ]  External |
|  |  | [ ]  Internal [ ]  External |
|  |  | [ ]  Internal [ ]  External |

<insert or remove rows as required>

# Evaluation Criteria

Each offer will be assessed against the following evaluation criteria.

## Mandatory Evaluation Criteria

Delete section if not applicable.

Detail any mandatory requirements/criteria as detailed in the Acquisition Plan and market documentation, or state ‘Not Applicable’.

The mandatory criteria are:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. |  |
| 2. |  |
| 3. |  |

<insert or remove rows as required>

Offers that fail to meet one or partially meet any of the mandatory criteria are not acceptable and will not be considered further in the evaluation process.

*The following evaluation criteria are for* ***example only****. Evaluation criteria should be tailored for each Procurement to ensure the evaluation is fit-for-purpose.*

<example only – edit as required>

|  |
| --- |
| **Mandatory Criteria (incl. guidance)** |
| Attendance to an industry briefing session |
| Conflict of Interest (COI) - the supplier must provide executed COI declaration |
| Insurance - the supplier must Public Liability insurance not less than $1,000,000 for the whole term of the contract |
| Qualifications/ Licenses/ Accreditation - the supplier must hold the required qualification/ license/ accreditation relative to the requirement |
| Compliance with Industry Standards - the supplier must meet the applicable industry standards |
| Service Levels- the supplier must be able to comply with the following service levels:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Within 24 hours | Respond to messages (including phone and email) |
| Within 48 hours | Commence inquiries as per instructions |

 |

## Weighted Evaluation Criteria

The applicable weighted criteria including sub-criteria as detailed in the Acquisition Plan.

*Detail practical guidance as to what is being assessed for each criterion.*

The weighted criteria and relevant weightings are:

<example only – edit as required>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Weighted Criteria** | Guidance | Weighting (%) |
| Whole-of-life cost | *Consider the price in relation to the total cost associated with purchase*  | 50 |
| Quality | *Consider the following sub criteria*  | 50 |
| Qualitative sub-criteria | Guidance | Sub weighting (%) |
| Demonstrated experience | *Review the offer regarding the supplier’s demonstrated experience in delivering a project of a similar scale and scope* | 30 |
| Capability  | *Review the capability of the proposed good/service to achieve the intended outcomes/s. Consider the skills of proposed staff* | 20 |
| Capacity | *Review the capacity including availability of resources and timeliness of the offer to meet the deadline* | 20 |
| Level of compliance with specification | *Review the offer in relation to the level of compliance with the specification* | 15 |
| Industry Participation Policy | *Review the supplier’s Industry Participation Plan (if applicable)* | 15 |
| TOTAL | 100% |

## Non-Weighted Evaluation Criteria

Delete section if not applicable.

*Detail the applicable non-weighted criteria as detailed in the Acquisition Plan.*

*Detail practical guidance as to what is being assessed for each criterion.*

The non-weighted criteria are:

<example only – edit as required>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Non-weighted Criteria** | Guidance |
| Risk Assessment | *Risk assessment of the offer’s ability to achieve the outcome/ appointing the supplier* |
| Police check or DHS Screening or Security Clearance |  |
| Financial Viability Assessment | *Assessment of a supplier’s ability to meet its operating requirements while delivering the service (over the life of a proposed contract)* |
| Price / whole-of-life cost | *If using a balanced judgement approach* |

# Scoring System

*Your scoring system should be tailored to your specific requirement and should include guidance for scoring to ensure consistency across the evaluation team. It may be best to develop specific guidance for each criterion. Refer to the Evaluation Planning Guideline for further guidance*.

Scoring against the weighted evaluation criteria (including sub criteria) will be undertaken using the following system:

* the scoring system to be used when evaluating offers against the criteria or add as a separate attachment.

<example only – edit as required>

| **Rating** | **Guidance/ Characteristics** | **Score** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Outstanding offer | Highly convincing and credible. Offer demonstrates outstanding capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Comprehensively documented with all claims fully substantiated.  | 10 |
| Excellent offer | Highly convincing and credible. Offer demonstrates excellent capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Documentation provides complete details. All claims adequately demonstrated and substantiated.  | 9 |
| Very good offer | Offer complies, is convincing and credible. Offer demonstrates very good capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Some minor lack of substantiation but the supplier’s overall claims are supported.  | 8 |
| Good offer | Offer complies, is convincing and credible. Offer demonstrates good capability, capacity and experience, relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Minor uncertainties and shortcomings in the supplier’s claims or documentation.  | 7 |
| Adequate offer | Offer complies and is credible but not completely convincing. Offer demonstrates adequate capability, capacity and experience, relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Supplier’s claims have some gaps.  | 6 |
| Marginal offer | Offer has minor omissions. Credible but barely convincing. Offer demonstrates only a marginal capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.  | 5 |
| Limited offer | Barely convincing. Offer has shortcomings and deficiencies in demonstrating the supplier’s capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.  | 4 |
| Poor offer | Offer unconvincing. Offer has significant flaws in demonstrating the supplier’s capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.  | 3 |
| Very poor offer | Unconvincing. Offer is significantly flawed, and fundamental details are lacking. Minimal information has been provided to demonstrate the supplier’s capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.  | 2 |
| Inadequate offer | Offer is totally unconvincing, and requirement has not been met. Offer has inadequate information to demonstrate the supplier’s capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.  | 1 |
| Deficient offer | Offer was not evaluated against evaluation criteria as no response was provided or there is insufficient information to assess compliance or it did not provide the minimum level of requested information  | 0 |

*Appendix 3 provides an example template for recording scores for each criteria and comments that may be used in the consensus scoring stage.*

# Evaluation Process

*The evaluation methodology and process should be scaled to reflect the complexity of the Procurement and should ensure fair and transparent treatment of all offers.*

*For guidance on best practices and appropriate methodologies for evaluations, refer to the Evaluation Planning Guideline*.

## Evaluation Team Briefing (Preliminary Actions)

*Appendix 2 of this template provides an example conflict of interest declaration and confidentiality agreement that can be adopted by public authorities.*

Prior to the commencement of the evaluation, the Chair will ensure that all participants in the evaluation process, including specialist advisors or additional support, complete the confidentiality and conflict of interest declaration forms.

Prior to the evaluation, the Chair will provide the following to all participants in the evaluation process:

* a brief of the evaluation process and evaluation methodology
* a copy of the Probity and Ethical Procurement Guideline
* an outline of the probity arrangements including the confidentiality and conflict of interest form requirements
* a copy of the approved evaluation plan, along with resources/tools and any other materials required to undertake the evaluation
* instruction to keep clear, succinct notes throughout the evaluation process to be used as the basis for discussion to reach group consensus, as well as for supplier debriefings at the end of the procurement process
* instruction that professional judgements should be made based on the evidence provided, observed and analysed as part of the evaluation process.

Offers will then be distributed to the evaluation team.

*<detail any additional requirements, if applicable>*

## Stages in the Evaluation Process

The evaluation process will consist of the following stages:

<example only – edit as required>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stage | Description |
| 1 | *Mandatory Evaluation Criteria Assessment* |
| 2 | *Weighted Evaluation Criteria - Individual Scoring* |
| 3 | *Weighted Evaluation Criteria - Consensus Scoring* |
| 4 | *Risk Assessment* |
| 5 | *Reference Checks* |
| 6 | *Financial Viability Assessment* |
| 7 | *Negotiation* |
| 8 | *Confirm Value for Money* |

*Provide details of the different stages of the evaluation process that will be undertaken (as listed in the table above) including description of the stage and any actions required in each stage:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Stage 1: |  |
| Stage 2: |  |
| Stage 3: |  |
| Stage 4: |  |
| Stage 5: |  |

<insert or remove rows as required>

*Appendix 4 provides example generic descriptions of various stages of the evaluation process that can be tailored to the public authority’s policies and procedures and the specific evaluation process being undertaken.*

# Finalising the Evaluation Process

## Evaluation Report and Purchase Recommendation

Following the above outlined evaluation process, an Evaluation Report and Purchase Recommendation will be prepared by <insert responsible person’s name and role> for consideration and approval by the authorised person identified in the Acquisition Plan. The Evaluation Report may form part of the Purchase Recommendation.

The Evaluation Report/Purchase Recommendation will be signed and approved by each member of the evaluation team.

The Purchase Recommendation will be approved by an authorised person prior to awarding the contract.

## Notification of Outcome and Supplier Debriefing

After the approval of the Purchase Recommendation, all suppliers will be advised in writing of the outcome of their offer and given the opportunity to receive feedback on their offer.

Feedback relating to the supplier’s offer, as assessed against the evaluation criteria, will be provided to that supplier based on the recorded rationale for decisions made by the evaluation team.

Debriefing sessions will be conducted by:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name | Position  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

<insert or remove rows as required>

All debriefings will be documented and should be undertaken by at least two members of the evaluation panel. Any information which may comprise confidential or commercial interests of any supplier or other stakeholder will not be disclosed.

<insert additional requirements, if applicable>

*For all complex or strategic procurements, or procurements that are politically sensitive or have high visibility, consider how this may impact supplier debriefings.*

Based on the overall complexity of the procurement, the following items will be noted in regard to the conduct of supplier debriefing sessions:

* *the appointed probity advisor will be present at all debriefing sessions*
* *all debriefing sessions will be minuted and filed with relevant tender records/documentation.*

<insert additional requirements, if applicable>

# Evaluation Team Sign-Off

I have read and agree to abide by:

* The Probity and Ethical Procurement Guideline
* This Evaluation Plan and the Evaluation Key Principles (Appendix 1)

I understand I will be required to execute a *Conflict of Interest* declaration, and *Confidentiality Agreement* prior to commencing the evaluation even where I have no conflicts to declare.

I understand that I am required to notify the Chair of the evaluation team immediately in writing, if prior to, during or at the conclusion of the evaluation process, an actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest arises or appears likely to arise.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name | Position/ Unit | Signature |
|  |  | …………………………………………Date: |
|  |  | …………………………………………Date: |
|  |  | …………………………………………Date: |
|  |  | …………………………………………Date: |
|  |  | …………………………………………Date: |

**APPROVED BY:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Name: | *<enter Approving Authority as approved in the Acquisition Plan>*  |
| Position: |  |
| Signature: | Date: / / 202x |

#### Appendix 1: Example Evaluation Key Principles

The Evaluation key principles are the minimum directions that govern the evaluation and should not be amended without advice from your public authority’s procurement area.

Preliminary

To protect the interests of the public authority and suppliers, a thorough evaluation of offers received will be undertake. Care will be taken to ensure that all costs (direct and indirect) are considered together with qualitative, financial (including SAIPP economic contribution considerations), risk and probity aspects.

The evaluation team will adhere to the *Treasurer’s Instructions 18* and its supporting policies.

Achieving Value For Money (VFM)

Value for Money (VFM) is the achievement of a desired procurement outcome at the best possible price, based on a balanced judgement of financial and non-financial factors relevant to the procurement.

VFM in procurement is achieved by finding the optimum balance between whole-of-life cost and quality of an offer.

The economic benefit[[1]](#footnote-2) of the procurement to the South Australian economy should also be a factor in the value for money considerations above.

If the procurement or contract cannot achieve VFM and deliver the intended outcomes, then the procurement or contract should not continue.

Single Response (Offer) to Invitation

In the event that a single offer (only 1 offer) is received, or only a single offer is deemed compliant, the offer will be evaluated in the same manner as would occur if multiple offers were received, in full accordance with the criteria detailed in the evaluation plan.

If the sole offer is deemed unsuitable then the market approach should be abandoned, and a new procurement strategy developed.

Probity and Ethical Behaviour

The public authority will ensure that procurement decisions preserve public and private sector confidence in government processes and represent value for money. This is more likely to be achieved when probity principles are put into practice. A well planned, performed and documented procurement is more likely to withstand external scrutiny, thereby maintaining the integrity of the public sector and minimising process conflicts and complaints.

Any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest identified before, during or at the conclusion of the evaluation process will be documented and actioned appropriately by the Chair of the evaluation team.

All participants in the procurement evaluation process will adhere to the Code of Ethics and comply with the highest standards of ethical procurement when undertaking procurement activities.

Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest is a situation (actual, potential or perceived) where a personal, family, associate, or business relationship or other interest (e.g. in the capacity of a board or committee member of a third party) has a risk of unfairly influencing the proper outcome of a decision or process.

All participants in the procurement evaluation process (i.e. public authority employees and specialist advisors) will complete a conflict of interest declaration and confidentiality agreement prior to commencing the evaluation. A conflict of interest declaration will be completed even where there are no conflicts to declare.

Any known actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest will be identified, documented and managed effectively during the evaluation process.

Gifts and Hospitality

Employees will not, for themselves or others, seek or accept gifts or benefits that could be reasonably perceived as influencing them.

Offers of gifts during the evaluation process or any other point in the decision-making process will be refused, documented and reported to the Chair of the evaluation team.

Confidentiality and Non- disclosure of Commercial in Confidence Information

Confidentiality agreements for all participants (i.e. public authority employees, project advisers/consultants and probity advisers) are required to be completed prior to commencing a procurement evaluation process.

Procurement information will be treated as commercial-in-confidence. All information accessed and discussed (whether verbal or written) within the evaluation process, as well as the results of the evaluation process, is to be treated as confidential. Information and documentation will be kept secure at all times and not be divulged or given to any persons not directly involved in the evaluation process.

Measures will be in place to:

* + protect the competitive position and intellectual property of bidders;
	+ the commercial interests of government; and
	+ prevent unauthorised access to, and divulging of, commercial-in-confidence information (except where allowed for by government policy or legislation).

The nominated Contact Person (as detailed in the invitation/market document and often the Chair) is the only person permitted to communicate with internal and external stakeholders about the evaluation process and outcome.

All participants in the evaluation process should not discuss any element of the process with work colleagues or any other party.

Receiving and Opening Offers

All offers will be received as detailed in the invitation/market documentation. All suppliers will be notified in writing of the receipt of their offer.

Clarifications and Communications

Suppliers will be kept informed of the progress of the evaluation process by the Contact Person nominated in the invitation/market documentation and advised at soon as practically possible of any delays to the process.

The Contact Person will communicate directly with suppliers and any clarifications (if required) will be forwarded to the suppliers in writing with a reasonable time frame for suppliers to respond.

The Contact Person may authorise other members of the evaluation team to communicate with the suppliers when required (for example, technical experts).

Key discussions with suppliers will be documented, including minutes recording the main points raised in face-to-face meetings and telephone conversations.

Record Keeping/Notes

Decision making needs to be documented, including the process followed to arrive at that decision. All notes concerning a supplier’s offer during the evaluation, and rational for scores against evaluation criteria will be recorded in line with the public authority’s records management policy. This provides an audit trail and ensures that the public authority is transparent in all stages of the decision-making process.

Acceptance of Late Offers

In accordance with the *Sourcing Policy*, late offers are those offers received after the closing time specified in the invitation/market documentation. Any offers that are submitted and/or received late will be noted. Any decision to allow for late offers will be made based on the public authority’s procurement framework.

Departures from the Approved Evaluation Plan

The Chair will ensure that any departure from the approved evaluation plan, will be in accordance with the *Sourcing Policy* and if required, the appropriate approval is obtained.

All departures from the approved evaluation plan will be documented in the purchase recommendation.

Resolution of Differences

When differences arise between evaluation team members, the following guidelines may assist with resolving differences:

* place aside differences on that topic and move on to complete the remainder of the evaluation, and then return and review the debated topics
* allow differences to be aired and analyse the source of the differences
* seek clarification from the supplier
* allow the relevant technical expert to take the decision, either within the evaluation team or externally.

Absence of Evaluation Team Members

In the event that any member of the evaluation team is unavailable (as a result of a conflict of interest, sick leave, job reallocation or other reason for absence) an alternative staff member with an equivalent skill set or expertise may be chosen to undertake the duties of the original member. Any changes to the evaluation team will be recorded as a departure from the approved evaluation plan.

Negotiations

When conducting negotiations, the following is required:

* confidentiality is maintained
* the process is transparent, documented and conducted in a manner that is fair and equitable for all shortlisted suppliers
* requests seeking further information, improvements to a supplier's offer, or a best and final offer, are conducted in a consistent manner and that any accepted improvements are within scope of the market approach
* the negotiation is undertaken by persons with the appropriate skills and capability required to adequately represent and advocate on behalf of the public authority
* all negotiations between the parties are to be fully documented.

Roles and Responsibilities

*Evaluation team members*

Responsibilities:

* disclosing any actual, potential or perceived conflicts to the Chair
* maintaining probity and confidentiality
* evaluating the supplier’s offer in accordance with the evaluation plan
* thoroughly documenting the reasons for each rating given against the individual criteria
* assessing risk and determining risk management strategies
* identifying issues for further review
* ensuring the appropriate management of records
* referring any communications received from suppliers or related parties during the evaluation process to the Chair
* maintaining an appropriate audit trail
* assisting in the preparation of the Evaluation Report/Purchase Recommendation
* debriefing suppliers (if required)
* *insert any additional responsibilities, if required*

*Chair*

The Chair should have a good understanding of procurement to ensure an unbiased and efficient evaluation process. The Chair should be non-voting where possible.

Responsibilities in addition to those of the evaluation team are:

* coordinating the evaluation
* resolving differences
* communication with suppliers (when relevant)
* ensuring that all participants in the evaluation process complete a conflict of interest declaration and confidentiality agreement prior to commencing the evaluation process
* appropriately manage any conflicts of interest declared by the evaluation team members
* ensuring that the evaluation team has sufficient time, information and resources to evaluate supplier offers, that there is genuine debate, and that the evaluation team arrives at a consensus position or documents differences in position
* maintaining momentum and ensuring timeframes are met
* informing suppliers of the progress of the evaluation, particularly if there are delays
* reporting on matters associated with the evaluation
* ensuring that all evaluation team members have the skills, capability and capacity to score and recommend a suitable supplier
* finalising the Evaluation Report/Purchase Recommendation
* addressing any issues during the evaluation
* debriefing unsuccessful suppliers (if required)
* *insert any additional responsibilities, if required*

#### Appendix 2: Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Declaration

*Different public authorities and situations may require different declarations. You may use this template in the absence of a public authority specific conflict of interest/ confidentiality form.*

Confidentiality

As a member of the [Insert Procurement name] (Project) Evaluation Team, I understand and agree to comply with the following conditions:

* I acknowledge that I will be given access to confidential information while carrying out duties for the procurement.
* I acknowledge that all information, acquired by verbal or written means, provided or acquired in the course of my duties, including any intellectual property, is strictly confidential and I shall not disclose or reveal to any other party or person other than is necessary for the purpose of my Project duties and as a member of the Evaluation Team (Authorised Purpose).
* I shall not use or copy any confidential information without first obtaining the written consent the Chair of the Evaluation Team for any other purpose other than the Authorised Purpose.
* I shall keep confidential information in a secure manner, taking all necessary precautions to prevent disclosure to any unauthorised persons or parties.
* I shall notify the Chair of the Evaluation Team immediately if I become aware of any unauthorised acts including unauthorised use, disclosure, reproduction, copying or publication of any part of the Confidential Information.

On demand by the Chair of the Evaluation Team or at the expiry or termination of my duties or contract in relation to the Project, I shall immediately deliver to the Chair all Confidential Information in my control, including any records or documents which contain Confidential Information.

Conflict of Interest

I declare that to the best of my knowledge, I do not have any:

* financial interest in the Project;
* immediate relatives or close friends or associates or business relationships with a financial interest in the Project;
* personal bias or inclination which would in any way affect my decisions in relation to the Project; and/or
* personal obligation, allegiance or loyalty which would in any way affect my decisions in relation to the Project;

except as set out herein below:

|  |
| --- |
| Click or tap here to enter text. |

I acknowledge that if I have any actual, potential or perceived financial or personal interest in a supplier likely to bid (e.g. as a shareholder, director or employee); and/or a position of influence within a senior management team or on the board or committee as a director or a trustee of a supplier likely to bid then I cannot take part in any the Procurement or Evaluation Process.

I undertake to make further declarations detailing any actual conflict, potential conflict or perceived conflict which may arise during the Project to the Chair of the Evaluation Team. I agree to abstain from any decision where such a Conflict arises.

Gifts

I confirm that I will not for myself or others, seek or accept any gifts or benefits from any supplier responding to this Procurement during the Evaluation Period.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name: | Position: | Organisation: |
| Signed: | Date: |

#### Appendix 3: Example Evaluation Criteria Scoring Template

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluated by: |  |
| Supplier name: |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Mandatory Criteria | Compliance*(Select one.)* | Details of Compliance |
| **Criteria:** *Specify/ description* | [ ]  Pass[ ]  Fail |  |
| **Criteria:** *Specify/ description* | [ ]  Pass[ ]  Fail |  |
| **Criteria:** *Specify/ description* | [ ]  Pass[ ]  Fail |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria 1 | Criteria Weighting |
| **Criteria:** *Specify/ description* | **Weighting:** *Specify %* |
| **Sub-Criteria 1.1:** *Specify or delete row if n/a* | **Sub-Criteria Weighting:** *Specify %* |
| Your Score: | Your Weighted Score: |
| Comments *(justification for score):* |
| Sub-Criteria 1.2:  *Specify or delete row if n/a* | Sub-Criteria Weighting: *Specify %* |
| Your Score: | Your Weighted Score: |
| Comments *(justification for score):* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation Criteria 2 | Criteria Weighting |
| **Criteria:** *Specify/ description* | **Weighting:** *Specify %* |
| **Sub-Criteria 2.1:** *Specify or delete row if n/a* | **Sub-Criteria Weighting:** *Specify %* |
| Your Score: | Your Weighted Score: |
| Comments *(justification for score):* |

#### Appendix 4: Example Generic Descriptions for Different Stages of the Evaluation Process

The following sections are to be tailored to be relevant the process that will be undertaken. The descriptions are for guidance only.

**Stage [insert #]: Assessment of Mandatory Criteria**

Offers will be assessed against the mandatory criteria. These criteria are either passed or failed. Offers that fail to meet one or partially meet any of the mandatory criteria are not acceptable and will not proceed further in the evaluation process.

The offers that fail to meet the mandatory criteria will be recorded as non-conforming.

* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Weighted Criteria - Individual Scoring**

Offers that have met the mandatory criteria will be evaluated against the weighted evaluation criteria. This stage of the evaluation is conducted individually by evaluation team members.

Each offer will be scored out of *(insert scoring system number)* for each criterion including sub-criteria (if applicable) using the approved scoring system.

Each evaluation team member is to record a score for each criterion including sub-criteria (if applicable) and should be prepared to justify that score in the consensus scoring stage.

Clear, succinct notes are required in support of your scores. The comprehensiveness of your notes should align with the complexity of the procurement. All evaluation notes and material will be retained for audit purposes.

* *consider, if individual members or experts or sub evaluation teams are allocated a specific criteria/s to evaluate, outline how this will occur in the individual assessment stage*
* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Weighted Criteria - Consensus Scoring**

Once individual scoring has been completed, all members of the evaluation team will meet to consider their scores and reach a consensus score for each weighted criterion.

The consensus score for each criterion is based on individual assessments and evaluation team discussion.

The discussion will involve the evaluation team reviewing the initial individual scores, discussing the individual findings and coming to a consensus as to the appropriate scores to be awarded.

If differences between the evaluation team cannot be resolved, then the ultimate decision (score) will be made by the Chair.

Each evaluation team member will identify issues, if any, that require clarification with each supplier. The Chair will arrange for a clarification notice to be forwarded to the supplier(s) in writing and will set a reasonable time frame for the supplier(s) to respond.

Once clarification responses are received, the evaluation team will reconvene and review the clarification(s) and discuss if adjustments to the allocated scores (against the weighted or sub-weighted criteria) are required. These adjusted scores will be agreed to by consensus.

The reasons for the consensus scores will documented and the overall consensus score of the evaluation team will used for the formal evaluation and retained for the permanent record and be used as the basis for calculating the weighted scores.

* *if individual members or experts or sub evaluation teams evaluated specific criteria, outline the how the consensus assessment stage will be conducted*
* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Value for Money (VFM)**

VFM is achieved in procurement by finding the optimum balance between whole-of-life cost and quality.

* *this section should reflect the evaluation method and outline the process for applying VFM index or balanced judgment. For further guidance refer to the Value for Money in Procurement Guideline and the Evaluation Planning Guideline.*
* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Risk Assessment**

The risk assessment will consider all risk aspects of the offers.

The evaluation team will assess, discuss and document the significant risks identified in the offers. Any offer(s) considered to be of high risk by the evaluation team may be excluded from further consideration.

The evaluation team will discuss any areas of the offer(s) where further clarification is required to address the identified risks. The Chair will contact the supplier(s) in writing if clarification is required and will set a reasonable timeframe for the supplier(s) to respond.

The evaluation team will review the risk clarification(s) and where required, discuss the reassessment of risk, to be agreed to by consensus.

* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Overall Assessment and Comparison/Shortlisting**

The number of suppliers shortlisted will be determined by [insert method, natural break, top 3 suppliers, suppliers will achieve a minimum overall score of ‘x%’] or as determined by consensus by the evaluation team.

* *if using the balanced judgment method, amend this stage to describe the overall assessment and comparison of the weighted scores, price, identified risk level and non-cost value-adds of each shortlisted offer*
* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Presentations**

If required, supplier’s may be requested to present their offer to the evaluation team.

In this instance the Chair of the evaluation team will send a written request inviting a supplier to make a presentation of their offer to the evaluation team.

The presentation may also be a forum for seeking clarification regarding aspects of the supplier’s submission. All questions and answers at these presentation sessions will be documented.

The Chair may prepare a written report of the presentation(s).

Any clarifications that arise following the presentation will be communicated to the supplier through the Chair. The Chair will set a reasonable timeframe for the supplier to respond.

The evaluation team will review the weighted criteria (including sub-weighted criteria) scores allocated and the risks assessed in previous stages, and if necessary, adjust the score and risk assessment accordingly in consensus.

* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Referee Checks**

In addition to the information provided by each supplier, the evaluation team may contact the nominated referee of each shortlisted supplier.

Prior to any contact with referees, a standard list of questions will be established by the evaluation team for referees to respond to. In addition, a further range of specific questions may be determined for each supplier.

The chair may prepare a written report of the reference check(s).

**Stage [insert #]: Site Visits**

Site visits to suppliers during the evaluation process can also be undertaken provided it is essential for the solicitation, evaluation and negotiation of offers received.

Visits will be documented and undertaken by at least two members of the evaluation team. The cost of all travel and accommodation shall be at the public authority’s expense. These costs will not form part of the pricing of the offers.

**Stage [insert #]: Financial Viability Assessment**

Detailed financial viability assessment/s will be undertaken at this stage to verify the financial capacity of the supplier to undertake the work as well as assessing the solvency and overall financial viability (for example a company credit reports available (for purchase) through credit reporting public authorities such as Dun and Bradstreet).

A financial viability assessment will be conducted of the provisional preferred supplier(s) or the supplier(s) with which negotiations may be undertaken.

Any supplier(s) considered by the evaluation team to be of high financial viability risk may be excluded from further consideration.

Following Financial Viability Assessment, the evaluation team will finalise a short list and decide whether or not to undertake negotiations with one or more short-listed suppliers.

* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*

**Stage [insert #]: Negotiation**

Following the shortlisting of the preferred supplier/s, negotiations can be entered into to:

* resolve any departures from the specification
* achieve improved terms and conditions
* maximise the potential value available*.*

Negotiations may take place on any aspect of the proposed contract.

Negotiations should be carefully planned and well documented (i.e. both questions and responses). The evaluation team is to have discussed and agreed to tactics before each meeting. Written plans and strategies are to be prepared before each meeting identifying the public authority’s preferred position and its negotiating position on major issues. All negotiations between the parties are to be fully documented.

In accordance with the *Sourcing Policy*, a formal Negotiation Plan will be required for all contract negotiations undertaken for a complex or strategic procurement. All negotiations between the parties are to be fully documented and will be conducted by the evaluation team (or a separate negotiation team if required) as detailed in the Negotiation Plan.

At completion of the negotiations, the evaluation team may endorse preferred supplier/s.

**Stage [insert #]: Confirm Value for Money (VFM)**

As a final stage of the evaluation process, the evaluation team will confirm that VFM has been achieved and that the desired procurement outcome/s will be delivered by the preferred supplier/s.

If the procurement cannot achieve VFM and deliver the intended outcomes, then a supplier should not be awarded the contract.

* *insert additional requirements, if applicable*
1. For more guidance on economic contribution, refer to the South Australian Industry Participation Policy [↑](#footnote-ref-2)