****

* TECHNICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (TEC) MINUTE TEMPLATE

**Template Instructions**

* Note the template is a guide. The guide is meant to assist Agencies in preparing minutes efficiently and allow for correct GTB submissions.
* This minute template needs to be adapted to suit your procurement activity and discussions
* Agencies may choose to continue with their minute formats as long as the required information (as per this guide) is included
* The minute structure is in line with the TEC discussion structure recommended by the Fiji Procurement Office
* Please consult FPO if you need assistance
* The meeting minute template is based on the New Zealand Procurement Office template.

**Technical Evaluation Committee Summary**

**[Insert Tender Details]**

**[Insert Agency Name]**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Item | Response |
| Tender Details: |  |
| Agency: |  |
| Scope of purchase: |  |
| Recommended or preferred supplier/s:  |  |
| Contract term: |   |
| Estimated cost : |  |
| Total contract value: | . |
| Budget Details |  |
| Contract start date: |  |
| Issues to be resolved: | YES/NO.[If ‘YES’ refer to Issues to be Resolved.] |

**Minutes of meeting for [tender details] for [Agency Name] held at [meeting venue] on [insert date]**

**1.0 Background**

1.1 The TEC noted that this procurement relates to the purchase of [insert].

1.2 The key objective of the procurement is [insert].

1.3 The outcomes that the procurement aims to achieve are [insert].

**2.0 Requirements**

**2.1** The Agency reconfirmed that in summary, the agency’s requirement is to procure [insert].

2.2 The TEC noted and accepted the detailed statement of the requirements (refer Appendix x)

**2.3 Contract dates**

The following were noted by the TEC members:

* Contract to start by [insert start date].
* The initial term will be [insert] and the contract is due to expire on [insert date].
* There is an option to extend the contract term by [insert period]. This may be subject to negotiation. (Optional)

**3.0 Technical Evaluation Committee panel**

3.1 A cross-functional team of participants was involved in the evaluation of bids and recommending the supplier.

3.2 The TEC members are:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role**  | **Name** | **Organisation** |
| **Chair of evaluation panel:** |  |  |
| **FPO Representative** |  |  |
| **Agency representative** |  |  |
| **Legal advisor/Finance advisor etc.** |  |  |
| **Technical advisor** |  |  |

**4.0 Evaluation methodology**

4.1 The TEC members noted and agreed the following:

* THAT the evaluation model to be used is [choose: lowest price conforming / simple score / weighted attribute (weighted score) / target price / Brook’s Law].
* Price was a weighted criterion. OR
* Price was not a weighted criterion. Instead price was taken into account in determining overall value for money over the whole-of-life of the contract. A two-envelope process was used and suppliers’ pricing was only opened once a criterion scoring was completed.

**4.2 Administrative Requirement**

The TEC agreed that each supplier must meet more than 50% of the documents/administrative requirements that was issued in the Tender Documents (refer Appendix x) before advancing to the next stage of evaluation on merit.

**4.3 Technical Evaluation**

The TEC accepted the following evaluation criteria and weightings.

Please note that this model includes price as a weighted criterion.

[Insert evaluation criteria. Example below]

**Evaluation criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criterion** | **Weighting** |
| 1. **Technical merit (fit for purpose)**
 | 40% |
| e.g. Degree to which good/services meet or exceed requirements |  |
| e.g. Quality of goods/services |  |
| e.g. Degree of innovation |  |
| e.g. Level of risk |  |
| 1. **Capability of the supplier to deliver**
 | 30% |
| e.g. Supplier’s size, structure and annual turnover |  |
| e.g. Track record in delivering similar goods/services |  |
| e.g. Understanding of the requirements |  |
| e.g. Operational and financial systems to manage delivery |  |
| 1. **Value for money (based on whole-of-life cost)**
 | 30% |
| e.g. Total costs over whole-of-life |  |
| e.g. Other benefits |  |
| **Total weightings** | **100%** |

**4.4 Scoring Criteria**

In evaluating suppliers’ bids against the criteria, the panel agreed on the following rating scale.

[Please insert scoring criteria. Example below]

**Rating scale**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Description  | Definition  | Rating |
| **Excellent**  | Exceeds the requirement. Exceptional demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills and resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence. | **9-10** |
| **Good** | Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence. | **7-8** |
| **Acceptable** | Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with supporting evidence. | **5-6** |
| **Minor reservations** | Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the supplier’s relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence. | **3-4** |
| **Serious reservations**  | Satisfies the requirement with major reservations. Considerable reservations of the supplier’s relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence. | **1-2** |
| **Unacceptable** | Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the supplier has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence. | **0** |

**5.0 Innovation**

5.1 • The agency did not accept alternative proposals. OR

 • The agency did accept alternative proposals. Alternative proposals were received from the following suppliers:

 1)

 2)

**6.0 Administrative Requirements evaluation**

**6.1 Bids received**

The TEC noted and accepted the following bids and the administrative requirements were assessed accordingly:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier  | Address | Passed administrative requirements stage? |
|  |  | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
|  |  | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
|  |  | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
|  |  | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
|  |  | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |
|  |  | Yes [ ]  No [ ]  |

***Refer Appendix x for detailed assessment***

6.2 The following suppliers were eliminated at this stage:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of supplier** | **Reason for not shortlisting** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**6.3 Panel Discussions**

[Insert relevant panel discussion in relation to the above]

**7.0 Due Diligence**

Before the technical evaluation, the following due diligence was/were performed.

 [Insert details of due diligence and panel discussion]

(Refer FPO due diligence checklist for guidance)

**8.0 Technical Evaluation**

8.1 The TEC noted that the following suppliers met the required administrative requirements, passed due diligence test and were assessed as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | TechnicalPoints | Commentary (summary) | Ranking |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***Refer Appendix x for detailed assessment***

**8.1 Panel Discussions**

[Insert relevant panel discussion in relation to the above]

**9.0 Price Evaluation**

9.1 The TEC noted that the following suppliers met the administrative and technical evaluations and their price bid were assessed as follows:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | Price | PriceRanking | Commentary (summary) |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

***Refer Appendix x for detailed assessment***

**9.2 Panel Discussions**

[Insert relevant panel discussion in relation to the above]

**10.0 Overall Assessment**

10.1 The TEC noted the following overall points:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | Technical Ranking | Price Ranking | Overall Ranking | Commentary (summary) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

***Refer Appendix x for detailed assessment***

**10.2 Panel Discussions**

[Insert relevant panel discussion in relation to the above]

**11.0 Recommendation**

The TEC agreed to recommended [supplier(s)] for this contract.

**The basis for this decision is:**

*[Complete for each supplier]*

**Qualitative**

*[Explain]*

**Price**

*[Explain]*

**12.0 TEC Endorsement**

We confirm the following:

* the evaluation is in order and as per Procurement Regulations & Procurement Policy; and
* no conflict of interest was identified (Refer Appendix x)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Full name | Signature | Date |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |