AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT SERIES 2023 PART 5: LEGAL ISSUES AND RISKS IN PROCUREMENT

PRESENTED BY SCOTT ALDEN | PARTNER

04 OCTOBER 2023



Acknowledgement of Country

HWL Ebsworth would like to acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the land on which we are today. We would also like to pay our respects to Elders past and present.



THE 2023 PROCUREMENT SEMINAR SERIES

Part 1: Planning for a Perfect Procurement... Setting Up For Success – Wednesday, 09 August 2023

Part 2: Probity in Procurement – Wednesday, 23 August 2023

Part 3: Current Issues and Updates in procurement – NACC, Unsolicited Proposals and ECI Processes– Wednesday 6 September 2023

Part 4: Key Learnings form the ANAO Reports – Tuesday 19 September 2023

Part 5: Legal Issues and Updates in Procurement – GPJR and the Process Contract – Wednesday 4 October 2023

Part 6: The Art of Tender Assessment and Achieving VFM - 17 October 2023

Part 7: Managing your Procurement – 1 November 2023

Part 8: Prickly Issues in Procurement - 15 November 2023

Part 9: The Cth Contracting Suite and Cth Procurement Policies – 29 November 2023

To find out more about the additional seminars in our Procurement Seminar Series, and to register to attend, please contact Katarina Szivek on <u>kszivek@hwle.com.au</u>





What is the process contract?

What else is there?

A word about panels

A journey of discovery

The new regime

War stories



Legal Risks

The Process Contract

One Contract (before Hughes Aircraft)



- Invitation to Tender (Invitation to Treat)
- Tender (Offer) Validity Period
- Letter of Acceptance (Acceptance)





Two Contracts (after Hughes Aircraft)

- a. The Queen in Right of Ontario et al v Ron Engineering & Construction Eastern Ltd [1981] 1 S.C.R 111 (Canada)
- b. Hughes Aircraft Systems International and Airservices Australia (1997) 146 ALR 1
- c. IPEX ITG Pty Ltd (in liq) v State of Victoria [2010] VSC 480



What are its terms

Implied

- Receive and assess an on time compliant tender
- Good Faith

Express (Conditions of Tender)

- Closing Date
- Late Tender
- Assessment Criteria
- Value for Money?
- Mandatory Criteria
- Confidentiality
- Collusion
- Carry out committed Offer if Accepted



LEGAL FORMATION

	Process Contract	Substantive Contract
Request for X	Offer	Invitation to Treat
Tender Submitted	Acceptance	Offer
Letter of Acceptance		Acceptance



How is it formed – the required element of Certainty and Intention?

[A Process Contract will exist where]

...a timeline and detailed process, including evaluation criteria, are set out in such a way that suggests that an obligation (promissory in nature) to follow such timeline and process had been incurred.

IPEX decision



PROCUREMENT – LEGAL RISK – NON-CONTRACT

- Equitable Estoppel
 - LMI Australasia Pty Ltd v Baulderstone Hornibrook Pty Ltd (unreported 10 April 2003)
- Misleading and Deceptive Conduct
 - Section 18, Schedule 2 Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth)
 - JS McMillan Pty Ltd v Commonwealth (1997) 77 FCR 337
 - Hughes Aircraft
 - Fabcot Pty Ltd v Port Macquarie-Hastings Council [2010] NSWSC 726
- Government Procurement (Judicial Review) Act 2018 (Cth)



- Damages for a breach of the Process Contract
 - o Loss of Profit
 - o Loss of Chance
- J&A Developments v Edina Manufacturer Ltd, Amoura Ltd Ors [2006] NIQB 208
- Chaplin v Hicks [1911] 2 KB 786
- Compensation / Reliance
 - Statutory (s 236 of the Australian Consumer Law)
 - o Other heads



- There is no intention to create legal relations by this RFP. The request may result in negotiations for the award of a contract, but of itself is not an offer that applicants / Proposers accept by submitting a proposal. To avoid doubt, no process contract will arise by the issue of this RFP.
- By responding to this RFP you acknowledge acceptance of the principles specified within this documents...
- Proposers must acknowledge in their proposals that they accept all the terms and conditions and information requirements contained in this document.



- Each Proponent agrees and acknowledges that notwithstanding anything contained in this Call (except in relation to the irrevocable offer described in Clause 3.1.17), no contractual relationship exists between the Principal, and Operator... and any Proponent... in relation to the evaluation... or otherwise in dealing with a Proponent in relation to the ITS. (at clause 3.1.1)
- Each Proposal submitted in response to this Call will comprise an irrevocable offer... The irrevocable offer shall be given in consideration for the Principal agreeing to consider the Proposal in accordance with this Call... (at clause 3.1.17)

Cubic decision



• The tenderer acknowledges and agrees that no legal rights or obligations will be deemed to have arisen between the vendor and the tenderer until a tender is, if at all, accepted

State Transit Authority v AJC [2003] NSWSC 726

- Nothing contained in this ITT or any other communication ... between the Customer or its
 representatives and any party shall constitute an agreement, contract or representation made
 between the Customer and any other party (except for a formal award of contract made in
 writing by the Customer). Receipt by a potential supplier of this ITT does not imply the existence
 of a contract or commitment by or with the Customer for any purpose and suppliers should note
 that this ITT may not result in the award of any contract.
- The Customer reserves the right to change any aspect of, or cease, the tender process at any time

Confirms that a "tender process contract" will only be implied where there is an "objectively demonstrated intention to undertake the contractual obligations relied on" – and not where it is expressly ousted

Adferiad Recovery Ltd v Aneurin Bevan University Health Board [2021] EWHC 3049



 Except as expressly and specifically permitted in these Instructions to Proponents, no Proponent shall have any claim for compensation of any kind whatsoever, as a result of participating in this RFP, and by submitting a Proposal each Proponent shall be deemed to have agreed that it has no claim.

Tercon Contractors Ltd. v British Columbia (Transportation and Highways), 2010 SCC 4, [2010] 1 SCR 69

 The Ministry shall not be liable for any costs, expenses, loss or damage incurred, sustained or suffered by any bidder prior, or subsequent to, or by reason of the acceptance or the non-acceptance by the Ministry of any Tender, or by reason of any delay in acceptance of a Tender, except as provided in the tender documents.

Rankin Construction Inc v Ontaria 2014, CarswellOnt 12595



Excluding the Process Contract / Liability

- Can you exclude
 - Cubic cf State Transit Authority v AJC
 - o Tercon Contractors Ltd cf Rankin
- Should you exclude
 - Ron Engineering & Construction Eastern Ltd [1981] 1 SCR 111 Canada
 - City Polytechnic of Hong Kong v Blue Cross (Asia Pacific) Insurance [1994] HK CFI 355
 - Woollahra Municipal Council v Secure Parking Pty Ltd [2015] NSWSC 257
 - o Secure Parking Pty Ltd v Woollahra Municipal Council [2016] NSWCA



A WORD ABOUT PANELS

De-Registering Suppliers

- Do you have Panel Conditions?
- Do you have a Panel Deed?
- Have you retained discretions?
- Eden Contractors v State of NSW (No 2) [2007] FCA 689
 - Contractor Performance Reports 'critical'
 - Breached duty of care tort of unlawful interference with Eden's business
 - Misuse of market power under s46(1) of Trade Practices Act
 - Negligent misrepresentation
- Austar Plumbing P/L v Sydney Water [2018] NSWSC 864
 - Sub-standard work (47 CARs between 2013 and 2017)
 - Warning from Sydney Water
 - Sydney Water had not breached Good Faith and decision not unreasonable or procedurally unfair



THE PROCESS CONTRACT – FINDING OUT WHAT HAPPENED

Debrief

Austender/ Publication

Freedom of Information

Word of Mouth

Legal Discovery



THE PROCESS CONTRACT – PRELIMINARY DISCOVERY

Griffin Energy Pty Ltd v Western Power Corporation [2006] FCA 1242

- Coal fired power station in Western Australia
- Mandatory requirements
- Environmental standards
- Power output
- Tender awarded to Wambo Griffin Energy doubted mandatory requirements complied with
- Made application for preliminary discovery



Telstra Corporation Limited v Minister for Communications, Information Technology and the Arts (No.3) [2007] FCA 1567

- \$600m broadband grant
- 5 tenderers
- Included Optus and Telstra
- Optus and government negotiating for \$900m
- Telstra considered unfair
- Applied for preliminary discovery
- Tenderer clarification questions



A NEW REGIME

Government Procurement (Judicial Review) Act 2018

- Application (Who and What)
- Non Discrimination
- Basis to Exclude
- Limited Tenders Justification
- Complaints
- Investigation
- Injunction
- Compensation
- Public Interest Certificate
- Cannot Affect Current Contracts
- Other Rights Not Affected



SOME WAR STORIES

Late Tender

Chair of TEC – Conflict of Interest

E-Tender – 'Preferred Didn't Upload'

Didn't Empty Tender Box

Result Too Risky

Good Idea... Shame You Lost

Brown Bags



CONTACT



SCOTT ALDEN PARTNER, SYDNEY

T +61 2 9334 8418 E salden@hwle.com.au



BRIAN AMBLER PARTNER, SYDNEY

T +61 2 9334 8984 E bambler@hwle.com.au



This seminar and accompanying documentation is not intended to be legal advice and should not be relied upon as such.

The copyright of this material is and will remain the property of HWL Ebsworth Lawyers.



HWLEBSWORTH

LAWYERS

ADELAIDE | BRISBANE | CANBERRA | DARWIN | HOBART | MELBOURNE | NORWEST | PERTH | SYDNEY