|  |
| --- |
|  |
| REGISTRATION EVALUATION BOARD REPORT (REBR)AZ[INSERT] |
| FILE REFERENCE: |
| PROJECT [NUMBER][PROJECT TITLE]**[LOCATION & STATE]** |
|  |
| PROJECT SPONSOR: **[Insert Here]**PROJECT VALUE: **$[X.YYm]**PACKAGE VALUE: **$[X.YYm]** |
|  |
| Shortlist RecommendationIn accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Board recommends that the following companies be invited to tender on [TENDER NUMBER AND TITLE] for project [NUMBER AND TITLE].* [LIST COMPANY NAMES]
 |
| **[Director Clearance\*]**I have reviewed this Registration Evaluation Board Report and recommend that it proceed for Executive Review and Approval.Name: Sign: Date: Position:  |
| Executive Review and Approval\* Refer to the DEQMS for Executive Review and Approval delegations |
| **ENDORSED BY:**I have reviewed and endorse/do not endorse this Board Report in accordance with the DEQMS.Name: Sign:Position:Date: |
|  |  |
| **APPROVED BY:**I approve/do not approve the shortlist recommendation made by the Evaluation Board.Name: Sign:Position:Date: |

[NOTE: *If procuring from a panel for the PM/CA, Environmental/Heritage Consultant etc. as a single stage procurement, or conducting a single stage RFT, use TEBR template*.]

[NOTE: *The Board Report is to be reviewed and approved by the relevant Director if they are not on the Evaluation Board. This review should be undertaken prior to referring the PDDP to DPA for executive review and approval*]

[NOTE: *Delete all guidance notes prior to finalisation*]
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# Executive Summary

1. [PROVIDE DETAILS OF THE KEY ISSUES AND OUTCOMES OF THE TENDER EVALUATION BOARD REPORT]
2. [USE NUMBERED PARAGRAPHS]

# References

1. Project Development and Delivery Plan (PDDP) approved [DATE]

A-1 Amendment 1 to the PDDP [DATE] [REMOVE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

A-2 Amendment 2 to the PDDP [DATE] [REMOVE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

1. Evaluation Plan approved [DATE]

B-1 Amendment 1 to the Evaluation Plan [DATE] [REMOVE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

B-2 Amendment 2 to the Evaluation Plan [DATE] [REMOVE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

1. ITR [DATE]

[MODIFY AS REQUIRED]

# Project Aim and Description

[IF THE PDDP IS INCLUDED AS AN ATTACHMENT TO THE REBR, INSERT AS FOLLOWS:]

The Delegate is referred to Reference A, attached as Annex [INSERT PDDP ATTACHMENT REFERENCE] for information regarding the Project Aim and Description.

[OR - IF PDDP IS NOT ATTACHED:]

1. FROM THE APPROVED/AMENDED PDDP, BRIEFLY IDENTIFY THE AIMS OF THE PROJECT]
2. [DESCRIBE ANY BACKGROUND ISSUES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO THIS PROPOSAL INCLUDING PRIORITY OR TIMING REQUIREMENTS]
3. [IDENTIFY ANY OTHER FACTORS, WHICH MAY HAVE AN IMPACT ON THIS PROPOSAL SUCH AS THE AGE OF THE FACILITY OR CAPABILITY REQUIREMENTS]

# Scope of the Work

[IF THE PDDP IS INCLUDED AS AN ATTACHMENT TO THE REBR, INSERT AS FOLLOWS:]

The Delegate is referred to Reference A, attached as Attachment [INSERT PDDP ATTACHMENT REFERENCE] for information regarding the Scope of the Work.

[OR - IF PDDP IS NOT ATTACHED:]

1. [IDENTIFY THE SCOPE OF WORKS FOR THIS PROJECT AS APPROVED IN PDDP]

# SOURCE SELECTION

1. In accordance with Reference A, the [Head Contractor/Managing Contractor/DSC… etc] is to be engaged through a [NOMINATE SELECTION PROCESS].
2. Reference B details the methodology for conducting the selection process and this Board Report documents the first stage of the selection process.

# Invitation to Register

1. The Invitation To Register Interest (ITR) was advertised on AusTender on [DATE] with a closing time and date of [INSERT CLOSING TIME AND DATE].
2. In addition, the ITR was advertised in the following media:
	1. [INSERT RELEVANT MEDIA/ NATIONAL PRINT/ REGIONAL PAPERS AND THE DATE OF ADVERTISEMENT OR DELETE PARAGRAPH IF NOT USED.]
3. [INSERT NUMBER] of companies requested the registration documentation before the closing date.

# Briefings/Site Inspections

1. A registration briefing [and/or site inspection] [was/was not] conducted by the [Project Manager / Contract Administrator (PM/CA) or Project] on [DATE]. The following companies attended the [tender briefing/site inspection]:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES OR DELETE AS APPLICABLE]

# Addenda and INFORMATION DOCUMENTS

1. [NUMBER] [INSERT EITHER “No” OR THE NUMBER] [Information Documents /Addenda] were issued during the registration period and [is/are] attached to this Report at [INSERT ATTACHMENT REFERENCE]. The Probity Adviser [cleared/did not clear] all Information Documents and Addenda. [DELETE IF NONE ISSUED OR AS APPLICABLE]

# Submission Receipt and Opening

1. Submissions were received and opened in accordance with the Infrastructure Division DEQMS tender receipting processes. A copy of the Tender Closing Register is at Annex A.
2. [NUMBER] late submissions were received. [INSERT EITHER “No” OR THE NUMBER OF LATE SUBMISSIONS. NOTE: *Provide detail of the management of any late submissions*].
3. Submissions were received from [NUMBER] companies, these being:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES]

# Submission Conformance

1. In accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan at Reference B, prior to distributing submissions to the Board, the Chair conducted conformance checks to ensure that each submission complied with the conformance requirements set out in the ITR before admitting the submissions to evaluation. The Chair checked that each submission:
	1. was submitted by the Closing Date and Time;
	2. met all Minimum Form and Content requirements; and
	3. met all Conditions for Participation.
2. Only those submissions that satisfied the conformance requirements were admitted to evaluation, unless the failure to satisfy a requirement fell within the allowable discretion provided in the Commonwealth Procurement Rules.
3. Where the Board Chair found that there was doubt over conformance of any submission, it was noted to all members of the Board and referred to [the Probity Adviser or DCFPC], [AMEND AS APPROPRIATE] in accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan. In consultation with the [Probity Adviser or DCFPC], [AMEND AS APPROPRIATE] the Chair determined the conformance of the subject submission(s) and this was recorded for tabling at the Board meeting. [Insert details regarding any suspected non-conformances, and any advice received]
4. In accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan, all conforming submissions were distributed by the Chair to the remaining Board members for the commencement of individual detailed evaluation. Accordingly, the submissions from the following companies were admitted to Detailed Evaluation Stage:
	1. [LIST COMPANIES]

# Assessment of Submissions

1. The Board members are detailed in Table 1 and are in accordance with the Evaluation Plan. [NOTE: *If the Board composition changed between approval of the EP and the Board meeting, note here that Delegate approval was sought and obtained for this amendment to the Board’s composition and identify Reference*.]

Table 1 Board Members

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Description | Organisation / Position | Name |
| Chairperson |  |  |
| Member |  |  |
| Independent Member |  |  |
| Project Manager / Contract Administrator |  |  |

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

Table 2 Probity Advisor and Observers

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

1. Specialist advice was sought from [INSERT NAME AND TITLE] on [INSERT] aspects of the submissions. [E.g. Staff from Program Support with regard to advice and interpretation of Financial Statements during the evaluation submissions]. [OR DELETE PARAGRAPH IF NO SPECIALIST ADVICE SOUGHT]

# Convening the Board

1. The Board noted the Evaluation Principles as outlined in the Evaluation Plan. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with these principles.
2. Prior to conducting the Evaluation, the Probity Adviser provided a short Probity Briefing and distributed the agreed Probity Protocols. [DELETE IF A PROBITY ADVISER WAS NOT USED FOR THIS EVALUATION]
3. Prior to discussing the submissions received, the Chair confirmed that all members had no conflict of interest in relation to the submissions and that they had been provided sufficient time to complete their individual assessments. [NOTE: *If a conflict was disclosed, identify the conflict here, along with any advice provided by the Probity Adviser/DPA, and any management strategy that was implemented*].
4. The individual weighted scores are summarised in Table 3 below.

Table 3 Individual Weighted Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | BOARD MEMBER | BOARD MEMBER | BOARD MEMBER | BOARD MEMBER |
| **Score** | **Rank** | **Score** | **Rank** | **Score** | **Rank** | **Score** | **Rank** |
| [COMPANY NAME] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [etc] |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# detailed evaluation

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

# Summary of Detailed Evaluation

[SUMMARISE BOARD DISCUSSIONS OF THE INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS, THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF EACH SUBMISSION AND THE OUTCOMES OF THE DETAILED EVALUATION STAGE]

1. Table 4 below details the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores by evaluation criterion. Detailed narratives of the strengths, weaknesses and risks by evaluation criterion and by reference to the 10 point scoring guide in the Evaluation Plan are provided at Annex [INSERT REFERENCE]. This Annex also includes detail of the Board’s consideration of relevant information regarding the clarifications and referee reports for each submission. [REMOVE LAST SENTENCE IF NO CLARIFICATIONS/REFEREE REPORTS WERE SOUGHT]

[AMEND AS REQUIRED]

Table 4 Preliminary Board Agreed Scores

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | Preliminary Ranking |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

1. In accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Preliminary Board Agreed Scores were subject to amendment during the comparative assessment of all submissions, which was undertaken to ensure there were no significant imbalances between the technical merit scores given to the submissions.

# Exclusion of Submissions

[IF NOT APPLICABLE REPLACE TEXT WITH ALTERNATIVE PARAGRAPH]

1. In accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Board determined at the commencement of the comparative assessment stage that, on technical merit, [INSERT SUBMISSION/COMPANY] was clearly uncompetitive. In the case of this submission, 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 submissions from evaluation should only be used where the Detailed Assessment Rating is “Marginal” or less. Justification must be included to support the Board’s decision.*

[OR – ALTERNATIVE WORDING]

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

# Comparative Assessment

1. In accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Board conducted a comparative assessment to determine a Board Agreed Ranking, after finalising the Board Agreed Scores. Submissions were compared to reduce the likelihood of any imbalance between relative scores.

[SUMMARISE THE BOARD DISCUSSIONS AND OUTCOMES OF THE COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT STAGE. NOTE: *It is at this stage that the comments should begin to argue the differentiation on technical merit between submissions, the probability of success and risks to Defence for each submission*]

1. Table 5 shows the Board Agreed Scores against the Evaluation Criteria while Table 6 shows the Board Agreed Overall Score and Ranking for each submission.

Table 5 Board Agreed Scores Against Evaluation Criteria

| Company | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] | [insert evaluation criterion & weighting] |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 6 Board Agreed Overall Scores and Ranking

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Board Agreed |
| Score | Rank |
| [COMPANY NAME] |  |  |
| [etc] |  |  |
|  |  |  |

NOTE: *Report all reasons behind the changes from the Preliminary Score to final Board Agreed Score for each Submission by evaluation criteria.*

# Referee’s Reports

[SUMMARISE THE REFEREE REPORTS SOUGHT AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS]

[DETAIL IF ANY REFEREE COMMENTS IMPACTED ON THE RANKINGS AT TABLE 6]

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

OR– ALTERNATIVE WORDING]

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

**CLARIFICATIONS**

[SUMMARISE ANY CLARIFICATIONS SOUGHT FROM REGISTRANTS AS PART OF THE EVALUATION PROCESS]

[DETAIL HOW THE CLARIFICATIONS IMPACTED ON THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT]

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

[OR– ALTERNATIVE WORDING]

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

**FINANCIAL REPORTS**

[SUMMARISE ANY FINANCIAL REPORTS SOUGHT IN RELATION TO ANY REGISTRANTS]

[DETAIL HOW THE FINANCIAL REPORTS IMPACTED ON THE BOARD’S ASSESSMENT]

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

[OR – ALTERNATIVE WORDING]

1. The Board did not identify any financial risks.

# Probity Advice

DESCRIBE HOW PROCESS WAS MANAGED IF NO PROBITY ADVISER, INCLUDE ALL PROBITY ISSUES AND ADVICE SOUGHT

1. The Probity Communication Log is attached at Annex [X] [OR]
2. The Probity Adviser’s Report is attached at Annex [X]. [DELETE IF NOT APPLICABLE]

# Shortlist

1. The Board was satisfied that the Board Agreed Overall Scores and Ranking as illustrated in Table 6 accurately reflects the outcomes of evaluation. [AMEND AS REQUIRED]
2. [DETAIL THE RECOMMENDED APPROACH IF ANY OF THE APPROVED SHORTLISTED COMPANIES WITHDRAW]
3. [PROVIDE DETAIL ON WHICH COMPANIES WILL BE ADVISED AS UNSUCCESSFUL]

# Shortlist Recommendation

1. The Board confirms that the evaluation of submissions was conducted in accordance with the approved Evaluation Plan, provided as a reference to this Report.
2. The Board recommends that:
	1. [COMPANY NAME]

be shortlisted and be invited to submit a tender for project [NUMBER AND TITLE] for [INSERT SERVICE] in accordance with the approved PDDP at A.

[DETAIL THE RESERVE COMPANIES, IF ANY]

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [INSERT ALL BOARD MEMBER NAMES, DATE AND SIGN] |  |
|  |  |

# Annexes

1. Tender Closing Register
2. Detailed Board Comments on Submissions
3. Probity Adviser’s Report [IF APPLICABLE]
4. Information Documents and Addenda [IF APPLICABLE]

# ATTACHMENTS

A ATTACH COPIES OF PDDP, EVALUATION PLAN AND OTHER RELATED DOCUMENTS TO ASSIST IN EXECUTIVE REVIEW AND APPROVAL, AS APPROPRIATE.)