

Standard evaluation process

1. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

- 1.1 Offers MUST satisfy the Mandatory Conditions for Participation (MCP), if any, before they can be evaluated.
- 1.2 Offers satisfying the MCP will be evaluated using the standard Commonwealth ATM evaluation criteria as follows:
 - a) extent to which the Potential Supplier's Response meets the Customer's Requirement set out in the ATM;
 - b) Potential Supplier's proven capacity to provide the Requirement; and
 - c) *total costs to be incurred by the Customer.*
- 1.3 Minimum of 2 people should undertake the evaluation.
- 1.4 For the purposes of providing a consistent methodology for scoring of offers, the scoring regime set out in the table below MUST be used.
- 1.5 The Evaluation of Offer/s Sheet in PART 2 will be used to record the evaluation of offers:
- 1.6 The Offer achieving the highest score (combination of Technical and Price) will be considered to be highest value for money outcome and is therefore the preferred supplier.

2. PROBITY

- 2.1 All offers must be treated as confidential and must be kept in a secure place when not being attended. Only agency staff (and any technical advisors) involved with the evaluation process will have access to offers.
- 2.2 The evaluation process and the content of documentation must not be discussed by the Committee with any person outside the evaluation process, unless that person has a legitimate 'need-to-know' for the purpose of performing his or her duties.
- 2.3 APS employees involved in RFX process are reminded of their obligations to adhere to the *APS Code of Conduct* and the APS Values.
- 2.4 Any person involved in the RFX process will be required to declare any conflict of interest.
- 2.5 If a conflict of interest (including potential or apparent conflict of interest) is declared, the Delegate and/or Probity Advisor, must decide on the appropriate course of action to resolve or manage the conflict of interest. A record of the conflict of interest declaration and the delegate's decision must be kept.
- 2.6 Agency staff and advisors involved in the evaluation process must not solicit or accept gifts, offers of employment or entertainment. Any such offer MUST be reported to the Delegate.

Score	Criteria	Description
(5) Good	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the requirements and offers increased levels of service/goods. • Provides demonstrated evidence, which is substantiated, of their capability and capacity to provide the increased levels of services/goods at a high standard. • No risks/issues identified.
	Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price/rates provided in accordance with ATM. • Price is feasible, at the lower range of budget.
(4) Above Average	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the requirements. • Provided demonstrated evidence, which is substantiated, of where the proposed levels of services/goods are being or have been provided at a very good standard. • Insignificant risks/issues identified which do not require strategies to manage.
	Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price/rates provided in accordance with ATM. • Price is feasible, at the mid-range of budget.
(3) Average	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets the requirements as stated in the requirements. • Provided evidence (may or may not be substantiated) where similar services/goods to those being offered are being provided or have been provided previously, at an acceptable level. • Minor risks/issues identified which require minor strategies to manage.
	Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price/rates provided in accordance with ATM. • Price is feasible, at the higher end of the budget.
(2) Marginal	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet all the requirements. • Provided limited evidence (may or may not be substantiated) of where similar services/goods are being provided or have been previously provided. • Medium risks/issues identified which require detailed strategies to manage.
	Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price/rates essentially provided in accordance with ATM.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price may not be feasible and/or may not be workable form a budget perspective.
	(1) Unacceptable	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet the requirements.
		Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Price is not feasible and/or is not workable from a budget perspective.
	(0) Unacceptable	Technical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to provide a response.
		Price	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failed to provide price/rates.