****

* TECHNICAL EVALUATION COMMITTEE (TEC) REPORT TEMPLATE

**Template Instructions**

* Note the template is a guide. The guide is meant to assist Agencies in preparing TEC Report efficiently for GTB endorsement.
* This template needs to be adapted to suit your procurement activity and discussions
* This TEC report replaces the TEC minutes and FPO Board Paper and is **submitted directly to the Board**
* Please consult FPO if you need assistance

**Technical Evaluation Committee Summary**

**[Insert Tender Details]**

**[Insert Agency Name]**

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

**TENDER EVALUATION COMMITTEE REPORT TO GOVERNMENT TENDER BOARD**

**WSC xx/xxx [Contract for [STATE TENDER DETAILS]**

(For Endorsement)

**1.0 Background**

1.1 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 Project Summary**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Details | | |
| Estimated cost (before tender) : | (Delete row if not applicable) | | |
| Budget: | $ xxxxx  Source: IDC No. xxxxxxxxx. [Name of allocation] | | |
| Contract term: | (Delete row if not applicable) | | |
| Tender close date: |  | | |
| No of tender documents downloaded: | xx | **No of bids received:** | xx |

1. **Evaluation methodology**

3.1 The TEC members noted and agreed that the evaluation model is to be used:

Lowest Price  Simple Score  Weighted Attribute

Technical evaluation is simple score while price was taken into account in determining overall value for money over the whole-of-life of the contract

* 1. The bids were accordingly assessed and points were awarded for each criteria based on the information provided in the bids.

3.3 Rating was based on 1-10 with ten (10) as excellent and zero (0) as unacceptable. [Alternatively refer to Appendix that details scoring methodology]

3.4 The TEC accepted the following evaluation criteria and weightings based on the specification in the tender documents.

[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%** |

**4.0 Administrative Requirement**

4.1 Each supplier must meet more than 50% of the documents/administrative requirements that was issued in the Tender Documents before advancing to the next stage of evaluation on merit. Having met more than 50% of the administrative requirements, the following suppliers qualified to the next stage of evaluation on merits using the agreed evaluation criteria and weightings (Refer to Appendix x)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | Score | Sufficient Requirements Met? | FNPF/Tax Compliance? | Business Registered to execute service/supply of goods? |
|  |  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
|  |  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
|  |  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
|  |  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |
|  |  | Yes  No | Yes  No | Yes  No |

4.2 The following suppliers were eliminated at this stage:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Name of supplier** | **Reason for elimination** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**5.0 Innovation/Alternative Proposals (delete if not applicable)**

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 Due Diligence**

**6.1** 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)

**7.0 Technical Evaluation**

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

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

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

**7.2 Panel Discussions**

[Insert relevant panel discussion in relation to the above]

**8.0 Price Evaluation**

The TEC noted that the following suppliers met the administrative and technical evaluations and their price bids were assessed as follows: (Appendix x)

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

**8.1 Panel Discussions**

[Insert relevant panel discussion in relation to the above]

**9.0 Overall Assessment**

The TEC noted the following overall points:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Supplier | Technical Ranking | Price Ranking | Overall Ranking | Commentary (Justification for decision) |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**10.0 Recommendation**

In view of the above, the Board is invited to consider the following:

1. THAT the tender be awarded to [company recommended] at the cost of [amount] for a period of [contract period]
2. THAT the contractor be required to pay a performance bond of [10% of bid amount] within fourteen days after award of contract
3. THAT the agency put in place a proper contract vetted by SG’s office with a copy of the same submitted to FPO within 14 days of signing the contract

This report is respectfully submitted for consideration

**11.0 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 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

***Invited FPO Representative***

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