

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS  
ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO

**Group: 3**

**Program: 1.6**

**Question No. SBE14/042**

**Senator Bilyk asked the following question at the hearing on 20 November 2014:**

Senator BILYK: All right, I will ask a different question. You have had lots of time today, Senator O'Sullivan. Why weren't the four shortlisted bidders given the opportunity to respond to the department's belated concerns about the security specifications of the vehicles?

CHAIR: Is that what it was about? I am not sure that that is in evidence.

Senator BILYK: No, it is.

Mr Croweller: Can you please repeat the question, sorry.

Senator BILYK: Why weren't the four shortlisted bidders given the opportunity to respond to the department's belated concerns about the security specifications of the vehicles?

CHAIR: I do not know that the department had belated concerns.

Senator BILYK: I am not asking you, Chair.

CHAIR: Well, have you given that evidence?

Mr Croweller: The other bit is for the tender.

[.....]

Mr Croweller: The short answer is, Senator, that they were not able to adequately meet the specification for the vehicle.

Senator BILYK: Were they given an opportunity to respond to the concerns?

Mr Croweller: I would have to take that on notice on the specifics of that, Senator.

**The answer to the honourable senator's question is as follows:**

The Department provided opportunities for each tenderer to clarify information submitted in the RFT process to enable the value for money assessment of each bid. Following this process, the Department determined that the unsuccessful tenders would not represent value for money and awarding a contract would therefore not be in the public interest. These tenderers were notified that their bids were unsuccessful on 16 July 2013.