

Risk Assessment – Routine Procurements

This Risk Assessment is intended for routine procurements and should only be used in the following circumstances:

- Using an existing panel arrangement and the procurement is for low complexity goods or services; or
- Using the *Commonwealth Contracting Suite* and the procurement is valued at less than \$200,000 (including GST) and is for low complexity goods or services, or
- Procurement is from an Indigenous supplier (up to \$200,000 including GST); and
- Procurement does not involve consultancy services.

Undertaking a Contract Labour Hire Procurement?

Please also complete the questions marked with **[CLH]** as there are additional risks specific to contract labour hire.

Higher Value, Complex or Strategic Procurements

For non-panel procurements valued at \$200,000 (incl GST) or more, or those involving more complex requirements, please use the Bureau's [Risk Register Template](#) instead. Please also remember the *Modern Slavery Act 2018* may also apply to your procurement if it is over \$200,000 in value and not using a panel arrangement.

Why assess procurement risk?

The *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* require that risk be assessed and managed for all procurements of any value. Please include this risk assessment when you send your Procurement Plan to your Delegate for approval.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios

The following risk factor scenarios reflect risks that commonly occur when purchasing low value, low complexity goods and services. Please select **Low**, **Medium**, or **High** against each scenario. Definitions of these three risk levels are in the [Enterprise Risk Management Framework](#) handbook. Consider both likelihood and consequence when choosing a Risk Level then briefly discuss how you will mitigate or treat the risk. Contact Procurement and Contracts procurement@bom.gov.au if you need advice.

High Rated Risks

Where one or more risk factor scenarios are assessed as **High** this template is no longer suitable and you will need to use the Bureau's [Risk Register Template](#) instead. You will also need to seek Legal advice for High rated risks.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios	Risk Level			Treatment / Mitigation
	Low	Med	High	
Registration and Planning				[Some suggested actions to help prevent the risk from arising]
• Failure to achieve a value for money outcome because insufficient time made available to conduct process properly or an impractical timeframe proposed.	☒	☐	☐	Plan properly. Allow sufficient time to conduct process. Seek advice from P&C about realistic timeframes.
• Delays and probity issues arise because quote already sought, or contact made with potential tenderers prior to commencing process.	☒	☐	☐	Do not seek quote or contact tenderers until advised by P&C.
• Business needs not satisfied because requirements are not adequately understood and determined.	☒	☐	☐	Research the market, Review past purchases. Liaise with tech SMEs.
• [CLH] Bureau fined because the Labour Hire Providers (recruitment agencies) nominated to tender are not licensed to operate in VIC, QLD or SA and the role is in one of these locations.	☒	☐	☐	Check the State licensing registers before nominating providers. For accurate results, search by ABN.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios	Risk Level			Treatment / Mitigation
Tendering	Low	Med	High	[Some suggested actions to help prevent the risk from arising]
Failure to attract value for money responses because Statement of Requirements is poorly drafted or missing key information.	☒	☐	☐	Liaise with SMEs for technical advice. Ensure Evaluation Panel and Delegate peer-review SOR.
Complaints arise or negative impact on Bureau's reputation due to perceived favouritism or claims of misleading the market.	☒	☐	☐	Ensure ATM documentation is complete. Ensure all tenderers are given equal access to information and equal time to tender.
Poor quality responses received because Tenderers given insufficient time to tender.	☒	☐	☐	Approach market for at least one week. Extend ATM if necessary.
Probity issues or complaints arise because conflict of interests not declared prior to tendering.	☒	☐	☐	Do not commence evaluation until COIs completed and probity issues addressed.
[CLH] Procurement fails because candidate is represented by more than one Labour Hire Provider	☒	☐	☐	Contact P&C who will confirm 'sole representation' with Provider.
Evaluation	Low	Med	High	
Complaints arise or procurement fails because previously agreed evaluation process and criteria not followed.	☒	☐	☐	Do not change evaluation criteria or process without seeking advice from P&C. Document changes.
Tenderers no longer available or price goes up because evaluation takes too long.	☒	☐	☐	Ensure Eval Panel are resourced and available to conduct evaluation
No tenderers respond - or no tenderers identified that are deemed value for money or able to meet the Bureau's requirements (i.e., failed procurement)	☒	☐	☐	Allow sufficient time for tendering. Ensure SOR is complete, accurate and contract timeframes realistic.
[CLH] Complaints received, or probity issues arise because Evaluation Panel member works (or has worked) for a Provider that is tendering.	☒	☐	☐	Ensure COI declaration is made by panel member. Seek probity advice
Finalisation	Low	Med	High	
Unable to execute contract because budget insufficient or no longer available.	☒	☐	☐	Conduct (passive) market research to determine indicative costs.
Contract not gazetted (reported) within 42 calendar days because of delays in submitting Spending Proposal paperwork	☒	☐	☐	Ensure Spending Proposal submitted to P&C within 14 days of contract execution.
Contract Management	Low	Med	High	
Poor supplier performance because contract management activities not planned adequately.	☒	☐	☐	Develop Contract management Plan. Identify Contract Manager.
[CLH] Price goes up when the contract is being extended or varied meaning it is no longer value for money to continue to hire the labour hire contractor.	☒	☐	☐	Negotiate with Supplier to reduce price. Reduce scope of contract. Register new procurement.
[CLH] No more options for extension but the labour hire contractor is still working in the role and the contract has expired (or about to expire)	☒	☐	☐	Ensure extension option exercised well in advance of contract expiry.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios	Risk Level			Treatment / Mitigation
COVID-19 Related Risks To determine if additional clauses need to be added to the contract or Work Order please complete the following: • Risk that the Bureau will be in breach of the contract terms because it is delayed in providing contract dependencies or resources to the supplier during COVID-19 (e.g., onboarding, access to equipment etc.) • Risk the Supplier will be in breach of the contract terms because it is delayed in providing the relevant goods or services during COVID-19 (e.g., due to travel or logistical disruption etc.)	Low	Med	High	[Some suggested actions to help prevent the risk from arising] Identify risk early. Seek legal advice and insert appropriate clauses. Research market. Ask tenderers to address possibility of delays in tender response. Seek legal advice and insert clauses.
Other Risks Please include a description of any other risks relevant to your procurement. These may include WHS related risks. • Other risk 1: • Other risk 2: • Other risk 3:	Low	Med	High	[Please insert some actions that may help prevent the risk from arising or contact P&C]
Overall Risk Profile [Please consider all the risks you have assessed and determine the overall risk profile for this procurement]	Overall Risk Level			Delegate Approval
	Low	Med	High	Has this Risk Assessment been attached to the Procurement Plan for Delegate approval? ☒ Yes ☐ No



Evaluation Report

Procurement Title	Accelerated Reporting and Central Reporting Packages
Procurement Registration No. (PRN)	1140-2021-22
Program / Group	Enterprise Services Group
Requesting Officer	s22 [REDACTED]

Background

This report outlines the evaluation findings in relation to the above referenced procurement activity and is submitted to the Spending Delegate ([Delegation 2.6: Approving Goods and Services Expenditure](#)) for PGPA Act Section 23 approval.

The evaluation was undertaken following the Approach to Market (ATM) detailed below:

Tenderer(s) approached:

1. KPMG

Tenderer(s) responded:

1. KPMG

This procurement was not registered with the Procurement and Contracts Team prior to seeking a quote and it was not conducted through the Procurement and Contracts Team. A summary of the actions to support this procurement that were taken prior to drafting this report include:

Action	Date	Description
Quote was provided by KPMG to Bureau as the existing contract was due for renewal	May 2022	Existing KPMG reporting modules utilized by Bureau Finance team with license expiring in June 2022.
Spending delegate approval obtained	May 2022	Quote and requirements to renew licence was presented to CFO (spending delegate). This was approved.
Registered procurement	May 2022	Registered procurement with P&C. Was advised to document actions to date and run remainder as a formal process
Evaluated response	May 2022	Evaluated Tenderer's quote and drafted Evaluation Report
Conflicts declared	May 2022	Conflict of interest declarations were/will be completed.

The evaluation followed for this procurement has complied with the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* and the Bureau procurement policies.

Evaluation Methodology											
The following staff were involved in assessing the offer(s) to determine the best value for money outcome for the Bureau: Member 1: s22 – APS Employee Member 2: s22 – APS employee											
The rating and criteria set out below was applied for the evaluation of offers. Evaluation Rating <table> <tr> <td>Very Good</td><td>The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a very high standard and presents minimal or no risk to the Commonwealth and its claims are fully supported by the information provided.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Good</td><td>The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a high standard and/or presents limited risk to the Commonwealth. The Respondent's claims, in the view of the Evaluation Committee (EC), are supported by the information provided.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Satisfactory</td><td>The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a satisfactory degree and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Poor</td><td>The Offer barely satisfies the Selection Criterion and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are major deficiencies in the information provided.</td></tr> <tr> <td>Unsatisfactory</td><td> The Offer does not satisfy the Selection Criterion and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more Selection Criteria will exclude the Respondent from being recommended. The Selection Criteria are not weighted. </td></tr> </table>		Very Good	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a very high standard and presents minimal or no risk to the Commonwealth and its claims are fully supported by the information provided.	Good	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a high standard and/or presents limited risk to the Commonwealth. The Respondent's claims, in the view of the Evaluation Committee (EC), are supported by the information provided.	Satisfactory	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a satisfactory degree and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.	Poor	The Offer barely satisfies the Selection Criterion and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are major deficiencies in the information provided.	Unsatisfactory	The Offer does not satisfy the Selection Criterion and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more Selection Criteria will exclude the Respondent from being recommended. The Selection Criteria are not weighted.
Very Good	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a very high standard and presents minimal or no risk to the Commonwealth and its claims are fully supported by the information provided.										
Good	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a high standard and/or presents limited risk to the Commonwealth. The Respondent's claims, in the view of the Evaluation Committee (EC), are supported by the information provided.										
Satisfactory	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a satisfactory degree and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.										
Poor	The Offer barely satisfies the Selection Criterion and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are major deficiencies in the information provided.										
Unsatisfactory	The Offer does not satisfy the Selection Criterion and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more Selection Criteria will exclude the Respondent from being recommended. The Selection Criteria are not weighted.										
Evaluation Criteria <table> <tr> <th>Criteria</th><th>Respondent: KPMG</th></tr> <tr> <td>the extent to which the respondent's offer met the Commonwealth's requirements set out in the RFQ</td><td> Very good – Bureau is currently using the existing reporting modules and want to renew the licence.  ARM and CRM Quote - BOM.pdf </td></tr> <tr> <td>the respondent's capacity to provide the requirement</td><td>Very good.</td></tr> <tr> <td>The extent to which the level</td><td>Very good - s47G GST inclusive</td></tr> </table>		Criteria	Respondent: KPMG	the extent to which the respondent's offer met the Commonwealth's requirements set out in the RFQ	Very good – Bureau is currently using the existing reporting modules and want to renew the licence.  ARM and CRM Quote - BOM.pdf	the respondent's capacity to provide the requirement	Very good.	The extent to which the level	Very good - s47G GST inclusive		
Criteria	Respondent: KPMG										
the extent to which the respondent's offer met the Commonwealth's requirements set out in the RFQ	Very good – Bureau is currently using the existing reporting modules and want to renew the licence.  ARM and CRM Quote - BOM.pdf										
the respondent's capacity to provide the requirement	Very good.										
The extent to which the level	Very good - s47G GST inclusive										

and structure of fees proposed provides value for money for the Australian Government	
Overall i.e. Value for Money (VFM)	Very good – Entering into 3-year contract to obtain a discount to support ongoing business reporting requirements.

Evaluation Outcome
Procurement Methodology and Findings KPMG was requested to submit a quote because the existing licence was due for renewal. Value for Money Assessment The Evaluation Committee have fully considered the response and can summaries the Value for Money Evaluation as follows: Very good – Entering into 3-year contract to obtain a discount to support ongoing business reporting requirements. Negotiation issues None.
Supplier Selection
Only one vendor was approached. The vendor provides comparable market price, skills & expertise, quality, and availability, timeliness of delivery and acceptance of the Commonwealth's terms and conditions under the Management Advisory Services Panel SON3751667.
Probity
Probity was maintained by the Evaluation Committee throughout the course of the evaluation and all documents were strictly handled in a manner to ensure confidentiality. s22 declared a conflict with the incumbent supplier and the decision was made to replace s22 to mitigate the risk. All correspondence with the Tenderer was undertaken by the Financial Reporting Team.
Evaluation Panel Recommendation

Preferred Tenderer Recommendation

The evaluation committee unanimously recommends that KPMG be contracted for \$**s47G** GST inclusive to provide Accelerated Reporting and Central Reporting Models. This decision is based on the evaluation committee's assessment that the offer from KPMG provides a value for money outcome for the Bureau.

The anticipated start date of the contract will be 2 June 2022 and the end date will be 1 June 2025.

Central Administration Fee

The Management Advisory Services (MAS) panel SON3751667 was used in this procurement and a 0.4% Central Administration Fee (CAF) is charged for contracts entered into under this arrangement.

If the Bureau enters into a contract with the preferred Tenderer under this panel the total CAF charged is \$**s47G** (GST inclusive), which is in addition to the price tendered by the preferred tenderer. A breakdown of the proposed total cost is detailed below:

Component	Amount
Preferred Tenderer's Price:	\$ s47G GST inclusive
Central Administration Fee	\$ s47G GST inclusive
TOTAL COST	\$s47G GST inclusive

The evaluation committee also unanimously recommends that the Central Administration Fee of \$**s47G** (GST inclusive) be paid to Department of Finance upon receipt of a correctly rendered invoice.

The Delegate is also advised that two separate Spending Proposals will need to be raised. A Spending Proposal to pay the vendor and another to pay Department of Finance for the CAF.

s22 <i>In lieu of my hardcopy signature and as the Evaluation Chair for 1140-2021-22 Accelerated Reporting and Central Reporting Packages, I endorse the attached Evaluation Report.</i>	s22 <i>In lieu of my hardcopy signature and as the Evaluation committee member for 1140-2021-22 Accelerated Reporting and Central Reporting Packages, I endorse the attached Evaluation Report.</i>
s22	s22

Evaluation Committee Chair

Date: 25.05.2022

Evaluation Committee Member

Date: 25.05.2022

Spending Delegate Approval

In accordance with the evaluation committee's recommendation, as a Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act – Section 23 Approver and under the Bureau's Authorisations and Delegations schedule (Delegation 2.6), I certify and approve:

That under the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013, a Value for Money Evaluation exercise has been completed in accordance with the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* and *Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013*.

Signature

s22

Approver

s22

Title and
Workgroup

Chief Financial Officer/Business Management Program

Date

27.05.2022

Next Steps

Prior to delegate approval, provide a draft copy of the VFM report to Procurement & Contracts (P&C) for review.

Once the VFM report is signed, provide a signed copy to the appointed P&C officer who will finalise the Contract in preparation for execution.

Risk Assessment – Routine Procurements

This Risk Assessment is intended for **routine procurements** and should only be used in the following circumstances:

- Using an existing panel arrangement and the procurement is for low complexity goods or services; or
- Using the *Commonwealth Contracting Suite* and the procurement is valued at less than \$200,000 (including GST) and is for low complexity goods or services, or
- Procurement is from an Indigenous supplier (up to \$200,000 including GST); and
- Procurement does not involve consultancy services.

Undertaking a Contract Labour Hire Procurement?

Please also complete the questions marked with **[CLH]** as there are additional risks specific to contract labour hire.

Higher Value, Complex or Strategic Procurements

For non-panel procurements valued at \$200,000 (incl GST) or more, or those involving more complex requirements, please use the Bureau's [Risk Register Template](#) instead. Please also remember the *Modern Slavery Act 2018* may also apply to your procurement if it is over \$200,000 in value and not using a panel arrangement.

Why assess procurement risk?

The *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* require that risk be assessed and managed for all procurements of any value. Please include this risk assessment when you send your Procurement Plan to your Delegate for approval.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios

The following risk factor scenarios reflect risks that commonly occur when purchasing low value, low complexity goods and services. Please select **Low**, **Medium**, or **High** against each scenario. Definitions of these three risk levels are in the [Enterprise Risk Management Framework](#) handbook. Consider both likelihood and consequence when choosing a Risk Level then briefly discuss how you will mitigate or treat the risk. Contact Procurement and Contracts procurement@bom.gov.au if you need advice.

High Rated Risks

Where one or more risk factor scenarios are assessed as **High** this template is no longer suitable and you will need to use the Bureau's [Risk Register Template](#) instead. You will also need to seek Legal advice for High rated risks.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios	Risk Level			Treatment / Mitigation
	Low	Med	High	
Registration and Planning				[Some suggested actions to help prevent the risk from arising]
• Failure to achieve a value for money outcome because insufficient time made available to conduct process properly or an impractical timeframe proposed.	☒	☐	☐	Plan properly. Allow sufficient time to conduct process. Seek advice from P&C about realistic timeframes.
• Delays and probity issues arise because quote already sought, or contact made with potential tenderers prior to commencing process.	☒	☐	☐	Do not seek quote or contact tenderers until advised by P&C.
• Business needs not satisfied because requirements are not adequately understood and determined.	☒	☐	☐	Research the market, Review past purchases. Liaise with tech SMEs.
• [CLH] Bureau fined because the Labour Hire Providers (recruitment agencies) nominated to tender are not licensed to operate in VIC, QLD or SA and the role is in one of these locations.	☒	☐	☐	Check the State licensing registers before nominating providers. For accurate results, search by ABN.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios	Risk Level			Treatment / Mitigation
Tendering	Low	Med	High	[Some suggested actions to help prevent the risk from arising]
Failure to attract value for money responses because Statement of Requirements is poorly drafted or missing key information.	☒	☐	☐	Liaise with SMEs for technical advice. Ensure Evaluation Panel and Delegate peer-review SOR.
Complaints arise or negative impact on Bureau's reputation due to perceived favouritism or claims of misleading the market.	☒	☐	☐	Ensure ATM documentation is complete. Ensure all tenderers are given equal access to information and equal time to tender.
Poor quality responses received because Tenderers given insufficient time to tender.	☒	☐	☐	Approach market for at least one week. Extend ATM if necessary.
Probity issues or complaints arise because conflict of interests not declared prior to tendering.	☒	☐	☐	Do not commence evaluation until COIs completed and probity issues addressed.
[CLH] Procurement fails because candidate is represented by more than one Labour Hire Provider	☒	☐	☐	Contact P&C who will confirm 'sole representation' with Provider.
Evaluation	Low	Med	High	
Complaints arise or procurement fails because previously agreed evaluation process and criteria not followed.	☒	☐	☐	Do not change evaluation criteria or process without seeking advice from P&C. Document changes.
Tenderers no longer available or price goes up because evaluation takes too long.	☒	☐	☐	Ensure Eval Panel are resourced and available to conduct evaluation
No tenderers respond - or no tenderers identified that are deemed value for money or able to meet the Bureau's requirements (i.e., failed procurement)	☒	☐	☐	Allow sufficient time for tendering. Ensure SOR is complete, accurate and contract timeframes realistic.
[CLH] Complaints received, or probity issues arise because Evaluation Panel member works (or has worked) for a Provider that is tendering.	☒	☐	☐	Ensure COI declaration is made by panel member. Seek probity advice
Finalisation	Low	Med	High	
Unable to execute contract because budget insufficient or no longer available.	☒	☐	☐	Conduct (passive) market research to determine indicative costs.
Contract not gazetted (reported) within 42 calendar days because of delays in submitting Spending Proposal paperwork	☒	☐	☐	Ensure Spending Proposal submitted to P&C within 14 days of contract execution.
Contract Management	Low	Med	High	
Poor supplier performance because contract management activities not planned adequately.	☒	☐	☐	Develop Contract management Plan. Identify Contract Manager.
[CLH] Price goes up when the contract is being extended or varied meaning it is no longer value for money to continue to hire the labour hire contractor.	☒	☐	☐	Negotiate with Supplier to reduce price. Reduce scope of contract. Register new procurement.
[CLH] No more options for extension but the labour hire contractor is still working in the role and the contract has expired (or about to expire)	☒	☐	☐	Ensure extension option exercised well in advance of contract expiry.

Common Risk Factor Scenarios	Risk Level			Treatment / Mitigation
COVID-19 Related Risks To determine if additional clauses need to be added to the contract or Work Order please complete the following: • Risk that the Bureau will be in breach of the contract terms because it is delayed in providing contract dependencies or resources to the supplier during COVID-19 (e.g., onboarding, access to equipment etc.) • Risk the Supplier will be in breach of the contract terms because it is delayed in providing the relevant goods or services during COVID-19 (e.g., due to travel or logistical disruption etc.)	Low	Med	High	[Some suggested actions to help prevent the risk from arising] Identify risk early. Seek legal advice and insert appropriate clauses. Research market. Ask tenderers to address possibility of delays in tender response. Seek legal advice and insert clauses.
Other Risks Please include a description of any other risks relevant to your procurement. These may include WHS related risks. • Other risk 1: • Other risk 2: • Other risk 3:	Low	Med	High	[Please insert some actions that may help prevent the risk from arising or contact P&C]
Overall Risk Profile [Please consider all the risks you have assessed and determine the overall risk profile for this procurement]	Overall Risk Level			Delegate Approval
	Low	Med	High	Has this Risk Assessment been attached to the Procurement Plan for Delegate approval? ☒ Yes ☐ No



Under \$80,000 or Panel where the Risk is Low

Evaluation Report

NOTE: this template is only appropriate for procurement activities either using a Panel or valued at less than \$80,000 (incl GST) or where the risk profile is 'low'.

For procurement activities not using a Panel and valued at \$80,000 (incl GST) or more, or where the risk profile is greater than 'low', this template is not sufficient. A 'Tender Evaluation Report' template should be used instead.

Note: Guidance notes in purple and highlighting are to be deleted

Procurement Title	Internal audit service provider
Procurement Registration No. (PRN)	4425-2024-25
Program / Group	Enterprise Services- Organisational Resilience
Requesting Officer Name	s22

Background

This report outlines the evaluation findings in relation to the above referenced procurement activity and is submitted to the Spending Delegate ([Delegation 2.6: Approving Goods and Services Expenditure](#)) for PGPA Act Section 23 approval.

The evaluation was undertaken following the Approach to Market (ATM) detailed below:

ATM Issue Date:

Tenderer(s) approached:

Tenderer(s) received:

ATM Close Date:

18/12/23

1. s22

2.

3. KPMG

4. s22

5.

6.

7.

1. s22

2. KPMG

3. s22

4.

5.

The evaluation followed for this procurement has complied with the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* and the Bureau procurement policies for low value and/or low risk procurements.

Panel SON 3751667 used in this procurement. The Bureau had previously entered a Cooperative Agency Procurement with the owning Entity to use this panel and all tenderers approached are panellists.

Low-Risk Evaluation Report**Evaluation Methodology**

The Evaluation Committee assessed the offers to determine the best value for money outcome for the Bureau and consisted of:

Chair: s22

Member 1: s22

Member 2: Bridie Andriske

Member 3: s22

Project Officer: s22

In accordance with the original Procurement Plan, the rating and criteria set out below was applied for the evaluation of offers.

Evaluation Rating

Very Good	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a very high standard and presents minimal or no risk to the Commonwealth and its claims are fully supported by the information provided.
Good	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a high standard and/or presents limited risk to the Commonwealth. The Respondent's claims, in the view of the Evaluation Committee (EC), are supported by the information provided.
Satisfactory	The Offer satisfies the Selection Criterion to a satisfactory degree and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.
Poor	The Offer barely satisfies the Selection Criterion and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to the Commonwealth. In the view of the EC, there are major deficiencies in the information provided.
Unsatisfactory	The Offer does not satisfy the Selection Criterion and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more Selection Criteria will exclude the Respondent from being recommended. The Selection Criteria are not weighted.

Low-Risk Evaluation Report

Detailed evaluation



Criteria	KPMG	s22
The Service Provider's demonstrated understanding of the Services required, including the identification of any key challenges and the management of risk.	Very good KPMG demonstrated a very good understanding of the services required including key challenges/risks.	
The Service Provider's demonstrated capability and capacity to provide the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work to a very high standard and within the specified timeframes.	Very good KPMG demonstrated a Very Good capability and capacity to provide services.	

The Service Provider's demonstrated organisational experience in providing the similar services to the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work.	Very good KPMG demonstrated Very Good organisational experience. KPMG have more comparable Commonwealth experience than other tenderers	s22
The relevant experience of nominated Key Personnel in providing the similar services to the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work [include any relevant qualifications, certifications, etc. required].	Very good KPMG achieved a Very Good rating in demonstrating their relevant experience of nominated Key Personnel.	

The professional and other standards that your organisation would apply to the Services and the measures your organisation proposes to ensure that standards are maintained for the term of the Contract.	Very good KPMG demonstrated a Very Good application of professional and other standards.	s22
The extent to which the level and structure of fees proposed provides value for money for the Australian Government.	Very good KPMG provided the best level and structure of fees, based on a comparison of blended daily rates. KPMG is rated Very Good.	
Overall i.e. Value for Money (VFM)	Very good	



Modern Slavery Act 2018
Not required

Evaluation Outcome
Evaluation Methodology and Findings All tenderer offers were compliant with any Mandatory Conditions of Participation or Essential Criteria. Value for Money Assessment The Evaluation Committee have fully considered the responses and can summarise the Value for Money Evaluation as follows; KPMG demonstrated best value for money – see attachment for details KPMG submission indicates previous agency engagement demonstrates more understanding of Bureau business – eg National Emergency Management Agency of Australia (NEMA). Negotiation issues Nil
Supplier Selection In the Evaluation Committee's opinion, KPMG provided an offer that was comparable to other offers in terms of quality but was lower in price.
Probity Probity was maintained by the Evaluation Committee throughout the course of the evaluation and all documents were strictly handled in a manner to ensure confidentiality. All correspondence with tenderers was undertaken by the Contact Officer (Procurement and Contracts) on behalf of the Evaluation Chairperson.
Evaluation Panel Recommendation

Preferred Tenderer Recommendation

The evaluation committee unanimously recommends that KPMG be contracted for \$s47G GST inclusive to provide Internal Auditor Provider Services. This decision is based on the evaluation committee's assessment that the offer from KPMG provides the best value for money outcome for the Bureau. The anticipated start date of the contract will be 1 July 2025 and the end date will be 30 June 2028.

Central Administration Fee

The MAS panel was used in this procurement and a 1% Central Administration Fee (CAF) is charged for contracts entered into under this arrangement.

If the Bureau enters into a contract with the preferred Tenderer under this panel the total CAF charged is \$s47G (GST inclusive), which is in addition to the price tendered by the preferred tenderer. A breakdown of the proposed total cost is detailed below:

Component	Amount
Preferred Tenderer's Price:	\$s47G GST inclusive
Central Administration Fee	\$s47G GST inclusive
TOTAL COST	\$s47G GST inclusive

The evaluation committee also unanimously recommends that the Central Administration Fee of \$s47G (GST inclusive) be paid to Australian Government Department of Finance upon receipt of a correctly rendered invoice.

The Delegate is also advised that two separate Spending Proposals will need to be raised. A Spending Proposal to pay the vendor and another to pay Australian Government Department of Finance for the CAF.

See attached email endorsement	See attached email endorsement	See attached email endorsement
s22 (chair)	s22	Bridie Andriske
See attached email endorsement	See attached email endorsement	See attached email endorsement
s22	s22	

Spending Delegate Approval

Low-Risk Evaluation Report

In accordance with the evaluation committee's recommendation, as a Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act – Section 23 Approver and under the Bureau's Authorisations and Delegations schedule (Delegation 2.6), I certify and approve:

That under the Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013, a Value for Money Evaluation exercise has been completed in accordance with the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* and *Public Governance, Performance and Accountability Act 2013*.

Signature

--

Approver

--

Title and
Workgroup

--

Date

--

Next Steps

Prior to delegate approval; provide a draft copy of the Evaluation report to Procurement and Contracts for review.

Once the Evaluation report is signed, provide a signed copy to the appointed Procurement and Contracts officer who will finalise the Contract in preparation for execution.