Organisational Design

Quality Score

Evaluation Consensus Score (out of 5)

Evaluation Criteria	s 47G (1)(a) [redacted]	Nous	s 47G (1)(a) [redacted]	Evaluation Comments
Capability - ability and methodology to perform the task The Service Provider's demonstrated understanding of the Services required, including the identification of any key challenges and the management of risk.		4.0		The methodology was particularly well articulated, by Nous [redacted] and [redacted] s 47G (1)(a) also demonstrated they had specific tools that they use to support the work. The Nouse methodology was deveopled by an internationally recognised org design expert.
Capability - skills/qualifications of personnel The relevant experience of nominated Key Personnel in providing the similar services to the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work		4.0		Nous was the standout here due to the unique expertise they have in the regulatory space and s 47F from Nous is also an internationally recognised expert in org design
Capability - previous experience The Service Provider's demonstrated organisational experience in providing the similar services to the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work.		4.0		Nous again could demonstrate a very strong track record in org wide projects with similar organisations. Some of the other providers, while they had previous experience, it was not always at the organisational level.
Capacity - ability start/complete the project within the timeframes, space, available resources etc. The Service Provider's demonstrated capability and capacity to provide the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work to a very high standard and within the specified timeframes		4.0		Nous and [redacted] in particular gave confidence that they could complete the project within the given timeframes having demonstrated that they had considered any delivery risks in their proposal. Their proposed team had availability and flexibility due to our changing timelines

Price Index

	s 47(1)(b) [redacted]	s 47(1)(b) [redacted]	s 47(1)(b) [redacted]	Evaluation Comments
Evaluation Price after all clarification The extent to which the level and structure of fees proposed provides value for money for the Australian Government. **Phase 1 pricing only has been used to ensure comparability.**				Phase one price predominately considered here to ensure comparability across the proposals. The responses with regard to phase two made some different assumptions. Prices were quite variable . Post the interviews that were help with the top three providers we asked clarifying questions to ensure our understanding of the overall price was understood fully.
Price index		0.4		

Evaluation Score

Weighted Score (out of 100)

Evaluation Criteria (weighted)	Max Score	Weighting (%)	s 47G (1)(a)	Nouse	s 47G (1)(a)
Capability - ability and methodology to perform the task The Service Provider's demonstrated understanding of the Services required, including the identification of any key challenges and the management of risk.	5	11.1	[redacted]	8.9	[redacted]
Capability - skills/qualifications of personnel The relevant experience of nominated Key Personnel in providing the similar services to the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work	5	11.1		8.9	
Capability - previous experience The Service Provider's demonstrated organisational experience in providing the similar services to the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work.	5	11.1		8.9	
Capacity - ability start/complete the project within the timeframes, space, available resources etc. The Service Provider's demonstrated capability and capacity to provide the services described in the Detailed Statement of Work to a very high standard and within the specified timeframes	5	33.3		26.7	
Price index	5	33.3		14.4	
FINAL SCORE		100.0		67.7	/100

Source of Funding

Cost Centre *	Status	Value excl. GST *	Project Code	Cost Centre Owner *
5070 - Workforce Strategy	Active	s 47(1)(b)		s 22

Selection Rationale and Value for Money

Selection Rationale and Value for Money *

The panel has recommended Nous Group are the most suitable supplier to undertake this work.

Nous Group were superior to all the other providers in a number of areas;

1. Organisation Design expertise - s 47F is a recognised expert in Organisation design. He has published research and articles on the topic and lectures at s 47F on Org Design.

2. Regulatory expertise - Nous Group were the only providers who could demonstrate deep regulatory expertise . s 47F s 47F is well known for her regulatory expertise having undertaken many consulting projects with other regulatory bodies and having actually been in the role of s 47F previously.

3. Methodology and previous experience - Nous has a sophisticated well articulated methodology. With numerous examples of having completed similar work with the same or greater scope in other relevant organisations

While Nous Group was not the lowest proposal in terms of fees, due to the reasons above the panel considers Nous to represent value for money. We believe selecting Nouse for this important piece of work will give ASIC the best outcomes.

Supplier Details

Supplier *	Nous Group Pty Ltd
Supplier ABN	66 086 210 344

Contingent Liabilities

Contingent Liabilities ☐ Approval of this Section 23 Request to Enter into Contract includes approval of a contingent liability

Recommendation

It is recommended that you:

1.* ◉ approve this proposal to spend relevant money under s.23 of the PGPA Act as detailed above or
○ approve this proposal to spend relevant money under s.23 of the PGPA Act as detailed above subject to the following conditions:

And

2.* ○ sign the contract / work order on behalf of ASIC or
◉ authorise the following officer to sign the contract / work order on behalf of ASIC: s 22

Section 23 Delegate s 22

Supporting Documents

Supporting Documents	https://ecm.a1.asic.gov.au/activities/ofppp/SON3751667/PNL2654%20-%20Organisational%20Design

Approval Details

Approval Details	Submitted for Approval to Approach Panel by Requester on 28/03/2022 Approved to Approach Panel by Senior Manager or SEL on 28/03/2022 Submitted for Approval to Enter Into Contract by Requester on 6/07/2022 Endorsed to Enter Into Contract by Endorsers on 6/07/2022 Approved to Enter Into Contract by Section 23 Delegate on 6/07/2022