

# Procurement Evaluation Plan

Use this report to plan the evaluation process for the procurement. This Evaluation Plan is mandatory for some procurement activities, as specified in the *Schools Procurement Procedure Document*. Consult the Schools Procurement Branch for guidance as required.

<b>Tender Number: KPS</b>											
<b>Tender Name: Student Toilet Upgrade</b>											
<b>Tender Description: Internal refurbishment of student &amp; accessible toilet blocks</b>											
<b>Name of person completing this form: Vicki Beard</b>											
<b>Date Tender Issued: 24 August 2023</b>	<b>Closing Date for Tender: 27 October 2023</b>										
<p><b>Roles and Responsibilities</b></p> <p>Roles and responsibilities for each of the procurement activities are summarised in the Procurement Responsibility Matrix.</p> <p><b>Evaluation Team(s)</b></p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Evaluation Team Members</th> <th>Role</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Shaun McClare</td> <td>Chair</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Vicki Beard</td> <td>Member</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TBC</td> <td>Member</td> </tr> <tr> <td>TBC</td> <td>Member</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><b>Advisers</b></p> <p>Advisers are planned to be used in undertaking the Tender evaluation: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><b>Financial Authority</b></p> <p>The Kalinda Primary School Council will be responsible for approving the engagement of the preferred supplier.</p>		Evaluation Team Members	Role	Shaun McClare	Chair	Vicki Beard	Member	TBC	Member	TBC	Member
Evaluation Team Members	Role										
Shaun McClare	Chair										
Vicki Beard	Member										
TBC	Member										
TBC	Member										

## Evaluation Timetable

The proposed evaluation timetable is as follows:

Date	Action
27 / 10 / 2023	Request for Tender closing date
06 / 11 / 2023	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of initial response evaluation and recommendation of short list</li> <li>Scheduling and completion of interviews and reference checks</li> </ul>
09 / 11 / 2023	School Council approval of preferred supplier (special meeting)
10 / 11 / 2023	Preferred supplier notified
13 / 11 / 2023	Intended execution of Proposed Contract(s)
21 / 12 / 2023	Intended commencement date of services/delivery of goods

## Pricing Assessment

Price will be one consideration when evaluating supplier responses. The evaluation team must ensure that it is comparing like-with-like when assessing the prices quoted by different suppliers.

## Evaluation Criteria

Supplier responses will be evaluated and scored against the following weighted criteria:

Criteria Category	Detailed Criteria	Weighting (out of 5)	Suggested guidelines
Criteria 1 – Compliance with specifications	Compliance with specifications	5	Overview of how your business will meet the specification requirements outlined in the plans and finishes and fixtures schedule.
Criteria 2 – Compliance with legislative requirements	Compliance with legislative requirements	5	
Criteria 3 – Positive reputational practices	Positive reputational practices	5	Evidence of your business's quality processes and positive feedback from customers
Criteria 4 – Capability/ Resourcing	Capability/ Resourcing	4	Detail of your business's resources and systems to support the delivery of the required procurement.
Criteria 5 – Past Performance	Past Performance	3	Details of your knowledge and previous experience relevant to the required

			procurement with similar specifications
Criteria 6 – Support/ Value Add	Support/ Value Add	1	Details of any value adding factors, such as innovation, local job and sustainability initiative (if applicable)

## Standard Procurement Evaluation Procedures

### Evaluation Criteria

#### Criterion requiring a Yes/No assessment

- Financial Viability**  
 Consideration will be given to not proceeding to contract with any supplier who cannot demonstrate financial viability.
- Conflict of Interest**  
 Consideration will be given to not proceeding to contract with any supplier who has a current conflict of interest and where an effective management process cannot be negotiated.
- Insurance**  
 Insurance arrangements will be assessed and negotiated with due consideration of risk with the preferred supplier. If an agreed negotiated outcome cannot be achieved, consideration will be given to not proceeding to contract.
- Compliance with the Proposed Contract**  
 Non-compliance with the proposed contract will be assessed and negotiated with due consideration of risk with the preferred supplier. If an agreed negotiated outcome cannot be achieved, consideration will be given to not proceeding to contract.

#### Mandatory Criteria

Mandatory criteria are usually limited to industry standards, certifications, or membership with particular associations. Either you have it or you don't. Mandatory criteria are a "yes or no", "pass or fail"; the Offer is either accepted or rejected on the basis of meeting the criterion. There is no capacity to rank the bidders from highest (recommended) to lowest (not recommended).

#### Weighted capability criterion

- The criteria to be used in the evaluation of supplier responses will be subject to weighting. The suggested weightings (a numerical score out of 5) for each of the six suggested criteria are provided above in the 'Evaluation Criteria' section.
- Weighting allows you to rank the criteria by their importance to the project. Weighted scores mean that a supplier scoring 7 for a very important criterion (4) has a weighted score of 28, whereas a score of 7 for a minimum requirement criterion (1) would have a weighted score of 7; total weighted score 35. In contrast, a supplier scoring 5 for a very important criterion (4) has a weighted score of 20, and a score of 7 for a minimum requirement criterion (1) would have a weighted score of 7; total weighted score of 27.
- Note that it would be unusual for all weightings to be equal. Some criteria should clearly be more important, and therefore weighted higher, than other criteria.

## Scoring of Criteria

The table below provides suggested scoring for each of the six suggested criteria. This is a guide only and may be adjusted by schools to better suit their needs.

Score	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Criteria</b>					
<b>1. Compliance with specifications</b>	Does not meet any specification requirements	Meets a limited number of specification requirements	Meets most specification requirements	Meets all specification requirements	Exceeds all specification requirements
<b>2. Compliance with legislative requirements</b>	Significant non-adherence of legislative requirements	Meets some legislative requirements, but instances of non-adherence or lack of documented good-practice	Meet most legislative requirements, with only minor, correctable instances of non-adherence	Meets all legislative requirements	Exceeds all legislative requirements by demonstrating leading practice
<b>3. Positive reputational practices</b>	Documented instances of negative publicity, causing reputational damage	Sufficient reason to believe there are instances of negative publicity, causing reputational damage	Positive reputation, with instances of good publicity	Very good reputation, with instances of very good publicity	Exceptional reputation, with ongoing exceptional publicity
<b>4. Capability / resourcing</b>	No workforce capable of delivering the good / service	Limited workforce available to deliver the good / service	Skilled workforce available to deliver the good / service	Very skilled workforce, available to deliver the good / service	Highly skilled workforce available to deliver the good / service
<b>5. Past performance</b>	No experience in the school, education sector or of delivering the good / service	Limited experience in the school, education sector or of delivering the good / service	Some experience in the school, education sector or of delivering the good / service	Considerable experience in the school, education sector or of delivering the good / service	Extensive experience in the school, education sector or of delivering the good / service
<b>6. Support / value-add</b>	No services / support offered beyond the specification requirements	Limited services / support offered beyond the specification requirements	Some services / support offered beyond the specification requirements	Considerable level of services / support offered beyond the specification requirements	Extensive level of services / support offered beyond the specification requirements

## Price Assessment

The Evaluation Team will assess the supplier's pricing separately to and independent of the capability criteria, and the financial evaluation will:

- Take full account of any assumptions stated by suppliers in relation to the prices submitted in their response. Where assumptions between suppliers vary, these will be equalised to ensure that the eventual price comparison is undertaken on a like-for-like basis. Account will be taken of the two forms of assumption - those which seek to limit the supplier's risk and those that are merely documented to record the basis on which pricing has been calculated. Those assumptions that seek to limit the supplier's risk will be recognised in any subsequent sensitivity analysis;
- Extend any Schedule of Rates items to estimated workload quantities (if required); and
- Include any other financial sensitivity analysis needed to differentiate the real cost of various scenarios (if required).

## Evaluation Procedures

### Submission Details

- Schools must include the location and date and time for tender responses
- Schools should also plan the process for dealing with late applications

### Determination of shortlist

The Evaluation Team will determine the evaluation method to be used to determine the shortlist (if shortlisting is needed). The number and diversity of the Responses will be taken into account in deciding on the appropriate method, with all Responses considered on their merits.

Options to be considered may include:

- Having all the evaluation team participate in the shortlisting or only some of the members, or only the Principal; or
- Applying all the criterion, or only a number, e.g. the criteria relating to resources or past experience; or
- Allowing price to be the major determining criteria, and including all of the Responses that are within a particular price range.

Appropriate documentation of the evaluation will be maintained. Where scoring has been undertaken an Evaluation Matrix should be completed and kept as the record of the evaluation.

Interviews will not generally be conducted at this stage. Clarification questions will be directed to suppliers if required to allow differentiation of suppliers and completion of scoring.

### Evaluation of Shortlist

The Evaluation Team will complete a more detailed evaluation of the shortlisted Responses:

- Interviews in the form of short presentations by the supplier followed by a Question and Answer period may be conducted to allow a more detailed evaluation against the criteria.
- References may be obtained for all shortlisted suppliers to allow more detailed evaluation of supplier performance.
- Confirmation of the preferred supplier's financial capability may also be undertaken as a due diligence step, if required.
- Following the completion of the evaluation of the shortlisted suppliers, scores will be adjusted and a final ranking obtained.
- Consideration will be given to requesting the shortlisted suppliers to submit a Best and Final Offer in accordance with the Terms and Conditions of the Invitation to Supply.
- Negotiation of services and price will be undertaken as necessary to confirm that the best value for money is obtained.

### Value for Money

Value for Money (VFM) generally considers:

- The relative ranking of the supplier's Response against other supplier Responses after evaluation against the specific evaluation criteria;
- The supplier's price structures for the full contract period, when compared to other suppliers and the school's budget, and
- Any risks to the school or DE in entering into a contract with the supplier.

The risk areas to be considered will include, but may not be restricted to, the following:

- Budget – likelihood of costs exceeding the contracted amount;
- Schedule – likelihood that contracted timelines may not be achieved; and
- Performance – likelihood that contracted KPIs may not be achieved.

VFM determination will be agreed by the Evaluation Team in a team meeting.

### **Evaluation Report**

An Evaluation Report may be developed on behalf of the team and circulated to Evaluation Team members for review and endorsement. The Evaluation Report will contain a ranking of Responses, and a recommendation for the preferred supplier supported by the value for money case.

### **Approval of the Preferred Supplier**

The Evaluation Report must be forwarded to the School Council, and the School Council President and the School Principal must note and sign the reasons for engaging the preferred supplier.

### **Notification of the Preferred Supplier and Contract Execution**

The preferred supplier will be advised and invited to enter into a contract for the performance of the agreed services.

### **Notification of the Unsuccessful Suppliers**

Following contract execution, the unsuccessful suppliers will be advised within 7 working days. The supplier may request a debriefing meeting.