Attachment 4: RFT Stage 1 Conditions for Participation and Evaluation Criteria

(a) **Overview**

Tenders submitted by Tenderers at the completion of the RFT Stage 1 shall be assessed by the Corporation in accordance with the terms of the RFT documents which will include the following Conditions for Participation and Evaluation Criteria.

(b) **RFT Conditions for Participation**

A Tenderer will first be assessed to determine if it meets the RFT conditions for participation outlined below (if a Tender, or the Tenderer who lodged that Tender, dose not satisfy any RFT Conditions for Participation, the Tenderer will be rejected, and excluded from evaluation):

Item no.	Conditions for Participation
CP1	The Tenderer must be accredited under the WHS Accreditation Scheme established under the Federal Safety Commissioner Act 2022 (Cth) and specified in the Federal Safety Commissioner (Accreditation Scheme) Rules 2023 (**WHS Accreditation Scheme**). Note the Federal Safety Commissioner (Accreditation Scheme) Rules 2023 outlines provisions applying to joint venture arrangements that include accredited and unaccredited builders.
CP2	Evidence that the Tenderer holds the appropriate certifications, accreditations, registrations or licenses required under the Occupational Licensing Act 2005 and Building Act 2016 to discharge all relevant obligations under the Contract and the Tenderer must execute a declaration to that effect.
CP3	Evidence that the Respondent continues to meet the following financial capacity threshold requirements, based on the calculation methodologies outlined in clause 3.3 of Volume 2 of this EOI: • Current ratio of ≥ 1; and • Net tangible assets of ≥ 5% of the Respondent's last 3 years' average revenue; and • A maximum financial capacity greater than or equal to $500M.

(c) **Tender evaluation methodology**

The evaluation of Tenders will involve a value for money assessment involving both qualitative and quantitative assessment which will be combined to provide a total score.

The Total score will be used to inform the selection of the preferred Tenderer(s) who will be invited to participate in the RFT Stage 2.

The Evaluation Criteria and weightings are outlined in the table below:

Item no.	Qualitative Evaluation Criteria	Weighting
QEC1	Demonstrated capacity and capability of the Tenderer to deliver the Project through a detailed methodology on how the Tenderer proposes they will manage the Project and its key elements and interfaces. Demonstrated sound understanding of the key issues, opportunities & risks associated with the Project, including environmental management, health and safety and innovation. Articulate the Tenderer's approach to addressing these issues and risks in order to achieve the desired Project outcomes. Demonstrated understanding and appreciation of the Corporation's requirements in delivery of the Project including knowledge of public sector operations, policies and legislation relevant to this role. Demonstrated financial capacity.	5%
QEC2	Demonstrated understanding of the Project and ability to deliver the Project within the nominated time frames including, logic, durations, resourcing, work structure and supporting evidence. Demonstrated capability and capacity of the Tenderer's personnel and providers to effectively and efficiently manage, design, construct and commission the Project. Demonstrated commitment to continuously improve and performance with subcontractors and suppliers to achieve better outcomes for the Corporation and the Tenderer.	20%
	Qualitative Total	**25%**
Item no.	**Economic and Social Benefits Criteria**	**Weighting**
QEC3	The Tenderer's Economic and Social Benefits Statement is assessed to determine the economic and social benefits the Tenderer can bring to the Tasmanian economy and wider community should the Tenderer become the Contractor.	30%
Item no.	**Quantitative Evaluation Criteria**	**Weighting**
QEC4	Demonstrated value for money through assessment of the normalised tender price derived by the quantity surveyor appointed by the Corporation, based on the tendered preliminaries and margins and submitted target construction sum, after a quantitative evaluation of any assumptions, clarifications and exclusions, including the assessed value of: • agreed/accepted innovations • commercial qualifications (risk profile and/or departures against the proposed conditions of Contract) • program against benchmark • probabilistic determination of residual risk to the Corporation.	45%
	Total	**100%**

Attachment 5: RFT Stage 2 Conditions for Participation and Evaluation Criteria

(a) **Overview**

Where one Tenderer has progressed to RFT Stage 2, the Tender submitted shall be assessed in accordance with the terms of the RFT Stage 2 Agreement.

Where two Tenderers progress to RFT Stage 2, the Tenders submitted by Tenderer(s) at the completion of the RFT Stage 2 shall be evaluated by the Corporation in accordance with the terms of the RFT documents which will include the following Conditions for Participation and Evaluation Criteria.

(b) **RFT Conditions for Participation**

A Tenderer will first be assessed to determine if it meets the RFT conditions for participation outlined below (if a Tender, or the Tenderer who lodged that Tender, dose not satisfy any RFT Conditions for Participation, the Tenderer will be rejected, and excluded from evaluation):

Item no.	Conditions for Participation
CP1	The Tenderer must be accredited under the WHS Accreditation Scheme established under the Federal Safety Commissioner Act 2022 (Cth) and specified in the Federal Safety Commissioner (Accreditation Scheme) Rules 2023 (**WHS Accreditation Scheme**). Note the Federal Safety Commissioner (Accreditation Scheme) Rules 2023 outlines provisions applying to joint venture arrangements that include accredited and unaccredited builders.
CP2	Evidence that the Tenderer holds the appropriate certifications, accreditations, registrations or licenses required under the Occupational Licensing Act 2005 and Building Act 2016 to discharge all relevant obligations under the Contract and the Tenderer must execute a declaration to that effect.
CP3	Evidence that the Respondent continues to meet the following financial capacity threshold requirements, based on the calculation methodologies outlined in clause 3.3 of Volume 2 of this EOI: • Current ratio of ≥ 1; and • Net tangible assets of ≥ 5% of the Respondent’s last 3 years’ average revenue; and • A maximum financial capacity greater than or equal to $500M.

(c) **Tender evaluation methodology**

The evaluation of Tenders will involve a value for money assessment involving both qualitative and quantitative assessment which will be combined to provide a total score.

The Evaluation Criteria and weightings are outlined in the table below:

Item no.	Qualitative Evaluation Criteria	Weighting
QEC1	Demonstrated capacity and capability of the Tenderer to deliver the Project through a detailed methodology on how the Tenderer proposes they will manage the Project and its key elements and interfaces. Demonstrated sound understanding of the key issues, opportunities & risks associated with the Project, including environmental management, health and safety and innovation. Articulate the Tenderer's approach to addressing these issues and risks in order to achieve the desired Project outcomes. Demonstrated understanding and appreciation of the Corporation's requirements in delivery of the Project including knowledge of public sector operations, policies and legislation relevant to this role. Demonstrated financial capacity.	5%
QEC2	Demonstrated understanding of the Project and ability to deliver the Project within the nominated time frames including, logic, durations, resourcing, work structure and supporting evidence. Demonstrated capability and capacity of the Tenderer’s personnel and providers to effectively and efficiently manage, design, construct and commission the Project. Demonstrated commitment to continuously improve and performance with subcontractors and suppliers to achieve better outcomes for the Corporation and the Tenderer.	20%
	Qualitative Total	**25%**
Item no.	**Economic and Social Benefits Criteria**	**Weighting**
QEC3	The Tenderer's Economic and Social Benefits Statement is assessed to determine the economic and social benefits the Tenderer can bring to the Tasmanian economy and wider community should the Tenderer become the Contractor.	30%
Item no.	**Quantitative Evaluation Criteria**	**Weighting**
QEC4	Demonstrated value for money through assessment of the normalised tender price and derived by the Quantity Surveyor appointed by the Corporation, based on the Tenderer’s Lump Sum D&C Offer, after a quantitative evaluation of any assumptions, clarifications and exclusions, including the assessed value of: • agreed/accepted innovations • commercial qualifications (risk profile and/or departures against the proposed conditions of Contract) • program against benchmark • probabilistic determination of residual risk to the Corporation.	45%
	Total	**100%**