



Te Puni Kōkiri
MINISTRY OF MĀORI DEVELOPMENT

Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa

RFP Evaluation Report

Whānau Ora Commissioning Services





Document control

Version history

Date	Version	Author	Description of change
5 February 2025	0.1	Procurement Support	Initial draft.
11 February 2025	0.2	Procurement Support	Draft including feedback from Audit New Zealand and Russell McVeagh
12 February 2025	0.3	Procurement Support	Draft, including feedback from Evaluation Panel.
14 February 2025	0.4	Procurement Support	Draft, including feedback from Evaluation Panel.
17 February 2025	0.5	Procurement Support	Penultimate draft.
24 February 2025	1.0	Procurement Support	Endorsed by Evaluation Panel.

Recommended by:

The following Evaluators have endorsed this report and its recommendations.




Name	Role	Date	Signature
Dame Karen Sewell (DNZM, QSO)	Evaluation Chair	24 February 2025	
Barbara Alaalatoa (ONZM)	Evaluator	24 February 2025	
Mike Hollings (KSO)	Evaluator	24 February 2025	
Grace Smit	Evaluator	24 February 2025	

Commercial in Confidence

Endorsed by:

Whānau Ora Steering Committee

(as reflected in the Steering Committee Minutes)

Name	Role	Date	Signature
Steven Sutton	Deputy Secretary, Governance (Chair, Whānau Ora Steering Committee)	26/02/2025	
Terina Cowan	Deputy Secretary, Strategy	26/02/2025	
9(2)(a)	Chief Advisor, Regions	26/02/2025	9(2)(a)
9(2)(a)	General Manager, Regional Support & Alignment	26/02/2025	9(2)(a)
9(2)(a)	General Manager, Data, Insights & Monitoring		
9(2)(a)	General Manager, Investments	26/02/2025	9(2)(a)
Paula Rawiri	Deputy Secretary, Policy	26/02/2025	
9(2)(a)	General Manager, Policy Development		

Note: Grace Smit, Deputy Secretary Regions, is a member of the Whānau Ora Steering Committee. As Grace was an Evaluator for this procurement, in line with good probity practice, she is not involved in endorsing the Evaluation Report.

Approvals

Approval of this RFP Evaluation Report

Process type: Closed competitive tender Request for Proposals (RFP).

This RFP Evaluation Report:

- Discusses the evaluation process undertaken by Te Puni Kōkiri for the RFP for Whānau Ora Commissioning Services;
- Describes the Evaluation Panel's assessment and recommendations as to which Proposals should be selected as preferred Respondent(s) to negotiate Outcome Agreement(s); and
- Describes the intended next steps if the recommendations set out in section 2 of the RFP Evaluation Report are approved by Te Tumu Whakarae mō Te Puni Kōkiri | Secretary for Māori Development.

Approved by:

Dave Samuels

Te Tumu Whakarae mō Te Puni Kōkiri | Secretary for Māori Development

Signature:



Date: 6/3/2025

Contents

RFP Evaluation Report	6
1. Introduction	7
2. Recommendations	7
3. Context / Key Information.....	8
4. Procurement process	8
5. Evaluation process	9
6. Evaluation Panel.....	10
7. Conflicts of interest and probity	11
8. Next Steps	11
9. Overall summary of scores	13
10. General findings and comments.....	14
11. Assessment of Region 1.....	15
12. Assessment of Region 2.....	21
13. Assessment of Region 3.....	25
14. Assessment of Region 4.....	29
15. Risk Assessment.....	34
Appendix A – Evaluation Workbook.....	37
Appendix B – Advisors’ Reports	37
Appendix C – Profiles of Evaluators	38

RFP Evaluation Report

I te tau 2008, i whakaputaina ai e Kahurangi Tariana Turia, nōna te whakaaro nui me te manawaroa i hangaia ai a Whānau Ora, te tauākī e whai ake nei,

“Ko Whānau Ora tā mātou aronga matua, arā, te oranga o te whānau me ngā kaupapa e ora ai, e tū motuhake ai te whānau i runga i ōna anō waewae.”

I te tīmatanga o tēnei tau i mate ai a Kahurangi Tariana, ā, koia tonu nei te wā i tīmata ai te Pae Arotake i tana mahi arotake i ngā tono mō te whakaratonga o ngā Ratonga Kōmihana hou o Whānau Ora. I roto i tētahi uiui i kī mai a Kahurangi Tariana ko tana moemoeā kia:

“... tāmatatia tō tātou iwi hei iwi pakari, motuhake hoki ... kia nui kē atu ai te kotahitanga o tēnei whenua i ō nāianeī.”

Kua ū te Pae Arotake ki te ia o ēnei kupu i roto i āna whiriwhiringa katoa.

In 2008, Dame Tariana Turia, whose vision and determination was central to the creation of Whānau Ora, made the following statement:

“Our main focus is on Whānau Ora – the well being of family and what it takes to make them well, healthy, independent, standing on their own two feet.”

Kahurangi Tariana died at the beginning of this year at the time that the Evaluation Panel began its work evaluating the Proposals for delivery of the new Whānau Ora Commissioning Services. In an interview she said that her vision was that:

“...our people are restored to being strong and independent... So this country can be far more united than what it is today.”¹

These words have been a constant with the Evaluation Panel throughout its deliberations.

¹ [New Zealand Herald, Q&A with Tariana Turia, 6 October 2008](#)

1. Introduction

This report:

- Discusses the evaluation process undertaken by Te Puni Kōkiri for the RFP for Whānau Ora Commissioning Services;
- Describes the Evaluation Panel's assessment and recommendations as to which Proposals should be selected as preferred Respondent(s) to negotiate Outcome Agreement(s); and
- Describes the intended next steps if the recommendations set out in section 2 of the RFP Evaluation Report are approved by Te Tumu Whakarae mō Te Puni Kōkiri | Secretary for Māori Development.

2. Recommendations

It is recommended that Te Tumu Whakarae mō Te Puni Kōkiri | Secretary for Māori Development:

Notes:	The Evaluation Panel has completed its evaluation of the Proposals received in accordance with the approved Procurement Plan, RFP and RFP Evaluation Plan documents ² .	Yes / No
Notes:	The assessment and recommendations detailed in this report have been endorsed by the Whānau Ora Steering Committee.	Yes / No
Notes:	No negotiations have been started to date. Progressing to Outcome Agreements will be subject to negotiations with preferred Respondents, further diligence and planning.	Yes / No
Approves:	For Region 1: National Hauora Coalition is selected as the preferred Respondent to progress to negotiate an Outcome Agreement; and 9(2)(b)(ii) will be advised their Proposals have not been selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement.	Yes / No Yes / No
Approves:	For Region 2: Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira is selected as the preferred Respondent to progress to negotiate an Outcome Agreement; and 9(2)(b)(ii) will be advised their Proposal has not been selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement.	Yes / No Yes / No
Approves:	For Region 3: Te Tauraki is selected as the preferred Respondent to progress to negotiate an Outcome Agreement; and 9(2)(b)(ii) will be advised their Proposals have not been selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement.	Yes / No Yes / No

² Dates approved by Whānau Ora Steering Committee: Procurement Plan (9 October 2024), RFP documents (22 November 2024) and RFP Evaluation plan (19 December 2024)

Approves:	For Region 4: The Cause Collective is selected as the preferred Respondent to progress to negotiate an Outcome Agreement; and 9(2)(b)(ii) will be advised their Proposals have not been selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Notes:	Te Puni Kōkiri retains the right, at its sole discretion, to pick up discussions with any of the Respondents not selected at this time to proceed to the next stage of the procurement, as set out in the RFP terms and conditions.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Notes:	Where incumbent commissioning agencies have not been selected to proceed, they will be advised that Te Puni Kōkiri is not issuing a notice of termination nor a notice of disengagement and will be in contact to discuss next steps in due course.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No
Notes:	All Respondents will be offered a debrief on their Proposal, to occur once Outcome Agreements have been executed.	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No

3. Context / Key Information

Contract:

- Intention to contract up to four Outcome Agreements for Whānau Ora Commissioning Services in designated regions, with one Commissioning Agency in each region.
- An initial contract term of six years from 1 July 2025 to 30 June 2031, subject to annual Budget commitments, plus two Rights of Renewal of three years. The maximum contract term is 12 years, ending 30 June 2037.

Budget:

- The maximum funding for the in-scope Whānau Ora services is \$157m (which assumed no change in funding from the 2023/24 year), noting that Whānau Ora funding depends on annual Budget appropriations. Any increases in funding in the future would depend on the Government agreeing to invest more in social investment via the Whānau Ora commissioning model. The alignment between Whānau Ora and the social investment approach is expected to be relevant to future Budget bids.
- Separate funding may be made available for transition and mobilisation costs for successful Respondents.

4. Procurement process

- The Whānau Ora Steering Committee approved the Procurement Plan on 9 October 2024.
- The Registration of Interest (ROI) was advertised on 4 October 2024 via the Government Electronic Tender Service (GETS) and closed on 24 October 2024.
- On 7 November 2024, based on an ROI Evaluation Report approved by the Whānau Ora Steering Committee, Te Puni Kōkiri shortlisted 10 Respondents to proceed to the closed RFP phase of the procurement.
- On 22 November 2024 the Whānau Ora Steering Committee approved the RFP documents for release.

Commercial in Confidence

- Te Puni Kōkiri issued the RFP to the Respondents via email on 22 November 2024.
- Questions, answers, and submission of Proposals were managed via email during the RFP stage. All interactions with potential Respondents were logged. Communications related to the procurement were managed through the project's Procurement Support team.
- The Whānau Ora Steering Committee approved the RFP Evaluation Plan on 19 December 2024, ahead of the RFP Proposals being opened or distributed.
- The RFP closed at 12.00pm on 19 December 2024.
- 12 Proposals were expected from the 10 shortlisted Respondents. 11 Proposals were received. Following a clarification request 9(2)(b)(ii) confirmed it had decided not to submit a Proposal for Region 2.

5. Evaluation process

All 11 Proposals passed initial compliance checks³ and were progressed into evaluation, as follows:

Region	Coverage	Respondents
Region 1	Northland, Auckland and Waikato	9(2)(b)(ii) National Hauora Coalition 9(2)(b)(ii)
Region 2	Bay of Plenty, Gisborne, Hawke's Bay, Taranaki, Manawatu-Wanganui and Wellington	9(2)(b)(ii) Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira
Region 3	Tasman, Nelson, Marlborough, Canterbury, West Coast, Otago and Southland	Te Tauraki 9(2)(b)(ii) 9(2)(b)(ii)
Region 4	Nationwide service focussed on Pacific peoples across Aotearoa New Zealand	9(2)(b)(ii) The Cause Collective 9(2)(b)(ii)

The RFP evaluation was completed between 20 December 2024 and 5 February 2025, in accordance with the RFP Evaluation Plan approved by the Whānau Ora Steering Committee.

Evaluation included the following activities by the Evaluation Panel:

- Between 20 December 2024 and 27 January 2025, individual scoring of each Proposal against the approved weighted criteria, using the approved rating scales. Reports from non-scoring Specialist Advisors were provided to assist the Evaluators, as set out in Appendix B.
- On 28 and 29 January 2025, moderation of collated scores, enabling the Evaluation Panel to:
 - Discuss their insights and scores;
 - Identify concerns and required clarifications;
 - Adjust individual scores (when requested by the relevant Evaluator) based on the discussion; and
 - Agree consensus scores.

³ Receipt and Compliance Report approved on 20 December 2024, by Steven Sutton as Chair of the Whānau Ora Steering Committee.

Commercial in Confidence

- Application of the approved evaluation criteria weightings to consensus scores to establish weighted scores and ranking of Proposals.
- Agreeing recommendations on which Proposals are selected as preferred Respondents to progress to Outcome Agreement negotiations, and which Proposals are not selected as preferred Respondents.

This process resulted in recommendations on which the Evaluation Panel unanimously agree.

Consensus scores, rankings, summary comments and recommendations have been broken down by region and set out in this report at sections 9 through 14.

The Evaluation Panel's detailed assessment of each Proposal, including scores and comments, is available on request, and referenced in Appendix A.

6. Evaluation Panel

The table below sets out the Evaluation Panel responsible for evaluating and scoring the Proposals, and the non-scoring specialist advisors and procurement support personnel.

The Evaluation Panel are respected leaders that each have a strong and diverse knowledge of the social services sector and have each made a significant contribution to the public sector during their careers.

Name	Role in Procurement
Evaluation Panel (scoring)	
Dame Karen Sewell, ONZM, QSO	Evaluator / Evaluation Chair
Barbara Alaalatoa, ONZM	Evaluator
Mike Hollings, KSO	Evaluator
Grace Smit	Evaluator

Brief profiles of the Evaluators are set out in Appendix C.

The non-scoring Specialist Advisors and Procurement Support similarly represent extensive experience in their areas of expertise and are drawn from a mix of internal Te Puni Kōkiri personnel and external advisors.

Name	Title	Role in Procurement
Specialist Advisor Workstreams (non-scoring)		
9(2)(a)	Chief Advisor, Strategy	Advisor - Data and Reporting including IDI
9(2)(a)	General Manager, Investments	Advisor – Strategy and Investment Planning
9(2)(a)	Project Director	Advisor – Transition / Implementation
9(2)(a)	Senior Consultant, 9(2)(a)	Advisor - Diligence
9(2)(a)	Chief Advisor, Regions	Advisor
9(2)(a)	Consultant, 9(2)(a)	Advisor

Commercial in Confidence

9(2)(a)	Partner, Russell McVeagh	Legal Advisor
9(2)(a)	Senior Associate, Russell McVeagh	Legal Advisor
Procurement Support (non-scoring)		
9(2)(a)	Director, 9(2)(a)	Procurement Lead / Moderation Lead
9(2)(a)	Consultant, 9(2)(a)	Procurement Advisor
Steven Heath	Associate Director, Audit New Zealand	Probity Assurance

7. Conflicts of interest and probity

Te Puni Kōkiri followed a rigorous conflicts of interest management process throughout the procurement which met the standard of practice required in the public service.

Evaluators and Advisors declared Conflicts of Interest prior to receiving the Proposals. No material conflicts were declared. One potential conflict was declared by one Specialist Advisor; a management approach was approved prior to their involvement in the evaluation.

Prior to the moderation hui commencing, the Evaluation Chair confirmed with the Evaluators that no new conflicts had been identified as a result of the Proposals that had been received.

Audit New Zealand, as Independent Probity Assurer, considered whether this stage of the procurement process as a whole was conducted in accordance with Te Puni Kōkiri policy, planning, and published procurement documentation, applicable rules and good practice for public sector procurement, and probity principles.

Audit New Zealand provided real time probity assurance during the RFP evaluation and attended the moderation. Where needed, the assurer provided observations and feedback to queries from the Evaluation Panel and Procurement Support personnel.

Audit New Zealand's Probity Report is provided separately to the Whānau Ora Steering Committee. No significant process issues or outstanding probity matters are identified.

8. Next Steps

On approval of this report, all Respondents will be advised whether they have been selected as preferred Respondents. A detailed communications plan is being prepared in this regard.

Preferred Respondents

Preferred Respondents will be invited to agree an Outcome Agreement with Te Puni Kōkiri for the provision of the Whānau Ora Commissioning Services. A negotiation plan is being prepared in this regard, that will include satisfactory resolution of any outstanding matters that have been raised by the Evaluation Panel and/or in the Advisors' reports, particularly as they relate to:

- Due diligence, including Pass with Condition factors from the relevant Proposals;
- Legal, including resolving any contract tags from the relevant Proposals;
- Implementation and planning, including resolving any requests for transition funding; and
- Service design, including but not limited to clarifying requirements for investment and planning, and for data, storage and reporting.

Commercial in Confidence

All points identified will be discussed with the preferred Respondents in the next stages of the process, whether during contract negotiations, during implementation and transition, or as part of the next layer of due diligence.

Unsuccessful Respondents

Those Respondents not selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement will be advised and will be provided an opportunity for a debrief once Outcome Agreement(s) have been awarded (expected to be in April).

Te Puni Kōkiri reserves the right to not proceed with the preferred Respondent (or any other Respondent) if the parties are unable to reach agreement on an Outcome Agreement.

If this transpires Te Puni Kōkiri may (but is not required to) enter into negotiations with another Respondent. This would be resolved through the appropriate governance channels at the time it is relevant.

Once contract(s) have been awarded, a contract award notice will be published on the Government Electronic Tender Service (GETS). All Respondents will be advised of the outcome and offered the opportunity for debrief (including the successful Respondents).

Transition and Implementation

Once contracts are executed, the Transition and Implementation period will formally commence, expected to begin in April 2025.

The transition requirements are split into five primary focus areas:

- **The ramp up of the Commissioning Agency** to ensure it has the necessary structures, staffing and systems in place to effectively receive and manage the transition;
- **Transitioning of services between existing and new Commissioning Agencies** ensuring a coordinated approach to maintaining service quality and ensuring contractual compliance;
- **Transitioning of Service Provider services** ensuring a coordinated approach to maintain service quality;
- **Whānau transitions (between Service Providers or to other agencies)** prioritising cultural and emotional wellbeing, individual support and regular communication to minimise disruption; and
- **Existing Commissioning Agency 'wind-down'** focuses on the completion of final reporting, secure data transfer and the fulfilment of all financial obligations.

During the transition period, effective and consistent communication to all impacted stakeholders is imperative to provide clarity to all parties.

9. Overall summary of scores

The consolidated consensus scores and rankings for the weighted criteria for all four Regions are set out in the following table.

Sections 10 through 14 below detail the summary assessment and recommendations for each Region.

Respondent	Understanding of requirements and key outcomes (10%)	Approach (35%)	Implementation and Transition Plan (15%)	Response to Outcome Agreement (40%)	Total (%)			
					Region 1	Region 2	Region 3	Region 4
National Hauora Coalition	9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)			1			
9(2)(b)(ii)					2			
					3			
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)				9(2)(b)(ii)	1	
9(2)(b)(ii)						9(2)(b)(ii)	2	
Te Tauraki						9(2)(b)(ii)	1	
9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)				9(2)(b)(ii)	2	
						9(2)(b)(ii)	3	
The Cause Collective	9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)					9(2)(b)(ii)	1
9(2)(b)(ii)							9(2)(b)(ii)	2
								9(2)(b)(ii)
9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)	9(2)(b)(ii)					9(2)(b)(ii)	2

10. General findings and comments

The Evaluation Panel considered the quality of the Proposals reflected the length and significant value of the contract opportunity. The Proposals reflected the depth and sophistication of the Respondents when it came to considering the devolved commissioning model for the 2025 Framework that is being implemented, that will be whānau centred, locally led and government enabled.

The Evaluation Panel reflected that the increased depth and sophistication of the services being provided indicates real development in the sector since the initial inception of Whānau Ora. Consistent with the RFP, the Evaluation Panel noted this change bodes well for the increasingly data-driven social investment approach to the 2025 Framework for Whānau Ora that the RFP is implementing as the next stage of the model's development.

The assessment of Proposals was based on demonstration of understanding, capability and suitability of approach (for both implementation and ongoing services), and willingness to accept the terms, conditions and requirements of the 2025 Framework.

Key themes included:

- The higher scoring Respondents did a better job of demonstrating understanding of and embracing the needs of the 2025 Framework and the Commissioning Services required. That appeared most prominently in areas such as the data-driven social investment approach to the future of Whānau Ora. Incumbent commissioning agencies tended to promote continuation rather than moving to the new ways of working.
- Many Respondents did not fully grasp the concept of and/or the requirements for Investment Boards. Proposals that scored lower had proposed approaches that did not align well with the RFP requirements. This is an area to validate understanding with each preferred Respondent during Outcome Agreement negotiations.
- All Proposals presented some challenges to work through regarding regional coverage and/or representation. This is an area to explore during Outcome Agreement negotiations with each preferred Respondent.
- 9(2)(b)(i) Respondents requested financial support for implementation and transition. The Evaluation Panel notes that funding decisions were not a factor in the Evaluation Panel's evaluation, and did not impact scoring. Any such decisions would need to be worked through as part of Outcome Agreement negotiations with the relevant preferred Respondent.
- Each Proposal from all shortlisted Respondents had due diligence issues, and such issues would need to be worked through as part of Outcome Agreement negotiations with the relevant preferred Respondent. None are sufficiently material to 'fail' a Proposal at this RFP stage of the process.
- 9(2)(a), 9(2)(b)(i) of the ten Respondents accepted the draft Outcome Agreement in full and received a score of 10 out of a possible 10, in accordance with the scoring scale. Where full acceptance of the draft Outcome Agreement did not align with material in Proposals, this was factored into the scoring of the relevant evaluation criterion, rather than factored into the "Response to Outcome Agreement" criterion, i.e. those Respondents still scored 10 out of 10 for that criterion. Identified discrepancies should be explored in any Outcome Agreement negotiations with the relevant preferred Respondents.

11. Assessment of Region 1

The tables below capture the consensus scores and rankings for and the Evaluation Panel's comments on the Proposals for Region 1.

The summary comments in the tables below represent the key strengths and weaknesses of the Proposals as assessed by the Evaluation Panel. Where a proposal's response was assessed as adequate, no further comment has been included in the tables below.

Respondents – Region 1	Score	Ranking
National Hauora Coalition	9(2)(b)(ii)	1
9(2)(b)(ii)		2
		3

Respondent	Understanding of requirements and key outcomes (10%)	Approach (35%)	Implementation and Transition Plan (15%)	Response to Outcome Agreement (40%)	Total
National Hauora Coalition					
9(2)(b)(ii)					

Summary comments

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

Evaluation Panel conclusions

9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)

Evaluation Panel recommendations for Region 1

For Region 1, the consensus recommendation of the Evaluation Panel is that:

- a) National Hauora Coalition are selected as preferred Respondent for Region 1; and
- b) 9(2)(b)(ii) and 9(2)(b)(ii) are not selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement for Region 1.

The Evaluation Panel's detailed assessment of each Proposal, including scores and comments, is available on request, and referenced in Appendix A.

12. Assessment of Region 2

The below tables capture the consensus scores and rankings for and the Evaluation Panel's comments on the Proposals for Region 2.

The summary comments in the tables below represent the key strengths and weaknesses of the Proposals as assessed by the Evaluation Panel. Where a proposal's response was assessed as adequate, no further comment has been included in the tables below.

Respondents – Region 2	Score	Ranking
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	9(2)(b)(ii)	1
9(2)(b)(ii)		2

Respondent	Understanding of requirements and key outcomes (10%)	Approach (35%)	Implementation and Transition Plan (15%)	Response to Outcome Agreement (40%)	Total
Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	9(2)(b)(ii)				
9(2)(b)(ii)					

Summary of findings

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)

Evaluation Panel conclusions

9(2)(b)(ii)

Evaluation Panel Recommendations for Region 2

For Region 2, the consensus recommendation of the Evaluation Panel is that:

- a) Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira are selected as preferred Respondent for Region 2; and
- b) 9(2)(b)(ii) are not selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement.

The Evaluation Panel's detailed assessment of each Proposal, including scores and comments, is available on request, and referenced in Appendix A.

13. Assessment of Region 3

The below tables capture the consensus scores and rankings for and the Evaluation Panel's comments on the Proposals for Region 3.

The summary comments in the tables below represent the key strengths and weaknesses of the Proposals as assessed by the Evaluation Panel. Where a proposal's response was assessed as adequate, no further comment has been included in the tables below.

Respondents – Region 3	Score	Ranking
Te Tauraki	9(2)(b)(ii)	1
9(2)(b)(ii)		2
		3

Respondent	Understanding of requirements and key outcomes (10%)	Approach (35%)	Implementation and Transition Plan (15%)	Response to Outcome Agreement (40%)	Total
Te Tauraki	9(2)(b)(ii)				
9(2)(b)(ii)					

Summary of findings

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)

Evaluation Panel conclusions

9(2)(b)(ii)



Commercial in Confidence

Evaluation Panel recommendations for Region 3

For Region 3, the consensus recommendation of the Evaluation Panel is that:

- a) Te Tauraki are selected as preferred Respondent for Region 3.
- b) 9(2)(b)(ii) are not selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement for Region 3.

The Evaluation Panel's detailed assessment of each Proposal, including scores and comments, is available on request, and referenced in Appendix A.

14. Assessment of Region 4

The below tables capture the consensus scores and rankings for and the Evaluation Panel's comments on the Proposals for Region 4.

The summary comments in the tables below represent the key strengths and weaknesses of the Proposals as assessed by the Evaluation Panel. Where a proposal's response was assessed as adequate, no further comment has been included in the tables below.

Respondents – Region 4	Score	Ranking
The Cause Collective	9(2)(b)(ii)	1
9(2)(b)(ii)		2
9(2)(b)(ii)		3

Respondent	Understanding of requirements and key outcomes (10%)	Approach (35%)	Implementation and Transition Plan (15%)	Response to Outcome Agreement (40%)	Total
The Cause Collective		9(2)(b)(ii)			
9(2)(b)(ii)					

Summary of findings

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)



9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

9(2)(b)(ii)

Evaluation Panel Recommendations for Region 4

For Region 4, the consensus recommendation of the Evaluation Panel is that:

- a) The Cause Collective are selected as preferred Respondent for Region 4; and
- b) 9(2)(b)(ii) are not selected to proceed to the next stage of the procurement for Region 4.

The Evaluation Panel's detailed assessment of each Proposal, including scores and comments, is available on request, and referenced in Appendix A.



15. Risk Assessment

The procurement risk assessment outlined below is considered through the lens of proceeding with the preferred Respondents into the next stage of the procurement. The risks have been updated from those covered in the Procurement Plan and new identified risks.

Key:

	CONSEQUENCE				
	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
LIKELIHOOD	Almost Certain	Medium	High	Very High	Very High
	Likely	Medium	Medium	High	Very High
	Possible	Low	Medium	High	High
	Unlikely	Low	Medium	Medium	High
	Rare	Very Low	Low	Medium	Medium

Key Risks

Ref	Risk	Likelihood	Consequence	Rating	Mitigation action	Responsible
1.	IF the procurement is subject to challenge, THEN the procurement may need to be postponed or cancelled, resulting in reputational risk and the commencement date of 1 July 2025 not being met.	Almost Certain	Major		Run a strong, robust procurement process. Consider potential areas of challenge and mitigate in planning and approach. Take a proactive and comprehensive approach to debriefs and information release to assist unsuccessful Respondents the opportunity to understand the decisions made. Develop and implement a comprehensive Communications Plan. Complete negotiations of Outcome Agreements promptly.	Project Sponsor Senior Responsible Owner Procurement Lead Legal Advisor

Commercial in Confidence

2.	IF preferred Commissioning Agencies are not prepared for transition, THEN their ability to mobilise in the agreed timeframes while maintaining quality standards could be compromised.	Possible	Major		<p>Complete detailed implementation and transition planning with preferred Commissioning Agencies. Work with incumbent commissioning agencies and ensure disengagement plans align with the new Commissioning Agencies transition and implementation plans.</p> <p>Ensure design gaps are identified early and resolved during either contract negotiations or transition period.</p> <p>Relationship principles emphasise open and direct communication and collaboration between Te Puni Kōkiri and preferred Commissioning Agencies to build trust and relationship from the outset.</p> <p>Consider transition support funding.</p>	Project Director
3.	IF incumbent commissioning agencies are not adequately notified and engaged throughout the tender notification period THEN there may be a negative impact on service delivery and/or transition to the preferred Commissioning Agencies and/or negative media attention regarding the Whānau Ora expansion project or procurement.	Likely	Major		<p>Incumbent commissioning agencies will be individually advised at earliest opportunity, in line with the Communications Plan, and approval of the RFP Evaluation Report and its recommendations.</p> <p>Communications will remind incumbent commissioning agencies of the need to meet current contract obligations. Transition team to monitor.</p> <p>A clear and thorough Communications Plan developed and implemented to ensure information sharing is deliberately structured, timed and executed.</p>	Project Sponsor Change Lead Procurement Lead
4.	IF Te Puni Kōkiri cannot reach agreement with the preferred Respondent THEN Te Puni Kōkiri may enter discussions with other Respondents.	Unlikely	Major		<p>Account for this potential issue at the negotiation stage. If this eventuates, discussions should be with the next highest ranked Respondent.</p> <p>Ensure Communications Plan and Negotiation Plan each include this scenario and the process and decisions that need to be made so this could be actioned swiftly.</p> <p>Where Proposals indicated areas for potential discussion, ensure Negotiation Plan and</p>	Project Sponsor Procurement Lead Legal Advisor

Commercial in Confidence

					communication to preferred Respondents makes it clear that new points are not acceptable. Consider mitigations that will work across all Outcomes Agreements based on the Proposals. Use contract negotiations to leverage consistency across the Outcome Agreements. Consider individual specifications by exception only.	
5.	IF Stats NZ does not wish to enter into a Data Sharing Agreement with the Respondent (even if Te Puni Kōkiri is comfortable with any adverse outcome) THEN the successful award of the Outcome Agreement may not be viable.	Unlikely	Major		Assess early in Outcome Agreement negotiations, including communication with Stats NZ. Clarify that Respondents have accepted the Data Sharing Agreement included in the negotiations and make it clear that no new points in relation to the Data Sharing Agreement will be acceptable.	Project Director
6.	IF probity is not adequately managed THEN a Respondent may have (or it may be claimed that they have) an unfair advantage, and the integrity of the procurement may be compromised.	Unlikely	Major		Continue probity practices.	Project Director Procurement Lead
7.	IF intellectual property (IP) held by the incumbents is lost through transition, THEN the quality of Whānau Ora delivery may be compromised.	Unlikely	Major		Engage with incumbents to agree approach to any transition. Developed IP for key artefacts is owned by Te Puni Kōkiri e.g. Whānau Ora Progression Framework. Work with preferred Commissioning Agencies to build a strong transition and implementation plan, leveraging their ideas and own IP. Draw on the knowledge of Service Providers for continuity of services to whānau. Complete negotiations of Outcome Agreements promptly.	Project Director Whānau Ora Delivery Manager Legal Advisor

Appendix A – Evaluation Workbook

The scores and detailed comments from the Evaluation Panel's group moderation that inform this RFP Evaluation Report are available on request.

SharePoint link: [Whānau Ora RFP- Summary Consensus Scoring Workbook- Post Moderation.pdf](#)

Appendix B – Advisors' Reports

The Specialist Advisors' reports that informed the Evaluation Panel's evaluation, and the focus areas of the reports, were as follows:

Report	Focus Area in RFP Response Template
Due Diligence Assessment	Section 3: Due Diligence
Investment Planning	Section 4.2.2: Processes, Systems and Controls
Data and Reporting	Section 4.2.3: Data capture, storage and reporting
Implementation and Transition	Section 4.4: Implementation and transition
Legal	Section 4.4.4: Response to and level of acceptance of the terms of the Outcome Agreement

The Reports are available on request and are located at SharePoint link: [Advisors reports](#)

Appendix C – Profiles of Evaluators

Evaluator	Profile
Dame Karen Sewell (DNZM, QSO)	<p>Dame Karen has a background in Public Service and Education. She has held three chief executive positions in the Public Service. She was the Chief Review Officer and Chief Executive of the Education Review Office (ERO) and led ERO's on going evaluation of and reporting on the quality and outcomes of the NZ Education system.</p> <p>She was the acting Chief Executive of the NZ Qualifications Authority (NZQA) with its focus on the implementation, management and quality assurance and analysis of the whole of NZ's Qualifications Framework. She was also Secretary for Education with responsibility for the whole of the NZ Education System.</p> <p>For the past 14 years Dame Karen has worked in the areas of evaluation and identification and management of risk. She is Chair of the Risk and Assurance Committee for Te Puni Kōkiri, a member of Te Kawa Mataaho Risk and Assurance Committee and is an independent Risk Advisor to Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust Board.</p> <p>Dame Karen has also chaired the Australia and New Zealand School of Government Evaluation Committee and was Chair of Better Evaluation, a knowledge platform and global community that became the knowledge platform of the Global Evaluation Initiative.</p>
Barbara Alaalatoa (ONZM)	<p>Barbara has had over 40 years' experience across the education sector as a teacher, as an ITE lecturer and as a principal for 17 years at Sylvia Park School. In addition, she was the Chair of the Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand 2015 – 2019 (now the Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand). From 2019 – 2022 she was Chair of Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu The New Zealand Correspondence School.</p> <p>Barbara is presently the Chair of Ako Mātātupu Teach First New Zealand.</p> <p>In 2018 and 2019 she was also a member of the Tomorrow's School Task Force charged with reviewing the national schooling sector. From 2022 to 2024 she played a key role focused on ensuring the coherence of the refresh of the national New Zealand Curriculum.</p> <p>Barbara's roles have consistently focused on achieving more equitable outcomes for all, and especially those who are too often underserved by the system.</p> <p>In 2014 Barbara was appointed as a Member of the New Zealand Order of Merit for services to education. In 2020 she was promoted to an Officer of the Order, again for services to education.</p>

Commercial in Confidence

Evaluator	Profile
Mike Hollings (KSO)	<p>Mike Hollings has more than 40 years of wide-ranging experience in the Public Service mainly in the education sector but also in broadcasting and Māori Development.</p> <p>As a Senior National Manager at the Education Review Office (ERO), he was responsible for evaluating the quality of education at a system level. He was acting Chief Executive of ERO between June 2005 and May 2006.</p> <p>His other education sector roles include Manager of Planning and Development at Wairarapa Community Polytechnic, Manager of Policy Te Wahanga Māori at the Ministry of Education, Senior Lecturer at Waikato University and the Hamilton College of Education.</p> <p>Mike was Chief Executive of Te Mangai Paaho which had the responsibility for commissioning television and radio programming to be broadcast on mainstream networks and Iwi Māori radio stations.</p> <p>He has held senior management positions at Deputy Secretary level at Te Puni Kōkiri in Māori Development Policy and Regional Relationships.</p> <p>From 2006 to 2023 he was the Chief Executive of Te Aho o Te Kura Pounamu delivering education to over 30,000 students from diverse background and most of whom were not served well by the mainstream education system.</p> <p>In 2024 he was made a Companion of the King's Service Order.</p>
Grace Smit Ngāti Kahungunu, Ngāti Rakaipaaka	<p>Grace is Deputy Secretary Regions at Te Puni Kōkiri with responsibility for regional service delivery and Whānau Ora commissioning services.</p> <p>With 20 + years in public service leadership roles, Grace has held delivery, strategy, corporate and service design responsibilities across a number of different agencies. Due to these roles Grace's experience includes a number of significant procurement projects with an emphasis on service delivery to communities.</p> <p>Grace joined the Te Puni Kōkiri Executive Leadership Team in 2021. During this time, she has led a number of projects including the Māori Community Covid Fund, providing funding to community to accelerate vaccinate rates, and the Whai Kainga Whai Oranga Housing Project, a project jointly delivered with Ministry for Housing and Urban Development to enable iwi led housing solutions. Immediately prior to joining Te Puni Kōkiri, Grace held the dual role at the Ministry of Justice, of Pae Matua Director of the Waitangi Tribunal and the Māori Land Court.</p>

