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#

# EVALUATION SUMMARY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **RESPONSE** |
| **Order Title:** | [Title]  |
| **Order Number:** | [Order Number] |
| **Customer:** | [Name of Public Authority/Customer]  |
| **Scope:** | [ ]  Co-Location Services [ ]  Network Services[ ]  Gateway Services [ ]  Cloud Services[ ]  IP Telephony Services [ ]  POTS Telephony Services     *Provide a brief overview of what is to be purchased/provided*See ‘**Scope of Contract**’ at **Section 2** for further information |
| **Order Term:** | [Order Term]  |
| Accepted Order(s): | Atos Australia Pty LtdDatacom Systems (AU) Pty LtdNEC Australia Pty Ltd*Select recommended contractor(s) and delete as necessary*See ‘**Recommendation**’ at **Section 6** |
| **Order Cost Estimate:****(pre-quote)** | $[insert $ amount] (Inc GST)[Include paragraph outlining how the pre-quote estimate was determined] |
| **Total Estimated Order Value:** **(post-quote)** | $[insert $ amount] (Inc GST)*If the Price Variance is significant, please provide an explanation as to why this is the case?*The estimated order value is based on estimated service use at this time but may vary depending on service use requirements over the order term.Notwithstanding this, the WA Procurement Rule requirements for publishing contract award information and order changes that result in increases to estimated total order value will be adhered to.*All orders with a value of $50K or over must be published on Tenders WA. Order changes over $50k or order changes that increase the original order value by more than $50K must be recorded on Tenders WA.*  |
| **Order Commencement Date:** |       |
| **Management Plan:**Accountable Authority or Delegate: *Delete if not required* | Yes / N/A[If “YES” insert name of Officer or delegate] |
| **Customer Relationship Manager:** | [Insert name of Officer or position] |

# ORDER FORM DEVELOPMENT

## SUMMARY

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **ITEM** | **RESPONSE** |
| **Risk Assessment:***This section to be included at the Customer’s discretion depending on the nature, complexity and risk of the procurement exercise, otherwise delete if not applicable* | *If no significant or high risks identified, insert* All identified risks were rated as low [or] moderate. *If any identified risks were rated as significant or high, insert the following, selecting the applicable rating(s)* Some identified risks were rated as significant and/or high. Refer ‘Risk Register’ at Section 10. |
| **Public Authority Approval to Proceed to Quote:** | Name: [name]Title: [title] |
| Exemptions or Policy Approvals under GNICT2015:*Delete if not applicable* | As the Contract Authority of GNICT2015, the Department of Finance granted approval for the exemption on:      **For the following Exemption(s):*** From the GovNext Buying Rules.

As the contract manager the Office of Digital Government approved the policy approval on:     **Policy Approval(s):*** Purchase of network equipment;
* To specify an order term longer than the maximum; and
* Hardware support/maintenance.

*Delete as appropriate* |
| **Interactive Workshops:*****Delete content that is not applicable*** | Yes / Not applicableThe following workshops were conducted:* Requirements workshop(s);
* Design workshop(s); and
* Clarification/negotiation workshop(s).

See ‘**workshops**’ in Section 9, for more details. |
| **Closing Date of Order Form: *The date the quotes were received*** |       |

# THE EVALUATION

## EVALUATION PANEL MEMBERS

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **NAME** | **JOB TITLE** | **AGENCY / ORGANISATION** | **ROLE** |
| **VOTING MEMBERS** |
|  |  |  | Chairperson |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| **NON-VOTING MEMBERS** |
|  |  |  | Facilitator |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

The evaluation panel chairperson was [Name, Title and Contact details]. The evaluation panel facilitator was [Name, Title and Contact details].

All evaluation panel members completed a declaration of confidentiality and conflict of interest. No conflicts were identified / The following conflicts were identified: *Delete this paragraph if declarations of confidentiality and interest were not used*

*If the evaluation panel contained a technical expert, identify that person and their role. If a probity advisor or auditor was engaged for this process, include details here*

## QUOTES RECEIVED

Quotes were received from the following contractors:

1. Atos Australia Pty Ltd (Subiaco, WA);
2. Datacom Systems (AU) Pty Ltd (East Perth, WA); and
3. NEC Australia Pty Ltd (Perth, WA).

*Delete any GovNext contractor(s) that were not invited to submit a quote. The GovNext Umbrella Agreement requires all contractors invited to submit a quote, to do so*

## EVALUATION SCORE

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **EVALUATION CRITERIA** | **ATOS AUSTRALIA** | **DATACOM SYSTEMS** | **NEC AUSTRALIA** |
| 1 | Proposed Services |  |  |  |
| 2 | Transition Plan |  |  |  |
| 3 | Acceptance Test Plan |  |  |  |
| **Total Score** |  |  |  |
| **Evaluation Ranking** |  |  |  |

## EVALUATION RANKING

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **RESPONDENT** | **EVALUATION RANKING** | **EVALUATION SCORE** | **PRICE RANKING** | **PRICE****(INC GST)** |
| Atos Australia |  |  |  |  |
| Datacom Systems |  |  |  |  |
| NEC Australia |  |  |  |  |

*Note: sections 3.5 & 3.6 should be included when clarification or negotiation workshops are conducted. Delete these sections if no clarifications or negotiations are required and you are progressing straight to award.*

## PRIME COONTRACTOR QUOTE(S) REJECTED

Following the evaluation process the Evaluation Panel concluded the quote(s) from Atos Australia Datacom Systems NEC Australia would not be subject to further consideration and subsequently rejected in accordance with Clause 6.2(d) of the Customer Relationship Terms.

## SELECTED PRIME CONTRACTOR FOR CLARIFICATION / NEGOTIATIONS

Atos Australia Datacom Systems NEC Australia was selected from the evaluation to proceed to the Clarification/Negotiation workshop(s).

Following the Clarification/Negotiation Workshop(s) Atos Australia Datacom Systems NEC Australia submitted an updated quote which included the agreed amendments. The evaluation panel reconvened and recommenced the acceptance/rejection of the quote. (For information on the workshops see section 4)

*Note: there is no preferred respondent stage in GovNext evaluations and negotiations are conducted prior to the completion and approval of the evaluation report*

##

##

# WORKSHOP(S)

There were no workshops conducted during the ordering process.

*Or*

The following workshops were conducts as part of the ordering process.

*Delete specific workshop sections if not conducted*

## REQUIREMENTS WORKSHOP(S)

The requirements workshop was/were held on the please select date.

A workshop(s)was / were held with:

* Atos Australia Pty Ltd;
* Datacom Systems (AU) Pty Ltd; and
* NEC Australia Pty Ltd.

The major topics discussed at the workshop included:*Insert details outlining the key topics of conversation covered during the workshop, and what those topics covered*

Key findings / outcomes that resulted from the workshop(s) included:

* Insert finding; and
* Insert finding.

## DESIGN WORKSHOP(S)

The design workshop was/were held on the please select date.

A workshop(s)was / were held with:

* Atos Australia Pty Ltd;
* Datacom Systems (AU) Pty Ltd; and
* NEC Australia Pty Ltd.

The major topics discussed at the workshop included: *Insert details outlining the key topics of conversation covered during the workshop, and what those topics covered*

Key findings / outcomes that resulted from the workshop(s) included:

* Insert finding; and
* Insert finding.

## CLARIFICATION / NEGOTIATION WORKSHOP(S)

The clarification workshop(s) was/were held on the please select date.

A workshop(s) was / were held with:

* Atos Australia Pty Ltd;
* Datacom Systems (AU) Pty Ltd; and
* NEC Australia Pty Ltd.

The major topics discussed at the workshop(s) included: *Insert details outlining the key topics of conversation covered during the workshop, and what those topics covered*

 Key findings / outcomes that resulted from the workshop(s) included:

* Insert finding; and
* Insert finding.

# RECOMMENDATION

## BASIS

The quote submitted by [name of contractor] is the evaluation panel’s recommended quote.

The basis for this decision is as follows:

1. Quality

[Discuss]

1. Price

[Discuss]

1. Summary

[Discuss]

In summary, [name of contractor] is best suited to meet the service requirements and represents value for money.

# ENDORSEMENT BY EVALUATION PANEL

 DATE: / /2021

Panel member name position and agency

 DATE: / /2021

Panel member name position and agency

 DATE: / /2021

Panel member name position and agency

# EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

EVALUATION OF QUOTES

The evaluation of the quotes was based on the following:

## PROPOSED SERVICES EVALUATION

*Delete all or specific criteria not used in the evaluation*

1. **SERVICES OFFERED**

What services does the contractor propose to utilise in the delivery of the services and what addition services were outlined to improve the service delivery or service standard,

* Do the proposed services meet the requirements?
* Are there any additional options proposed as part of the service offering?
* Is there additional cost for the value add services?
1. **TRANSITION PLAN**

Does the transition plan articulate the tasks the contractor is required to perform to ensure performance of the complex services is in accordance with the requirements of the agreement?

* Does the plan articulate the stages and process for transition?
* Can the contractor meet the proposed timeline for implementation of the services?
* Are the roles and responsibilities clear?
* Are the specified personnel outlined in the transition plan suitably qualified, experienced and available during the transition timeline?
1. **ACCEPTANCE TESTING PLAN**

Does the acceptance testing plan articulate the tasks the contractor is required to perform and what tasks the customer is to perform in relation to acceptance testing, user acceptance testing and signoff of successful acceptance/user acceptance testing?

* Does the acceptance testing plan articulate the criteria for acceptance testing?
* Does the plan articulate the stages, process and procedures for acceptance testing?
* Are the roles and responsibilities clear?
* Is there sufficient detail on the proposed test environment(s)?

## PRICING EVALUATION

1. **PRICE OF OFFERED SERVICES**
* Does the price proposed meet the anticipated budget estimate?
* Is this the lowest price quote received?
* Does the quote represent value for money?

# EVALUATION RATING SCALE

A rating scale of 0-4 was used for evaluating each quote. Evaluation panel members scored each quote on the evaluation criteria. The rating scale and a description for the range of scores is shown in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SCORE** | **DESCRIPTION** |
| **0** | The quote provides an unsatisfactory level of detail in relation to the delivery of the proposed services.The evaluation panel are not confident in the proposed services. |
| **1** | The quote provides a poor level of detail in relation to the delivery of the proposed services.The evaluation panel are have concerns regarding the proposed services. |
| **2** | The quote provides a satisfactory level of detail in relation to the delivery of the proposed services.The evaluation panel are satisfied with the proposed services. |
| **3** | The quote provides a good level of detail in relation to the delivery of the proposed services.The evaluation panel are confident in the proposed services. |
| **4** | The quote provides a very good level of detail in relation to the delivery of the proposed services.The evaluation panel are very confident in the proposed services. |

## PRICING EVALUATION OF QUOTES

Quotes were ranked in pricing order from lowest cost to highest cost e.g.

* Lowest cost quote = 1
* Middle cost quote = 2
* Highest cost quote = 3

# EVALUATION SUMMARY

## SUMMARY OF EVALUATION COMMENTS

A summary statement for each contractor’s quote is provided below.

The summaries have been prepared for the purposes of providing feedback to the contractors and as a brief overview of the evaluation process.

The summaries are not meant to cover all criteria and issues discussed by the evaluation panel.

* 1. **ATOS AUSTRALIA**
* Total evaluation score [insert score] – ranking [insert ranking]/3
* Total cost $[insert amount] (Inc GST) – ranking [insert ranking]/3

**PROPOSED SERVICES EVALUATION**

1. **PROPOSED SERVICES**
2. **TRANSITION PLAN**
3. **ACCEPTANCE TESTING PLAN**

**PRICING EVALUATION**

1. **PRICE OF OFFERED SERVICES**

**Outcome:** Accept / Reject

* 1. **DATACOM SYSTEMS**
* Total evaluation score [insert score] – ranking [insert ranking]/3
* Total cost $[insert amount] (Inc GST) – ranking [insert ranking]/3

**PROPOSED SERVICES EVALUATION**

1. **PROPOSED SERVICES**
2. **TRANSITION PLAN**
3. **ACCEPTANCE TESTING PLAN**

**PRICING EVALUATION**

1. **PRICE OF OFFERED SERVICES**

**Outcome:** Accept / Reject

* 1. **NEC AUSTRALIA**
* Total evaluation score [insert score] – ranking [insert ranking]/3
* Total cost $[insert amount] (Inc GST) – ranking [insert ranking]/3

**PROPOSED SERVICES EVALUATION**

1. **PROPOSED SERVICES**
2. **TRANSITION PLAN**
3. **ACCEPTANCE TESTING PLAN**

**PRICING EVALUATION**

1. **PRICE OF OFFERED SERVICES**

**Outcome:** Accept / Reject

# RISK REGISTER

*Insert a risk register here if required*

*There is no single risk register or table that must be used in this section. The Risk Register provided in the Department of Finance ‘Risk Workbook’ template can be used, or any other risk register, table or other means of documenting risk.*

*As a minimum, this appendix should describe the risks identified, along with their ratings and treatment strategies employed.*