

QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

SUPPLEMENTARY BUDGET ESTIMATES HEARING: 15 October 2012

IMMIGRATION AND CITIZENSHIP PORTFOLIO

(SE12/0024) PROGRAM – OMARA

Senator Cash (L&CA 17) asked:

Provide a copy of the tender evaluation plan (including the criteria that have been used, and the process and methodology for evaluating the tender) and marketing scheme for the services for design and development of an ethical framework and tool kit.

Answer:

A copy of the Request for Quotation (RFQ) Evaluation and Probitly Plan is provided (please see attached PDF). There is no marketing scheme for the RFQ.



Australian Government

**Department of Immigration and
Citizenship**

**REQUEST FOR QUOTATION (RFQ)
EVALUATION & PROBITY PLAN**

RFQ No: 11/21

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	2
2.	Property and/or Services Required	2
3.	Maintaining Ethics and Fair Dealing.....	2
3.2	Conflict of Interest.....	2
3.3	Probity and Legal Advice.....	3
4.	RFQ Evaluation Team	3
5.	Evaluation Criteria	4
6.	Evaluation Methodology	4
6.1	Evaluation Process.....	4
6.2	RFQ Evaluation Report.....	6
7	Notification and Debriefing	6
	ATTACHMENT 1 Stage 2 - SCREENING	8
	ATTACHMENT 2 Stage 3 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION	9
	ATTACHMENT 3 Stage 4 - PRICE EVALUATION.....	11
	ATTACHMENT 4 Stage 5 - RISK ASSESSMENT	12
	ATTACHMENT 5 - SCORING SCALE	13
	ATTACHMENT 6 - DEED as to CONFIDENTIALITY & CONFLICT of INTEREST ...	14

1. Introduction

This Evaluation & Probity Plan (EPP) provides a framework for the selection of a preferred supplier. The EPP details the process and the methodology for the evaluation of responses to RFQ 11/21 to ensure that the process is fair and objective, and results in a value for money outcome. For background details refer to the attached Spending Proposal and Procurement Plan (Attachment A).

2. Property/Services Required

DIAC requires:

Consulting services for the design and development of an ethical framework and methodology to underpin decision making by registered migration agents including a comprehensive toolkit that facilitates understanding and teaching of that framework

3. Maintaining Ethics and Fair Dealing

3.1 Confidentiality of Information.

Confidentiality is essential to all stages of the evaluation process to ensure probity and fair dealing.

RFQ responses will be treated as confidential. All responses will be recorded and secured by the RFQ Registration Officer in accordance with the RFQ requirements. RFQ documentation is to be clearly marked 'Commercial-in-Confidence' and stored in a secure place. Any correspondence with respondents during the evaluation process and supporting reasons for decisions will be documented to ensure a complete audit trail. Upon completion of the evaluation process, original responses will be retained and filed and copies destroyed as classified waste.

The protection of information orally is just as important as physically protecting documentation. RFQ Evaluation Team members will not discuss RFQ responses or the evaluation process with any person outside of the Team.

To ensure that RFQ Evaluation Team members understand their obligations to maintain Confidentiality each team member will sign a Deed of Confidentiality before the evaluation process is commenced.

3.2 Conflict of Interest

Public confidence in the integrity of the Department's procurement process is crucial, and any real or apparent conflict of interest could jeopardise that confidence and the RFQ process.

RFQ Evaluation Team members will be required to disclose any actual, perceived or potential conflict of interest and take steps to avoid that conflict. Team members will also inform the Chair should a conflict of interest arise during the RFQ evaluation process.

Any conflict of interest is to be addressed as and when the issue arises, and documented. If required, the issue may be referred to Procurement and Contracts Legal for advice.

All RFQ Evaluation Team members must sign a Conflict of Interest Declaration.

Any external consultants engaged to provide specialist advice or participate in the evaluation process will also be required to sign a Deed of Confidentiality and a Conflict of Interest Declaration.

A copy of the Deed of Confidentiality and Conflict of Interest Declaration is attached (Attachment 6).

3.3 Probity and Legal Advice

The Procurement and Contracts Branch will provide probity and legal advice in relation to the RFQ process.

RFQ Evaluation Team members should review DIAC guidance on probity in procurement before the evaluation process is commenced. In this regard please refer to the DIAC Procurement Manual, chapter on Probity which is located at http://dimanet.immi.gov.au/financial_management/financial_guidance/functional_guidance/spending_public_money/procurement_manual.

- 3.4 Any questions from interested parties in response to the RFQ will be treated in confidence. No party will be provided information that is not available (or immediately made available) to all known interested parties.

4. RFQ Evaluation Team

The RFQ Evaluation Team members (the Team) are:

- Director, Professional Development
- Assistant Director, Professional Development; and
- Assistant Director, Professional Standards and Integrity.

The role of the Team is to evaluate all RFQ responses in accordance with this EPP and to prepare an Evaluation Report (ER).

All members of the Team and other officers and advisors involved in the evaluation must be fully prepared for the evaluation process. They must, as a minimum:

- read and understand the RFQ; and
- understand the relationship between the RFQ requirements and the evaluation criteria.

The Team and all other officers and advisors involved in the evaluation process, must also be fully aware of, and comply with, requirements of the:

- DIAC Procurement Policy Framework, including the *Commonwealth Procurement Guidelines* – December 2008 (as updated from time to time);
- Guidelines on official conduct of Commonwealth Public Servants (details available on IMMInet at http://dimanet.immi.gov.au/staff_services/values_conduct)

5. Evaluation Criteria

The preferred supplier will be selected on the basis of having submitted the response that provides best value for money for the Department as determined by an assessment of each response against the following evaluation criteria:

- a. Fitness for purpose:
 - i. proposed approach to providing the services; and/or
 - ii. proposed ethical framework and methodology and toolkit that best achieves desired purposes;
 - iii. capacity to provide resources in the required timeframe; and
 - iv. technical ability and relevant expertise to provide the required services.
- b. Performance history:
 - i. demonstrated experience providing services similar to those required, specifically experience in designing, developing or facilitating discussions around ethical frameworks and models and facilitating the development of ethical intelligence and sound decision making principles;
 - ii. demonstrated understanding and knowledge of application of ethics in the migration advice profession; and
 - iii. referees reports.
- c. The relative risk of each response;
- d. Price and financial considerations (including all relevant direct and indirect benefits and costs over the whole procurement cycle);
- e. Extent of compliance with the draft contract;
- f. Extent and breadth of experience in design, knowledge of contemporary adult learning principles.

6. Evaluation Methodology

6.1 Evaluation Process

The evaluation will be undertaken in a staged process as outlined below.

Stage 1 – Receipt and Registration

The RFQ responses will be received via hard copy or via email and registered. Late responses will not be considered, unless the respondent can demonstrate that the lateness was due to circumstances beyond the control of the respondent.

Late responses are to be referred to the Probity Advisor and/or the Legal Advisor before a response is formally screened out for non conformance with the RFQ requirements.

Stage 2 – Screening of RFQ responses

Responses will be screened to identify those which do not provide the required information specified in the RFQ.

All possible cases of non compliance with the RFQ requirements are to be referred to the Probity Advisor and/or the Legal Advisor before a response is formally screened out for non conformance with the RFQ requirements.

Clarification of responses may be sought from respondents during the screening assessment. For further procedural guidance in issuing a request for clarification refer to the Stage 3- Technical Evaluation, below.

A screening worksheet is attached (Attachment 1)

Stage 3 – Technical Evaluation

The technical evaluation will consist of an evaluation of the response against the criteria set out in the RFQ. An assessment involving scoring will be undertaken using the scoring scale attached at Attachment 5. This assessment will be used to rank respondents. The technical evaluation assessment worksheet is detailed in Attachment 2.

As part of the technical evaluation, clarification of responses may be sought from respondents. Requests for clarification will focus on addressing an ambiguity or error or omission, in the response to the RFQ. All requests for clarification will be in writing and from the contact officer, and will direct that answers from respondents must be in writing addressed to the contact officer

During this Stage the Team may also conduct reference checks. The Team may take into account referee comments and if required, reassess its previous evaluation in light of the information provided by the referee(s).

Stage 4 – Price Evaluation

An assessment of price will be undertaken. If required, the Team will normalise the price to account for RFQ price requirements and variations in responses.

The adopted price assessment methodology should allow an equal comparison between responses.

The worksheet for assessment of price is attached (Attachment 3).

Stage 5 – Risk Assessment

An appropriate risk assessment will be undertaken for each response. Any risks identified, which may relate to the successful negotiation of a contract acceptable to DIAC, are to be detailed in the risk assessment.

The risk assessment should include:

- (i) the degree of overall compliance by each respondent with the terms of the draft contract attached to the RFQ;
- (ii) the likelihood of each respondent achieving what has been offered in the response (including taking into account any referee comments); and
- (iii) any other risks identified in the evaluation process.

The Team should consult with Procurement and Contracts Legal section for advice on contractual compliance and associated risks.

The worksheet for detailing the risk factors and the assessment process is attached (Attachment 4).

Individual assessments of perceived risk may vary among the Team. Variations in assessments will be resolved by the Team by discussion and the application of the risk assessment factors as detailed in the extract.

Stage 6 – Value for Money

Value for money for each response will be determined by a consideration of the cost represented by the assessment of price and value represented by the technical assessment and an assessment of all risks.

6.2 RFQ Evaluation Report

An Evaluation Report will be prepared reporting on the outcome of the evaluation process. The report will include, amongst other things, a summary of the assessment and the ranking of each response, the value for money considerations, and the recommendation of the preferred supplier.

A final report will then be submitted to the Delegate for approval.

7 Notification and Debriefing

The RFQ process is proposed to be completed by 1 April 2011 with the date for seeking Delegate approval being 1 April 2011. The contract with the service provider is expected to be finalised by 9 April 2010 and the services to commence on 11 April 2011 May.

Once the contract has been finalised with the preferred service provider, unsuccessful respondents will be advised by letter and offered an opportunity for an oral debrief.

Approval of the Delegate

I, the Approving Delegate, approve of the Evaluation and Probity Plan.

Name: Stephen Wood

Signature:

Date: 22 Feb 11

Christine,
I am recommending that (as the Director Professional Standards has advised me that priorities in their area do not allow for release of the Assistant Director or other suitable officer from their Section over the next few weeks),

1. I replace the Assistant Director, Professional Standards and Integrity on the RFQ Evaluation Team;
2. You approve this evaluation and probity plan (with the amendment at 1 above);
3. You be the delegate for approval of the final report and recommendation of the preferred supplier

30/3/11

AGREED.

Christine Sykes.

30/3/11.

ATTACHMENT 1 Stage 2 - SCREENING

[Insert respondent's name]

Issues to be considered by the RFQ Evaluation Team	Compliance	Comment
Does the response provide all the information specified in Part 3 of the RFQ?		
Is the respondent, and any of its proposed subcontractors, compliant under the Equal Opportunity for Women in the Workplace Act 1999?		
If not, has the respondent provided a Letter of Compliance?		
Has the respondent confirmed they will comply with DIAC policy on Prohibition of Engaging Illegal Workers?		
Has the respondent confirmed that at the time of submitting their response, neither they nor any of their subcontractors, have any judicial decision against them (including any decisions under appeal) relating to unpaid employee entitlements?.		
Has the respondent advised the number of 'full time equivalent' persons employed to enable their Small Business Status to be determined?		

Compliance column to be completed by use of "yes/complies", "partially complies", or "no/does not comply"

ATTACHMENT 2 Stage 3 - TECHNICAL EVALUATION

[Insert respondent's name]

Numerical values to be assigned to the sub-criteria are detailed in Attachment 5 to this EPP. The scores are then averaged and a score entered against the criteria headings.

Fitness for purpose of property and services	Score	Comment
Proposed approach to providing the services		
Proposed ethical framework and methodology and toolkit that best achieves desired purposes		
Capacity to provide service in the required timeframe.		
Technical ability to provide the required services		

Performance history relevant to the property and services	Score	Comment
Demonstrated experience providing similar services, specifically experience in designing, developing or facilitating discussions around ethical frameworks and models and facilitating the development of ethical intelligence and sound decision making principles		
Demonstrated understanding and knowledge of application of ethics in the migration advice profession		
Extent and breadth of experience in design, knowledge of		

contemporary adult learning principles		
Referees reports		

ATTACHMENT 3 Stage 4 - PRICE EVALUATION

[Insert respondent's name]

Price / Fee structure	Score
The extent to which all required items and costs (including royalties, levies, duties, taxes and charges required for the completion of the contract, inclusive of any GST) are clearly outlined in the proposal.	
Justification of the costs provided in the pricing/fee schedule for the duration of the contract including options.	

ATTACHMENT 4 Stage 5 - RISK ASSESSMENT

[Insert respondent's name]

Risk	Likelihood rating	Consequence rating	Risk Rating
eg Risks identified with any partial or non compliance issues with draft contract			
eg The likelihood of the respondent achieving what has been offered in the response			
eg Any other risks identified in the evaluation process			

This assessment is to be undertaken referring to the DIAC Risk Assessment Toolkit, available on the IMMInet website.

ATTACHMENT 5 - SCORING SCALE

This is the scoring scale to be used by an RFQ Evaluation Team. The language used in the rating scale is intended as a guide to the team in determining the score to be given to a response. Responses do not have to achieve every description associated with a score to achieve that score.

Rating Scale	Score
<p>Exceptional</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specification requirements significantly exceeded in all areas. - No weaknesses or deficiencies in response. - Claims are fully substantiated. - Little or no risks that require management strategies. - High probability of success in the delivery/performance of the Services. 	5
<p>Very Good</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specification requirements met to a very high standard in all areas. - No weaknesses or deficiencies in response. - All Claims are well substantiated. - A low number of risks that require management strategies. - Very good probability of success in the delivery/performance of the Services. 	4
<p>Satisfactory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specification requirements met to a high standard in most areas. - Low number of weaknesses or deficiencies in response. - Claims are substantiated in key areas. - A number of risks that require management strategies. - Good probability of success in the delivery/performance of the Services. 	3
<p>Poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specification requirements poorly addressed in some areas. - Large number of weaknesses or deficiencies in response. - Claims largely unsubstantiated. A number of proposals unworkable. - A large number of risks that require management strategies. - Low probability of success in the delivery/performance of the Services. 	2
<p>Unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Specification requirements not met. - Very high number of weaknesses or deficiencies in response. - Claims unsubstantiated and unworkable. - A very high number of risks that require management strategies. - Little probability of success in the delivery/ performance of the Services. 	1

ATTACHMENT 6 - DEED as to CONFIDENTIALITY & CONFLICT of INTEREST

I, _____ (name), covenant for the benefit of the Commonwealth of Australia ("**Commonwealth**"), in connection with my work on, or in relation to, the **Department of Immigration and Citizenship**, [insert name] process (the "**Project**"), as follows:

1. For the purpose of the Project, I will, or may, receive and have access to information which:
 - (a) is identified as confidential;
 - (b) I know or ought to know is confidential;
 - (c) is by its nature confidential; or
 - (d) is Personal Information,
 collectively, "**Confidential Information**".

Unless the information is publicly available, or I am otherwise directed by the Commonwealth, I will assume information is Confidential Information.

For the purpose of this clause, "**Personal Information**" means information or an opinion (including information or an opinion forming part of a database), whether true or not, and whether recorded in a material form or not, about a natural person whose identity is apparent, or can reasonably be ascertained, from the information or opinion.

2. Subject to clause 3 of this Deed, I understand that I must:
 - (a) at all times treat as confidential and must not disclose to any person any Confidential Information;
 - (b) at all times keep all Confidential Information securely stored in accordance with any directions by the Commonwealth;
 - (c) as directed by the Commonwealth, deliver up to the Commonwealth all Confidential Information in my possession or control; and
 - (d) not:
 - (i) copy or duplicate or reproduce in any manner whatsoever, or evolve translations of or extractions from, any portion of the Confidential Information; or
 - (ii) modify, create or recreate by any means in whole or in part any aspect or version of the Confidential Information or cause or permit any other person to do any of the foregoing.
3. The restrictions imposed by clause 2 of this Deed will not apply to the disclosure of any information:
 - (a) to the extent to which it is required to be disclosed by law, a governmental agency or court order;
 - (b) to the extent to which it is necessary to enable me to lawfully work on the Project; or
 - (c) which is in or comes into the public domain otherwise than by disclosure in breach of this deed poll.

- 4. If at any time, I have an actual, apparent or potential Conflict of Interest, I shall:
 - (a) disclose in writing that interest promptly to the Chair of the Tender Evaluation Committee, and;
 - (b) take necessary action to avoid the conflict as directed by the Commonwealth.

In this clause, “**Conflict of Interest**” means I have interests which conflict or which may conflict with those of the Commonwealth, including in relation to the Project.

- 5. I warrant that I will:
 - (a) take all necessary action to satisfy my obligations under this Deed;
 - (b) promptly notify the Commonwealth of any unauthorised possession, disclosure, use or knowledge of the Confidential Information and take all steps necessary to prevent the recurrence of such possession, disclosure, use or knowledge;
 - (c) co-operate with the Commonwealth in any litigation against third parties which might be considered necessary or appropriate by the Commonwealth to protect the Confidential Information;
 - (d) do or cause to be done all acts, matters and things and execute or cause to be executed all agreements, deeds and other documents as may be necessary to give effect to this Deed; and
 - (e) if I am not an employee of the Commonwealth, indemnify the Commonwealth against any cost, expense, liability, loss or damage suffered by it arising out of or in connection with any breach of my obligations under this Deed.
- 6. Without limiting the Commonwealth's rights under or in connection with this Deed, or otherwise under statute, at law or in equity, I acknowledge that:
 - (a) a breach of this Deed may constitute a breach of section 70 of the *Crimes Act 1914* (Cth) which carries a penalty of up to two years imprisonment; and
 - (b) more generally, the provisions of this Deed survive the termination or expiration of this Deed.

EXECUTED as a Deed on _____ day of _____ 200X

by:

.....

(Name in full)

.....

(Signature)

in the presence of

.....

(Signature of Witness)

.....

(Name of Witness in Full)

Use this table to prioritise your risks as identified in each Risk Assessment & Treatment Plan Worksheet completed by your area/project.

Refer to the *DIAC Risk Assessment Toolkit* for guidance on identifying, assessing and rating your risks.

<i>Risk</i>	<i>Risk Owner</i>	<i>Residual Risk Rating</i>	<i>Priority</i>
1. Contract cannot be commenced by 11 April 2011	Project Manager	Low	1
2. Conflict of Interest	Project Manager	Low	2
3. Quoted cost does not represent value for money	Project Manager	Low	3
4. Overstates capacity to undertake project or to deliver project within stipulated timeline	Project Manager	Low	1
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			

RISK-ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT WORKSHEET (USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT)

Objective - what are we trying to achieve? Design and development of an ethical framework and methodology to underpin decision making for RMAs including a comprehensive toolkit that facilitates understanding and teaching of that framework		Date of risk assessment March 2011		RISK REFERENCE #
Risk Contract cannot be commenced by 11 April 2011				
Project/Business Manager Dora Chin-Tan		Project/Business Area Professional Development		
CAUSE Description – WHY might this risk occur?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delays in governance process and approvals Contract negotiation is protracted due to dispute over clauses in contract Quality of RFQ responses is poor Quoted costs all exceed budget available 				
CONROLS in place - What are we <u>currently</u> doing to mitigate the likelihood or the consequence of this risk?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard contract distributed with RFQ Scope has been restricted to contain cost and timeframe Material has been prepared to assist respondents 				
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK WITH THE CURRENT CONTROLS IN PLACE? – Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix				
Likelihood Possible	Consequence Slippage in time and performance standards	Risk Rating Medium		
What are we <u>planning</u> to do to mitigate the likelihood or consequence of this risk?				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Offer briefings to all respondents Require responders to identify risk and propose mitigation action Ensure Reg 10 approval is in place as soon as it becomes evident that there may be slippage in time Appropriate and comprehensive quotation evaluation criteria Terms and conditions of contract clearly stipulated at outset 				
Has the <u>costing</u> for the planned controls been included in your Budget proposals where necessary? (YES/NO) YES				
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK AFTER THESE PLANNED CONTROLS ARE IN PLACE? – Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix				
Likelihood Possible	Consequence Slippage in time and performance standards	Residual Risk Rating Low		
RISK REALISATION				
What action would you take if the risk is realised? Ensure new deadlines are drawn up and progress monitored. Press for reallocation of resources or consultants if necessary. Organise for new approvals if required for example Reg 10 approvals. Obtain legal advice. Brief Advisory Board and CEO.				

RISK ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT WORKSHEET (USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT)

Objective - what are we trying to achieve?	Design and development of an ethical framework and methodology to underpin decision making for RMAs including a comprehensive toolkit that facilitates understanding and teaching of that framework		Date of risk assessment	March 2011	RISK REFERENCE #
Risk	Conflict of Interest				
Project/Business Manager	Dora Chin-Tan	Project/Business Area	Professional Development		
CAUSE Description – WHY might this risk occur?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants could intend in the future to seek to deliver the Ethics Refresher course and/or partner with a provider who is doing so. 		CONSEQUENCE Description - WHAT will happen if this risk occurs? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consultant's deliverables may not have credibility with stakeholders Recommendations could be biased May undermine the perceived integrity of the Office of the MARA 			
CONTROLS in place - What are we <u>currently</u> doing to mitigate the likelihood or the consequence of this risk?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process for approval of activities and CPD providers 					
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK WITH THE CURRENT CONTROLS IN PLACE? – Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix					
Likelihood	Possible	Consequence	Biased Review and Recommendations		Risk Rating
What are we <u>planning</u> to do to mitigate the likelihood or consequence of this risk?					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultants to submit Declaration of No Conflict of Interest prior to contract commencement Stringent criteria for evaluation of quotations Stringent evaluation of Ethics activities submitted for approval as CPD activities 		Who in your area is responsible?	How will the controls be monitored?	When will the activities commence?	Are stakeholders outside your area informed?
		Assistant Director	Policies and procedures	March 2011	No
				March 2011	No
				March 2011	No
Has the <u>costing</u> for the planned controls been included in your Budget proposals where necessary? (YES/NO) YES					
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK AFTER THESE PLANNED CONTROLS ARE IN PLACE? – Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix					
Likelihood	Unlikely	Consequence	Biased Review and Recommendations		Residual Risk Rating
RISK REALISATION					
What action would you take if the risk is realised? Request for new consultant to be allocated to the project.					

RISK ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT WORKSHEET (USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT)

Objective - what are we trying to achieve?	Design and development of an ethical framework and methodology to underpin decision making for RMAs including a comprehensive toolkit that facilitates understanding and teaching of that framework		Date of risk assessment	March 2011	RISK REFERENCE #	
Risk	Quoted cost does not represent value for money					
Project/Business Manager	Dora Chin-Tan	Project/Business Area	Professional Development			
CAUSE Description – WHY might this risk occur?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consultants cost research and scope on misunderstanding of requirements • Consultants intentionally overstate costs for their own advantage 						
CONSEQUENCE Description - WHAT will happen if this risk occurs?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time slippage • Non compliance with procurement guidelines • Waste of time and resources having to re-commence procurement • Lack of trust by OMARA in provider 						
CONTROLS in place - What are we <u>currently</u> doing to mitigate the likelihood or the consequence of this risk?			Who in your area is responsible?	How will the controls be monitored?	Are stakeholders outside your area informed?	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accurate background research into costing • Access to comparative costing with similar projects 			Project Manager	Record of background information	No	
			Project Manager	Record of previous costing	No	
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK WITH THE CURRENT CONTROLS IN PLACE? – Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix						
Likelihood	Unlikely	Consequence	Slippage in time, possible non-compliance with procurement guidelines. Re-commencement of procurement exercise			Risk Rating
						Medium
What are we <u>planning</u> to do to mitigate the likelihood or consequence of this risk?						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre brief respondees on requirements • Closely evaluate costings and query any discrepancies or apparent misunderstandings 			Who in your area is responsible?	When will the activities commence?	Are stakeholders outside your area informed?	
			Project Manager	March 2011	No	
			Project Manager	March 2011	No	
Has the <u>costing</u> for the planned controls been included in your Budget proposals where necessary? (YES/NO) YES						
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK AFTER THESE PLANNED CONTROLS ARE IN PLACE? – Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix						
Likelihood	Unlikely	Consequence	Slippage in time, possible non-compliance with procurement guidelines. Re-commencement of procurement exercise			Residual Risk Rating
						Low
RISK REALISATION						
What action would you take if the risk is realised? Re-scope the project and if necessary recommence procurement exercise.						

RISK ASSESSMENT AND TREATMENT WORKSHEET (USE IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT'S RISK ASSESSMENT TOOLKIT)

Objective - what are we trying to achieve?		Design and development of an ethical framework and methodology to underpin decision making for RMAs including a comprehensive toolkit that facilitates understanding and teaching of that framework		Date of risk assessment		March 2011		RISK REFERENCE #	
Risk		Overstates capacity to undertake project or to deliver project within stipulated timeline							
Project/Business Manager		Dora Chin-Tan		Project/Business Area		Professional Development			
CAUSE Description - WHY might this risk occur?		CONSEQUENCE Description - WHAT will happen if this risk occurs?							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project consultants overstate qualifications and experience Project consultants underestimate challenges or issues 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slippage in terms of time or performance outcomes Slippage in terms of time or performance outcomes 							
CONTROLS in place - What are we <u>currently</u> doing to mitigate the likelihood or the consequence of this risk?		Who in your area is responsible?		How will the controls be monitored?		Are stakeholders outside your area informed?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not applicable 									
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK WITH THE CURRENT CONTROLS IN PLACE? - Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix									
Likelihood	Likely	Consequence		Slippage in time and performance standards		Risk Rating		Medium	
What are we <u>planning</u> to do to mitigate the likelihood or consequence of this risk?		Who in your area is responsible?		When will the activities commence?		Are stakeholders outside your area informed?			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation and evidence of qualifications and prior project experience Close scrutiny of evaluation criteria and checking of references 		Project Manager		March 2011		No			
Has the <u>costing</u> for the planned controls been included in your Budget proposals where necessary? (YES/NO) YES		Evaluators		March 2011		No			
WHAT IS THE RATING OF THIS RISK AFTER THESE PLANNED CONTROLS ARE IN PLACE? - Refer to the Department's Risk Matrix									
Likelihood	Possible	Consequence		Slippage in time and performance standards		Residual Risk Rating		Low	
RISK REALISATION									
What action would you take if the risk is realised? Not shortlist the respondent in question.									