

Objective or scope of works or services to be provided	The project aims to address the need for a more formalised downhill mountain bike trails network within Isaacs Pines to allow better management of these trails to meet community needs.	
Type	SHORT FROM OF TENDER (CONSTRUCTION)	
Funding	TAMS Capital Upgrades 2015-16 Budget	
	Budget appropriation (all figures ex GST)	\$185,000.00
	CWDD costs, planning consultant and signage	\$63,000.00
	TOTAL Project Budget – delivery by PCW:	\$122,000.00
	PCW Fees (4% total appropriation)	\$7,400.00
	Construction contingency (incl. Active certification)	\$14,000.00
	Specialist construction contractor	\$95,000.00
	Client Representative	\$6,000.00
Site	Pine Plantation located to the south of the Isaacs Ridge Reserve	
Consultation (including pre tender)	Community Consultation was undertaken by the client with stakeholders and user groups.	

PROCUREMENT RISK	
Risk	See Attached Risk Plan at Attachment A

PROCUREMENT METHODOLOGY	
Description of the procurement method to be used	Select tender to companies with proven experience in trails design and construction in the ACT. Presently there are only 3 firms with this knowledge and experience working in the local area that fit this criterion. All three will be approached to provide a quotation for this work.
Evaluation	See Attached Evaluation Plan at Attachment B
Is this suitable to be a Social Procurement?	It is intended that the local community will undertake the ongoing maintenance of the trails once competed.

EVALUATION TEAM			
Name	1. Steve Thomas	2. Sophie Clement <i>Kate Madden &</i>	3. Natasha Leggett
Position	Chair	Member	Member
Agency	PCW	<i>UPR PCS</i>	UPR
Statement on team composition	The team is a blend of PCW and Client staff with experience in the selection of suitable contractors to undertake this type of work.		

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	
Number of contracts	One

CONTRACT MANAGEMENT	
Contract management	A project specialist superintendent has been engaged by the agency to oversee the works.
Period of contract(s)	6 months for construction with a 12 month DLP period attached.

AUSTRALIAN FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS (FTAs)	
Does the AUSFTA / Australia-Chile FTA apply?	N/A

AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT FUNDING	
Is there Australian Government funding attached to the procurement?	No.

EXEMPTIONS	
Exemption	Nil exemptions are being sought.
Reason for Exemption	N/A

SHARED SERVICES PROCUREMENT RECOMMENDATION			
Project Officer	Steve Thomas	Signature and Date	<i>[Signature]</i> 20/11/15
		Phone Number	6205 4972
Manager	Barry Ingram	Signature and Date	<i>[Signature]</i> 23/11/15

AGENCY ENDORSEMENT			
Name	Sophie Clement	Phone Number	62074857
Position	Project Officer		
Signature	<i>[Signature]</i>	Date	23/11/15

DIRECTOR GENERAL/DELEGATE APPROVAL			
Name	-DHHH B. McQuert		
Position	Svr	Manager, Urban Places and Reserves, CWDD	
Statement	<i>APPROVED</i>		
Signature	<i>[Signature]</i>	Date	23/11/15

This Version 7.0 template has been developed in accordance the ACTIA Risk Matrix Template and with the ISO 31000:2009 risk management standard.

The following template will assist in the risk management process, to set the context and /or support decisions made throughout the risk management process. A stakeholder analysis should be completed first as it also helps to identify risks.

Analysing the risk (rating the risk) under ISO 31000:2009

- ✘ No longer accepted practice to rate “Raw risk”.
 - “Consequences, likelihoods and levels of risk will depend on the controls that are in place and their effectiveness “ (SA/SNZ HB 89:2013).
 - ✘ Do not arrive at the risk level prior to treatment or inclusion of risk mitigation strategies
 - ✘ Must consider the current controls before rating the risk where a Control is a measure in place to manage risk. (ISO Guide 73:2009)
- ✘ Must rate the consequence prior to the likelihood
 - “Risk is analysed by determining consequences and their likelihood.” (ISO 31000:2009)
- ✘ The consequence should be defined in its most normal form and not an extreme version of the risk.
 - ✘ For example a personal injury as a result of a paper cut would result in a minor injury not requiring medical treatment. It would not in the normal form result in blood poisoning and death.
- ✘ Following the process of ISO 31000:2009 there are three questions to ask:
 1. What is the consequence that the risk would take in its “most normal form” (not an extreme form) should the risk occur?
 2. What is the likelihood of that consequence? (How likely it the consequence to occur?)
 3. How good are the existing controls at managing the risk?
- ✘ Make an assessment as to the effectiveness of current controls
 - Adequate – doing everything we can
 - Room for improvement – more that could be done
 - Inadequate – controls do not treat the root cause of the risk.



ACT
Government

Commerce and Works

Capital Works Procurement Risk Management Plan

Project:	Isaacs Ridge Trail Network Upgrade Project
Project Objectives:	This projects aims to address the need for a formalised downhill mountain bike trails within the Isaacs Pines to better manage use and meet community needs.

Scope of the risk assessment	This risk assessment identifies and manages risks that relate to the procurement and the procurement process. Risks that relate to the construction phase of the project, onsite safety, ongoing relationship management with the successful tenderer and other operational risks are not the subject matter of this risk assessment.
-------------------------------------	---

Created by: Steve Thomas

Reviewed by: Barry Ingram

Date: Nov 2015

Stakeholder Analysis

Internal and External [Name and Agency/Organisation]	Level of Influence (over Procurement) [Ability to influence project outcome]	Level of interest (over Procurement) [Level of interest in the project outcome]
Urban Places & Reserves (UPR)	Moderate level of influence	High level of interest
Yarralumla Nursery Staff (YNS)	Moderate level of influence	High level of interest
Procurement Capital Works (PCW)	High level of Influence	High level of Interest

Risk Criteria



ACT Government Risk Matrix

Frequency	Almost Certain	Likely	Possible	Unlikely	Rare
>1 in 10	Is expected to occur in most circumstances	Will probably occur	Might occur at some time in the future	Could occur but doubtful	May occur but only in exceptional circumstances
1 in 10 - 100	Once a quarter or more	Once a year or more	Once every 1-5 years	Once every 5-20 years	Once every 20-100 years
1 in 100 - 1,000					
1 in 1,000 - 10,000					
1 in 10,000 - 100,000					

Risk Control Effectiveness

Control Effectiveness	Guide
Adequate	Nothing more to be done except review and monitor the existing controls. Controls are well designed for the risk, are largely preventative and address the root causes and Management believes that they are effective.
Room for improvement	Most Controls are designed correctly and are in place and effective however there are some controls that are either not correctly designed or are not very effective. There may be an over-reliance on reactive controls. Some more work to be done to improve operating.
Inadequate	Significant control gaps or no credible control. Either controls do not treat root causes or they do not operate effectively. Controls if they exist are just reactive. Management has no confidence that any degree of control is being achieved due to poor control design and/or very limited operational effectiveness.

Risk Register - Procurement

People	Reputation & Image	Business Processes & Systems	Financial	Operational	Insignificant	Minor	Major	Catastrophic
Injuries or ailments not requiring medical treatment.	Internal Review	Minor errors in systems or processes requiring corrective action, or minor delay without impact on overall schedule.	2.5% of Budget	> 5% of Budget	Minor injury or First-Aid Treatment Cases.	Life threatening injury or multiple serious injuries causing hospitalisation, intense public, political and media scrutiny. Eg. front page headlines, TV, etc.	Death or multiple life threatening injuries.	
Minor injury or First-Aid Treatment Cases.	Scrutiny required by internal committees or internal audit to prevent escalation.	Transient, minor effects	Mostly repairable damage	Permanent damage to structures or significance	Scrutiny required by external committees or ACT Auditor General's Office, or Inquest, etc.	Significant, medium-term environmental harm	Irreparable damage to highly valued items of cultural significance	
Minor injury or First-Aid Treatment Cases.	Scrutiny required by internal committees or internal audit to prevent escalation.	Transient, minor effects	Mostly repairable damage	Permanent damage to structures or significance	Scrutiny required by external committees or ACT Auditor General's Office, or Inquest, etc.	Significant, medium-term environmental harm	Irreparable damage to highly valued items of cultural significance	
Minor injury or First-Aid Treatment Cases.	Scrutiny required by internal committees or internal audit to prevent escalation.	Transient, minor effects	Mostly repairable damage	Permanent damage to structures or significance	Scrutiny required by external committees or ACT Auditor General's Office, or Inquest, etc.	Significant, medium-term environmental harm	Irreparable damage to highly valued items of cultural significance	

Priority For Attention

Priority	Suggested Timing of Treatment	Authority for controlled tolerance of risk
High	Short term - normally within one month Detailed action plan required	Director-General
High	Medium Term - normally within three months Needs senior management attention	Senior Executive
Medium	Normally within 1 year Specify management responsibility	Managers
Low	Ongoing control as part of a management system. Manage by routine procedures	All Staff

Priority for Attention - Action
Every care should be taken to act as soon as possible to implement risk control measures where ever possible or to take action to fix the problem. Extreme Risks and High Risks especially where the risk relates to people & personal injury require us to act immediately to take steps to fix the problem.

** The suggested timing of treatment does not mean that immediate action might not be taken or that the timing can not be completed sooner than suggested.

Notes:
When identifying, analysing and rating risk consideration should be given, but not necessarily limited to, the attached categories of risk and the suggested examples of frequency and consequences.

This risk register is a 'dynamic risk register' consistent with AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009 risk management standard. Identify the risks, which could affect the successful outcome of the procurement and group by type of risk such as:

1. Procurement Risks: eg delays, process runs over time, no suitable tenders received, statement of requirements inadequately defined

Risk No	Risk Description (Cause/ Source) The risk event, source and cause. What can happen and how it comes about.	Describe the consequence If what can happen does happen what is the impact/outcome?	Actions to be taken: risk control/ treatment and risk owner How are Risks to be Managed and by whom? Risk controls and risk treatments – actions to be taken to manage the risk.	Risk Owner (area /person responsible for managing the risk)	Consequence Rating	Likelihood Rating	Residual Risk Rating	Control Effectiveness Rating
1	<p>Delay in procurement processes –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preparation of Documentation ▪ Delegate and client approvals 	<p>Delays to the program affecting the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tendering start/end dates • Evaluation/contract dates • Start/end of works 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Allow reasonable time in project schedule for procurement document development and approvals. ▪ Raise potential delays early with client and delegate. ▪ Maintain high level of quality control over formal procurement documents and approval process. ▪ Maintain high level of liaison with stakeholders during procurement period. ▪ Tender documentation clearly outlines the tender evaluation process and the tenderer requirements. • Tender period long enough for tenderers to prepare good quality 	UPR/PCW	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Adequate

Risk No	Risk Description (Cause / Source) The risk event, source and cause. What can happen and how it comes about.	Describe the consequence If what can happen does happen what is the impact / outcome?	Actions to be taken: risk control / treatment and risk owner How are Risks to be Managed and by whom? Risk controls and risk treatments – actions to be taken to manage the risk.	Risk Owner (area / person responsible for managing the risk)	Consequence Rating	Likelihood Rating	Residual Risk Rating	Control Effectiveness Rating
2	Tenders received exceed the approved budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation process takes longer, delaying the construction programme. Negotiation with the tenderers takes longer. Funds are insufficient to complete all the intended scope of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtain pre tender design estimates and adjust the scope or budget to suit. Reduce the scope of work to suit the approved budget. Negotiate a reduced scope of work with lowest tenderer. Tenderers are required to submit a detailed break up of prices, to aid analysis and evaluation of tenders. Prior to tender, establish the priority of the scope of work. UPR to allocate additional funds to enable full scope to proceed. 	UPR UPR TET PCW UPR UPR	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Adequate

Risk	Risk Description (Cause / Source) The risk event, source and cause. What can happen and how it comes about	Describe the consequence If what can happen does happen what is the impact / outcome?	Actions to be taken: risk control / treatment and risk owner How are Risks to be Managed and by whom? Risk controls and risk treatments – actions to be taken to manage the risk	Risk Owner (area / person responsible for managing the risk)	Consequence Rating	Likelihood Rating	Residual Risk Rating	Control Effectiveness Rating
3	Tenders received are not compliant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation process takes longer, delaying the construction programme. Negotiation with the tenderers takes longer. Works are not completed in a timely manner. Insufficient tenders received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Risk of non compliance is reduced by keeping selection criteria relevant to the scope of works Contact all tenderers prior to release of RFT to qualify willingness and capacity to Tender. Supply advance information to better inform the Tenderers 	UPR/PACS PCW PCW	Major	Rare	Medium	Adequate
4	Poor quality of Tenders received	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation process takes longer, delaying the construction programme. Negotiation with the tenderers takes longer. Works are not completed in a timely manner. No tenders are acceptable. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow adequate time for tender documents to reviewed by UPR & PCW Ensure tender period is long enough for tenderers to prepare quality tender submissions. Negotiate with the lowest tenderer 	UPR/PCW PCW TET	Minor	Possible	Medium	Adequate
5	Internal approvals are delayed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works are not completed in a timely manner. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tender evaluation Team to be well prepared. Allow adequate time for tender evaluation and signoff. 	UPR/PCW UPR/PCW	Minor	Possible	Medium	Adequate

Risk No	Risk Description (Cause/Source) The risk event, source and cause. What can happen and how it comes about	Describe the consequence If what can happen does happen what is the impact/outcome?	Actions to be taken: risk control / treatment and risk owner How are Risks to be Managed and by whom? Risk controls and risk treatments – actions to be taken to manage the risk.	Risk Owner (area /person responsible for managing the risk)	Consequence Rating	Likelihood Rating	Residual Risk Rating	Control Effectiveness Rating
6	Tender documents are misunderstood.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The evaluation process takes longer, delaying the construction programme. Negotiation with the tenderers takes longer. Works are not completed in a timely manner. Unacceptable number variations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow adequate time for tender documents to reviewed by UPR & PCW Ensure tender period is long enough for tenderers to prepare quality tender submissions. Allow extra time for answering RFI during the tender period Allow adequate contingency 	UPR/PCW PCW PCW UPR/PCW	Minor	Possible	Medium	Adequate
7.	Tenderer pulls out during tender process.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced number of acceptable applicants. Insufficient tenders received. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure tender lists are evenly rotated as much as practical, to distributed workloads across industry Contact all Tenderers prior to release of RFT to qualify willingness and capacity to Tender 	PCW	Moderate	Possible	Medium	Adequate

Risk Treatment Action Plan

A risk action treatment plan is required for all risks, where the control effectiveness rating is "room for improvement" or "inadequate."

Risk Ref No	Risk Description (Cause/ Source) The risk event, source and cause. What can happen and how it comes about	Additional actions to be taken to manage the risk. In addition to actions listed above. (Including the riskowner)	Residual Risk Rating	Monitoring and Reporting	Emergency Response should Control Measures Fail Contingency Plan

13

Clement, SophieJ

From: Binks, Richard
Sent: Friday, 4 December 2015 3:33 PM
To: Clement, SophieJ
Subject: RE: Isaacs Ridge - RFT additional provider

Hi Sophie,

I have sought advice on this. Once a select tender has been opened tenderers cannot be added. We could only include this tenderer if we restarted the process.

Regards

richard

From: Clement, SophieJ
Sent: Friday, 4 December 2015 3:02 PM
To: Binks, Richard
Subject: Isaacs Ridge - RFT additional provider

Hi Richard,

As discussed, would it be possible to invite a fourth provider to tender on the Isaacs Ridge mountain bike trail upgrade project? A local provider has shown interest in the tender – details below.

Is there a pre-qualification requirement for this tender? My understanding is there is not one.

Thanks,
Sophie

[Redacted content]

Sophie Clement | Project Officer
Phone 02 6207 4857

DESIGN & DEVELOPMENT | CAPITAL WORKS DESIGN & DELIVERY | ROADS & PUBLIC TRANSPORT DIVISION | TERRITORY & MUNICIPAL SERVICES |
Macarthur House | 12 Wattle St LYNEHAM | GPO Box 158 Canberra ACT 2601 |



*Think before you print: 1 ream of paper=6% of a tree and 5.4kg of CO₂ in the atmosphere; 3 sheets of A4 paper=1 litre of water

Clement, SophieJ

From: [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, 15 December 2015 9:07 AM
To: Clement, SophieJ
Subject: Re: Tender 27512.300: Isaacs Ridge

Thanks Sophie.

On 15 Dec 2015, at 8:45 AM, Clement, SophieJ <SophieJ.Clement@act.gov.au> wrote:

Hi [redacted]

I have contacted Richard and Stephen's manager with your below request as I understand Stephen is not back until tomorrow and I am unable to provide a copy of the document. He should have an officer action the request this morning. Give me a call (6207 4857) or email if you don't hear from them by after lunch today (say 2pm) and I'll follow up.

Thanks,
Sophie

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 14 December 2015 5:48 PM
To: Clement, SophieJ
Cc: Darren Stewart
Subject: FW: Tender 27512.300: Isaacs Ridge

Hi Sophie

An auto reply from Richard requests that I ask my question below of Steve Thoms. This email address doesn't work and neither does using Thomas. There is no phone number provided. Can you assist me or forward to Steve please?


[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: Monday, 14 December 2015 5:41 PM
To: 'Richard.binks@act.gov.au' <Richard.binks@act.gov.au>
Subject: Tender 27512.300: Isaacs Ridge

Hi Richard

Could you please provide the Tender Form in Word format for inclusion in our response? It seems to be in PDF only at the moment.

Thanks so much.



This email, and any attachments, may be confidential and also privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender and delete all copies of this transmission along with any attachments immediately. You should not copy or use it for any purpose, nor disclose its contents to any other person.

15

Bruan, Nicole

From: Clement, SophieJ
Sent: Tuesday, 15 December 2015 11:14 AM
To: Ashley, Katherine
Cc: Thomas, Stephen (ACTPS); Ingram, Barry
Subject: FW: Change to the Tender Evaluation Team
Attachments: Revised Evaluation Plan to PPM - 15 December 2015.docx; Isaacs Ridge trails - evaluatin team

Hi Katherine,

Yes, I can confirm the change to the Tender Evaluation Plan as attached. We did initially nominate PCS Ranger Kate Hadden (see attached email) to be the third team member however she was unable to be on the team due to other PCS duties.

Thanks,
Sophie

From: Ashley, Katherine
Sent: Tuesday, 15 December 2015 9:55 AM
To: Clement, SophieJ
Cc: Thomas, Stephen (ACTPS); Ingram, Barry
Subject: Change to the Tender Evaluation Team

Hi Sophie

Can you please confirm the changes to the Tender Evaluation Plan (see attached) for our records, this will need to go with the PPM when the Contracts are executed.

Regards

Katherine Ashley | Senior Project Manager
BESc | BArch | BID
6 | M

Procurement and Capital Works | Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate | ACT Government
Level 2 Annex, Macarthur House, 12 Wattle St, Lyneham ACT 2602 | www.act.gov.au

Revised Evaluation Plan

1. Introduction

This Evaluation Plan relates to the tender processes to engage a contractor for the construction of new irrigation pump house and another tender process to select a contractor to undertake the irrigation works.

This plan details the Evaluation Team and its responsibilities, the evaluation methodology and the evaluation criteria by which offers received will be evaluated. The Request for Tender or other procurement/tender documents must include the evaluation criteria and methodology as set out herein.

The methodology for this procurement will be select tender to engage a contractor for the construction a new pump house. An open tender will be used to select a suitable irrigation contractor the irrigation works. All processes will be undertaken in accordance with the Government Procurement Act, supporting regulation and the endorsed procurement plan.

2. Evaluation Team

The evaluation team detailed below has been formed to evaluate the responses to the tender.

All members of the evaluation team are aware of their responsibilities and obligation to demonstrate impartiality and equity to all respondents.

2.1 Role

The evaluation team will be responsible for:

- a) maintaining probity;
- b) evaluating the responses in accordance with the criteria and methodology;
- c) documenting the evaluation process;
- d) preparing an evaluation report;
- e) seek Director General or Delegate approval to proceed with a contract with the preferred respondent; and
- f) debriefing unsuccessful respondents.

2.3 Members

Members of the evaluation team are personally appointed and should not be withdrawn or replaced without the approval of the Director General or Delegate.

Position	Name	Directorate
Chair	Steve Thomas	PCW
Member	Katherine Ashley	PCW
Member	Natasha Leggett	UPR

2.4 Specialist Advice and Support

The evaluation team may, as required, utilise specialist advice to assist in the evaluation process.

The areas of experience may include:

- a) technical analysis, including advice from Consultants and PCW Directors/Managers;
- b) past performance, including advice from officers within ACT Government
- c) financial assessment;
- d) assessment of the Work Health and Safety System;
- e) probity and technical procurement advice, including from the ACT Government Solicitor and PCW Directors/Managers (such advice may include, but not be limited to, technical drafting advice and review of draft evaluation reports for clarity and consistency with the *Government Procurement Act 2001* (ACT) and the RFT)*; and
- f) legal issues, including advice from the ACT Government Solicitor.

3. Evaluation Process and Criteria

3.1 Evaluation Process

- a) All tenders will be assessed using the methodology outlined below. The methodology takes into consideration the process that will be used to assess value for money. Tenderers will be required to address the Evaluation Criteria listed as part of their Tender Submission and the Evaluation Team will examine each offer received.
- b) Any offer that does not comply with the Conditions of Tender in the Contract documents or is incomplete may be deemed to be non-conforming and may be excluded from further consideration. Tenders not complying with any of the Mandatory Criteria will be excluded from further consideration;
- c) Public Sector Offers: Any offers received from Government bodies (Local, State, Territory or Commonwealth) will be evaluated using the principle of 'competitive neutrality' as defined by the National Competition Policy, i.e. offers should include all commercial costs that private sector organisations would include in their offers;
- d) An Alternative tender may only be considered if it is submitted together with conforming tender. If considered, they will initially be evaluated to determine if they provide a product or service which at least equals the project objectives set out in the tender documents. Should such an offer be considered not to provide such benefit it may be excluded from further consideration;
- e) The Evaluation Team may seek in writing additional information for clarification of offers received where this information does not materially impact on the conformance of the tender nor alter the tender price. All clarifications will be fully documented and appropriately filed.

- f) The Evaluation Team may seek an independent Safety Professional's assessment of each Tenderer's submission against Assessable Criteria 5 – Work Health and Safety System. The independent Safety Professional will provide a written report supporting the score (0 – 10 range in accordance with the attached Risk Rating Table), and this score will generally be adopted by the Tender Evaluation Team.
- g) Initially the tender will be scored against the Evaluation Criteria using the scoring regime in the Risk Rating Table attached to this plan. The Evaluation Team will reach a consensus score for each response. The overall score is the cumulative total of individual weighted criteria multiplied by their respective score.
- h) Where any offer is rated a score of 3 or below, for any individual criterion, it may be excluded from further consideration where the Evaluation Team considers the offer represents an unacceptable risk to the Territory.
- i) The tenders shall then be ranked on the basis of score and may be short-listed. Tenders short-listed will be those with the highest scores. A shortlist may be made up of 2 - 3 Tenderers.
- j) The short-listed tenders may be further assessed by comparison with the lowest priced tender to test if the difference in price of the highest scored tender represents value for money for the specific project.
- k) The preferred tenderer will be the tenderer offering best value for money having regard to all relevant factors and may not necessarily be the tenderer with the highest score. These relevant factors **must** be disclosed in the RFT and must include "the level of risk to which the proposed solution exposes the interests of the ACT".
- l) If the preferred tenderer is not the tenderer with the highest score, full justification for selection of another short listed tender will be provided.
- m) The short-listed tenderers may be requested to attend an interview with the Evaluation Team. The full Evaluation Team will be present at the interview. All documentation presented and minutes of the interview will be kept for inclusion into the Contract should the tenderer be successful.
- n) The risk assessment in the approved Procurement Plan for this project may be utilised to test if reduction in identified risks justifies the selection or otherwise of the tenderer with the highest score.
- o) Once a preferred tenderer has been identified, any post offer negotiations, if required, will take place prior to entering into a Contract.
- p) Negotiations will take place solely with the preferred tenderer until such time as either: (i) a contract is formed; (ii) the preferred tenderer withdraws their offer; (iii) the capacity to negotiate is exhausted; or (iv) the Territory decides to accept no offers and may elect to recall tenders.
- q) On formation of a contract or in the event that no offers are accepted, the unsuccessful tenderers will be notified in writing and offered the opportunity to attend a debriefing session.

3.2 Evaluation Criteria

Subject to the note below on Variable Weighting, the table below shows the criteria and weighting that will be used to assess responses.

ASSESSABLE CRITERIA	WEIGHTING
<p>1. Appreciation and understanding of the scope, requirements and tasks for this project and ability to undertake the works, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project risks and project tasks identified and methodology proposed to properly manage the risks and tasks. • Project program showing key milestones and dates. • Tenderer to provide confirmation on the availability of all key personnel (internal staff and sub-consultants) nominated for the duration of the project. Include a list of any other projects or responsibilities that are being undertaken at the same time as the contract period for this project. • Confirm ability to undertake and/or comment on RFT project program dates. Provide a statement and project program to demonstrate how the tenderer can commence and complete works within the required timeframe. 	30%
<p>2. Demonstration of Past Performance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List and briefly describe similar projects they have successfully undertaken in the last five years. Provide information on key team members (roles), project values, timeframes for project delivery and contact details of referees involved in referenced projects. <p>Tenderer is to limit each project to 1 A4 page maximum</p> <p>Note:</p> <p>The Tender Evaluation Team may also use records of performance, claims, and compliance of Codes provided by other ACT Government Agencies, Departments or Consultants engaged by the ACT Government to determine the Tenderers past performance on similar types of projects.</p>	20%
<p>3. Work Health Safety Record</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and describe records of any fines or other penalties (including Prohibition Notices) issued by WorkSafe ACT in the past 5 years. • Provide example WHS&R site management plan (from a similar project) suitable for implementation on this project. 	30%

<p>4. Tender Price (Financial)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the completed Pricing Schedule and the completed Short Form Request and Contract Schedule. <p>Method of Assessment of financial offer: If the lowest financial offer quoted in a tender is lower than $0.8F_{avg}$ (where F_{avg} is the average financial offer of all qualifying tenders), then Financial Offer Score = $((0.8 \times F_{avg}) / \text{Tenderer's Financial Offer}) \times 10$ with the maximum Financial Offer Score capped at 10 If the lowest financial offer quoted in a tender is higher than $0.8F_{avg}$, then Financial Offer Score = $(\text{Lowest quoted fee} / \text{Financial Offer}) \times 10$</p> <p>The financial offer score may be adjusted if the financial proposal is seen as a high risk to the Territory, e.g. very low offer, substantial departure from the average offer, or much higher than the budget.</p> <p>Note: Analysis of the financial offer, including rates in the Bill of Quantities may be undertaken by the Tender Evaluation Team to assist in determining the preferred Tenderer. This may include a sensitivity analysis of costs involving the extension of provisional quantities and/or foreseeable variations. (No additional information is required for submission by the Tenderer)</p>	20%
---	-----

Tenderers must respond to the above Evaluation Criteria and submit as part of their tender.

3.3 Late Tenders

When Tenders ACT receive and process a late tender lodgement, the Tenders ACT Support Team will advise the project officer the time and date of electronic lodgement for a particular tender.

Late Tenders and incomplete Tenders may be admitted for evaluation at the absolute discretion of the Territory, and in accordance with AS4120 Code of Tendering and Probity advice.

In deciding whether to admit a late Tender for evaluation, the Territory may take into account any factors it considers relevant, including without limitation:

- a) Whether the late Tenderer is likely to have had an opportunity to obtain some unfair advantage from late submission;
- b) How late the Tender is, the reasons given for lateness and evidence available;
- c) Whether the Tender was mishandled by the Territory, by an official postal service or by a reputable delivery service; and
- d) Evidence of unfair practices.

4. Evaluation Report & Letters of Decline/Debriefings

4.1 Evaluation Report

The evaluation team will prepare the following information for inclusion with the evaluation report.

- a) background to the process;
- b) the evaluation process, including comments (strengths and weaknesses) and scores against each criteria;
- c) the weighted score of each tender;
- d) value for money;
- e) proposed methods for management of tender specific risks;
- f) identification of any issues which should be resolved by negotiation; and
- g) recommendations to the Director General or approving delegate.

4.2 Letters of Decline / Debriefings

Letters of decline will be sent to all unsuccessful Tenderers. Letters of decline and debriefings will comply with the requirements outlined in Procurement Circular 2007/05 *Debriefing Unsuccessful Tenderers*.

Risk Rating Table for use in Tender Evaluation

Descriptor	Sample Commentary	Rating
Superior	Highly convincing and credible. Response demonstrates superior capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Comprehensively documented with all claims fully substantiated. Insignificant risk.	10
Outstanding	Highly convincing and credible. Response demonstrates outstanding capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Documentation provides complete details. All claims adequately demonstrated and substantiated. Insignificant risk.	9
Excellent	Response complies, is convincing and credible. Response demonstrates excellent capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Some minor lack of substantiation but the Tenderer's overall claim is supported. Low risk.	8
Very Good	Response complies, is convincing and credible. Response demonstrates very good capability, capacity and experience, relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Minor uncertainties and shortcomings in the Tenderer's claims or documentation. Low risk.	7
Good	Response complies and is credible but not completely convincing. Response demonstrates adequate capability, capacity and experience, relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Tenderer's claims have some gaps. Low risk.	6
Adequate	Response has minor omissions. Credible but barely convincing. Response demonstrates only a marginal capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Medium risk.	5
Reservations	Barely convincing. Response has shortcomings and deficiencies in demonstrating the Tenderer's capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Medium risk.	4
Poor	Unconvincing. Response has significant flaws in demonstrating the Tenderer's capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. Medium risk.	3
Very Poor	Unconvincing. Response is significantly flawed and fundamental details are lacking. Minimal information has been provided to demonstrate the Tenderer's capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. High risk.	2
Inadequate	Response is totally unconvincing and requirements have not been met. Response has inadequate information to demonstrate the Tenderer's capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the Evaluation Criterion. High risk.	1
Not Acceptable	Tenderer was not evaluated as it did not provide any requested information and/or contravened nominated restrictions. High risk.	0

Bruan, Nicole

From: Clement, SophieJ
Sent: Thursday, 17 December 2015 3:43 PM
To: Clement, SophieJ; Ashley, Katherine; Leggett, Natasha; Thomas, Stephen (ACTPS)
Cc: Hill, Diana
Subject: RE: Isaacs Ridge RFT evaluation - technical points
Attachments: RFT 27512 Short Form - Isaacs Ridge Trail.pdf; Isaacs-Ridge-Trails-upgrade-151201_ContractorBrief.pdf

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Hi Stephen, Katherine and Tash,

Further to the previous email please find attached the final Project Brief and the final draft of the Short Form RFT. Note the % for each criteria was changed in the final short Form RFT released and are as shown below (I do not have a copy of the updated version that went out with the RFT):

- Criteria 1 – Appreciation 30%
- Criteria 2 – Past Performance 20%
- Criteria 3 – WHS 30%
- Criteria 4 – Price 20%

Thanks
Sophie

From: Clement, SophieJ
Sent: Thursday, 17 December 2015 3:00 PM
To: Ashley, Katherine; Leggett, Natasha; Thomas, Stephen (ACTPS)
Cc: Hill, Diana
Subject: Isaacs Ridge RFT evaluation - technical points

Hi Stephen, Katherine and Tash,

Katherine suggested I provide dot points on the key technical issues important for Isaacs Ridge trails construction. Here's a few notes on the key areas of technical expertise/ challenges:

Trail design and construction downhill trails - look, feel, difficulty and erosion control

- The key challenge at Isaacs Ridge on the downhill trails will be achieving advanced, generally natural surface trails that are, as much as possible, hand built while also mitigating erosion risks.
- The trails in this area are historically hand built with difficult features including rough rocky terrain, rock drops and large gap jumps suitable for advanced riders. This look and feel is to be maintained while also managing erosion.
- The management of erosion will require machine built features such as roll-overs, however, the contractor will need to consider how to use these features and achieve a technically difficult, steep and rocky trail that is max. 1200 wide and should average 900mm wide.
- The four management crossings will be very important as these need to be well designed on the ground and built to ensure downhill riders are slowed to a walking pace prior to crossing the management tracks.

Volunteer workshops - working with the volunteer group will be a key part of the construction process

- Work with the volunteer group to review the detailed design alignment and engage the volunteers in the project.
- Coordination of volunteers on a build day – provide guidance on what is to be done and oversight of work .
- Ability to communicate/ demonstrate trail design features and trail building techniques to pass on knowledge and skills on sustainable trails and a creating a good riding experience.

Priority work for construction

- The upgrade/ construction of the two downhill trails is the highest priority.
- The cross country trail is second priority.

Thanks,
Sophie

From: Ashley, Katherine
Sent: Thursday, 17 December 2015 8:32 AM
To: Clement, Sophie
Cc: Leggett, Natasha
Subject: RFT dotties

Hey Sophie

Can you send us those dot points we talked about yesterday for the Isaacs Ridge Tender.

Regards

Katherine Ashley | Senior Project Manager
BESc | BArch | BID
T [REDACTED] | M [REDACTED]

Procurement and Capital Works | Chief Minister, Treasury and Economic Development Directorate | **ACT Government**
Level 2 Annex, Macarthur House, 12 Wattle St, Lyneham ACT 2602 | www.act.gov.au