



MINUTE

RM8 Ref: D17/479168

20 December 2017

TO: Rob Walker, Group Manager, Stakeholder Engagement Group
CC: Kim Laybutt, Manager, Contracts and Procurement
FROM: Andreas Marcelja, Industry Relations Manager

Evaluation report – CASA 17/107 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey

I attach an evaluation report in relation to the procurement for the provision of a Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey to CASA.

I request that you read the report, and if satisfied with it and the recommendation, approve the report and the recommendation made by signing the last page. If you do not agree with the recommendation, please advise accordingly.

Otherwise, return the report once signed.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'A. Marcelja', written over a horizontal line.

Andreas Marcelja
Industry Relations Manager
Stakeholder Engagement Group

Evaluation Report

CASA 17/107 Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey

1. Background

- 1.1 The objective of the procurement is to conduct stakeholder research and analyse the results, including an evaluation and comparison with the previous research results and determine how CASA can effectively improve its performance and relationship with the aviation community going forward.

2. Procurement Process

- 2.1 On 24 November 2017, an Approach to Market (ATM) was issued for the procurement of services to conduct a stakeholder satisfaction research survey. The ATM closed on 8 December 2017 at 5.00pm.

- 2.2 The procurement method was limited tender.

- 2.3 The ATM was emailed to the following Potential Suppliers:

(a) [REDACTED]

(b) Colmar Brunton

(c) [REDACTED]

- 2.4 At the ATM Closing Time, two Submissions were received from the following Respondents:

(a) [REDACTED]

(b) Colmar Brunton

[REDACTED] declined to submit a proposal citing other workload commitments.

- 2.5 The procurement was conducted in accordance with the *Commonwealth Procurement Rules* (CPRs) and *CASA Procurement Manual*, using the Commonwealth Contracting Suite (CCS) to approach the market. The CCS Contract will be used to enter into an arrangement with the preferred Supplier, under the Commonwealth Contract Terms.

3. Evaluation process

- 3.1 Submissions were evaluated against the criteria stated in the Commonwealth ATM Terms (ATM Terms) to determine the best value for money outcome for the procurement.

3.2 The criteria for evaluation were the:

- (a) extent to which the Potential Supplier's Submissions meets the Customer's requirement set out in the ATM;
- (b) Potential Supplier's demonstrated capability and capacity to provide the requirement; and
- (c) whole of life costs to be incurred by the Customer. Considerations will include both the quoted price and any costs that the Customer will incur as a result of accepting the potential Supplier's Submission.

3.3 An evaluation team was established to:

- (a) evaluate the Submissions in accordance with the evaluation criteria; and
- (b) sign off on an evaluation report with a recommendation for the FAO's approval.

3.4 The evaluation team consisted of:

Name	Position Title	Branch and Group	Role
Fiona Beirne	Communications Officer	Regulatory Communications, Stakeholder Engagement Group	Evaluation team member
Andreas Marcelja	Manager Industry Relations	Industry Relations, Stakeholder Engagement Group	Evaluation team chair

3.5 The evaluation criteria are not weighted.

3.6 The following ratings were applied to each of the evaluation criteria:

Very Good (5): The Submission satisfies the evaluation criterion to a very high standard, and presents minimal or no risk to CASA, and its claims are fully supported by the information provided.

Good (4): The Submission satisfies the evaluation criterion to a high standard, and/or presents limited risk to CASA. The Tenderer's claims are supported by the information provided.

Satisfactory (3): The Submission satisfies the evaluation criterion to a satisfactory degree, and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to CASA. There are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.

Poor* (2): The Submission barely satisfies the evaluation criterion, and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to CASA. There are major deficiencies in the information provided.

Unsatisfactory* (1): The Submission does not satisfy the evaluation criterion, and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to CASA.

* A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more evaluation criteria will exclude the Respondent from further participation in the procurement process.

4. Evaluation

4.1 The compliant Submission/s were fully evaluated. The final evaluation of Submissions is provided at **Attachment A** [Group Evaluation Worksheet].

5. Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

5.1 No Conflicts of interest were declared by the evaluation team.

6. Recommendation

6.1 The evaluation team recommends the contract be awarded to Colmar Brunton.

6.2 The proposed contract will commence on 8 January 2017 and end on 30 April 2017. The total cost for the contract term is [REDACTED].

6.3 The estimated maximum expenditure, including possible extensions, will be as follows:

Financial Year	Expenditure (including GST)
2017/18	[REDACTED]
Total	[REDACTED]

6.4 The funding is accounted for in the FY17/18 SEG OPEX budget.

6.5 Approval to exercise any contract extension will be sought prior to extending the arrangement.

7. Approvals

7.1 Evaluation Team sign off

Name	Signature	Date
Andreas Marcelja (Chair)	<i>A. Marcelja</i>	20/12/17
Fiona Beirne <i>F. Beirne</i>	<i>Fiona Beirne</i>	20/12/17


7.2 Contracts and Procurement Section

Supported / Not Supported

Name: Kim Laybutt	Signature: <i>Please refer to email on page 9.</i>
Position: Manager, Contracts and Procurement	Date: / /

7.3 FAO Approval

Approved / Not Approved

Name: Rob Walker	Signature: 
Position: Group Manager Stakeholder Engagement Group	Date: 20 11 2017



ATTACHMENT A: GROUP EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Reference ID:	D17/467683
Procurement Title:	CASA Stakeholder Satisfaction Survey 17/107

Evaluation Ratings

The evaluation criteria are not weighted.

The following ratings were applied to each of the evaluation criteria:

Very Good (5): The Submission satisfies the evaluation 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 (4): The Submission satisfies the evaluation criterion to a high standard and/or presents limited risk to the Commonwealth. The Tenderer's claims are supported by the information provided.

Satisfactory (3): The Submission satisfies the evaluation criterion to a satisfactory degree and/or presents an acceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth. There are some minor deficiencies and shortcomings in the information provided.

Poor* (2): The Submission barely satisfies the evaluation criterion and/or presents some degree of unacceptable risk to the Commonwealth. There are major deficiencies in the information provided.

Unsatisfactory* (1): The Submission does not satisfy the evaluation criterion and/or presents an unacceptable level of risk to the Commonwealth.

* A 'Poor' or 'Unsatisfactory' rating for one or more evaluation criteria will exclude the Potential Supplier from further participation in the procurement process.

COMPLIANT RESPONSE EVALUATION

The following two compliant Responses were fully evaluated:

Supplier Name	Evaluation Criteria			Overall Evaluation
	Meets Requirement	Proven Capacity	Total Cost	Value for Money Assessment and Comments
[REDACTED]	<p>3</p> <p>All minimum requirements and timelines met.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>[REDACTED] proposal identified a senior team of two comprising researcher and communications specialist. Their proposal identified limited current experience – a number of projects identified were at least three years old. No identified experience with aviation industry.</p> <p>[REDACTED] submitted a number of questions to CASA to help inform their proposal but did not submit this until well after the deadline.</p>	<p>4</p> <p>The proposal outlined a breakdown of costs to address the various elements of the fieldwork but it did not include the hourly/daily rates for the project team.</p> <p>The associated travel component was separated out from the fieldwork costs.</p> <p>Additional fieldwork options were proposed but not costed.</p> <p>The proposal also suggested incentive payments but did not indicate whether this would be an additional cost to CASA.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>[REDACTED] submission showed they understood the approach to market and could meet CASA's minimum requirements. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] 40 depth interviews.</p> <p>[REDACTED] Colmar Brunton. [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED] two senior researchers but indicated they would outsource the fieldwork [REDACTED]</p> <p>Whilst the evaluation panel thought the proposal was value for money, there were concerns raised about the additional time and resources CASA would need to devote to [REDACTED] project team.</p>

Colmar Brunton	<p>5</p> <p>Colmar Brunton's proposal demonstrated a very good understanding of the brief and the issues that will affect the research.</p>	<p>5</p> <p>Colmar Brunton has considerable experience in delivering complex, large scale research projects for the aviation sector and government within extremely tight timeframes. Many recent examples were included.</p>	<p>3</p> <p>Colmar Brunton provided a clear breakdown of costs which covered all known charges (except for a breakdown of hourly/daily rate for the individual project team members).</p> <div style="background-color: black; width: 100%; height: 15px; margin-top: 5px;"></div>	<p>4</p> <p>Colmar Brunton provided a comprehensive proposal that met all stated requirements and provided an in depth understanding of the tasks. The proposal demonstrated a reassuring level of detail which represents a low risk to CASA and a detailed understanding of the requested task.</p> <p>Colmar proposed a very experienced team that would be dedicated to the project with significant prior experience in the aviation industry.</p>
----------------	---	---	--	---

Beirne, Fiona

From: Laybutt, Kim
Sent: Wednesday, 20 December 2017 2:07 PM
To: Beirne, Fiona
Cc: Glover, Carly
Subject: RE: PLEASE REVIEW: Stakeholder Engagement Survey evaluation of responses [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi Fiona,

Supported.

As this contract is above [REDACTED], once the evaluation report has been signed off you'll need to have the contract drafted by LARPIS. You can send it to them via legal@casa.gov.au.

Thanks

Kim

Kim Laybutt
Manager, Contracts and Procurement
CASA\Finance Branch

T: (02) 6217 1193
M: 0427 481 097

www.casa.gov.au

CASA procurement and contracting information, guides and checklists can be found at <http://horace/groups-and-branches/Pages/contracts-procurement.aspx>

-----Original Message-----

From: Beirne, Fiona
Sent: Wednesday, 20 December 2017 12:24 PM
To: Tenders
Cc: Laybutt, Kim
Subject: PLEASE REVIEW: Stakeholder Engagement Survey evaluation of responses [SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hi Kym

Andreas asked me to forward the attached to you for review before he provides to Rob Walker for endorsement.

Would be grateful if you/or one of the team could let me know today if we have missed anything as I am mindful of the commencement date of the contract (8 January).

cheers

Fiona Beirne
Communication Advisor
Safety Promotion and Communication
Stakeholder Engagement Group/CASA

P: 02 6217 1134 16 Furzer Street, Phillip ACT 2603
REGULATION REFORM | COMMUNICATION

-----Original Message-----

From: Marcelja, Andreas

Sent: Wednesday, 20 December 2017 11:15 AM

Cc: Beirne, Fiona

Subject: HPE Records Manager CASA ELECTRONIC SUB-FILE : F17/4135-5 : Evaluation of responses
[SEC=UNCLASSIFIED]

UNCLASSIFIED

Hey Fiona, can you please check the evaluation documents for me? Thanks, Andreas.

-----< HPE Records Manager record Information >-----

Record Number: F17/4135-5

Title : Evaluation of responses