

TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT

TO:

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CC:

MANAGER PARKS AND CONSERVATION

FROM:

DIRECTOR ASSETS

FILE REF:

43930 22/80075

DATE:

4 MARCH 2022

TENDER 21234 ARBORICULTURAL CONSULTANCY SERVICES

Issue

To consider Tender 21234 for the provision of Arboricultural Consultancy Services.

The Contract award is for an initial period of three (3) years. There are two (2) twelve (12) month, or part thereof, options to extend at the discretion of the City.

Background

The City requires a suitable qualified and experienced Arboricultural Consultant to provide specialised advice, auditing, assessment and reporting on selected trees.

Detail

Public Tender 21234 for Arboricultural Consultancy Services was advertised on Saturday 11 December 2021 and closed on Tuesday 11 January 2022. One Addendum was issued with revised Specification and Schedule of Rates.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

Item	Detail
Contract Form	Consultancy
Contract Type	Schedule of Rates
Contract Duration	Three (3) years
Commencement Date	March 2022
Expiry Date	March 2025
Extension Permitted	Yes, Two (2) twelve (12) month, or part thereof

The following companies submitted Tenders:

Legal Name	Trading Name	Abbreviation
Arbor Centre PTY LTD as trustee for Arbor Centre unit trust	Arbor Centre	AC
Arbor West PTY LTD	Classic Tree Services	CTS
Paperbark Technologies PTY LTD	Paperbark Technologies	PBT
Westworks Group PTY LTD as trustee for Ussheridan Trust	Westworks Consultancy	WWC

All tender submissions were deemed conforming.

The Tender Evaluation Panel (Panel) comprised:

- Coordinator Trees & Conservation
- Coordinator Safety Systems
- Project Officer Irrigation, Parks Technical
- Project Manager, Construction

Probity Oversight

Oversight to the Tender assessment process was undertaken by an external Probity Advisor (William Buck Consulting (WA) Pty Ltd) and the City's Contracts Officer.

Please refer to the Confidential Memo for reference to the external Probity Advisor Final Report.

Tender submissions were evaluated in accordance with the Procurement and Evaluation Plan (PEP) and included the following selection criteria:

Q	Criteria	Weighting	Schedule Reference
1	Sustainable (Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement a. Environmental Considerations 5% b. Buy Local 10% c. Reconciliation Action Plan 2.5% d. Disability Access & Inclusion 2.5%	20%	3A, 3B, 3C, 3D
2	* Occuaptional Safety and Health	20%	2
3	*Resources & Capacity	30%	3E
4	*Experience	30%	3E

Pricing is not included in the qualitative criteria and considered as part of the overall value for money assessment. The Tenderer must achieve a minimum acceptable qualitative score (as determined by the City) and for each of the qualitative criteria detailed above (*) to be considered for further evaluation.

Evaluation Criteria 1– Sustainable Procurement (20%)

Evidence of Sustainable (Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement was assessed based on the Tenderers' responses provided within the Questionnaires provided in Schedules 3A, 3B, 3C and 3D that were included in the tender documentation.

Sub Criteria a) Environmental Considerations (sub weighting 5%)

The City is committed to procuring goods and services that provide the most positive environmental, social and economic impacts over the entire life cycle of a product or service. Respondents are encouraged to provide credentials of any environmental claims of the goods and/or services submitted in this Tender.

Tenderer	Ranking
AC	1
CTS	2
PBT	3
WWC	4

Sub criteria b) Buy Local Considerations (sub weighting 10%)

An assessment was made based on the response provided, detailing the following information:

- Purchasing arrangements through local businesses;
- Location of respondents' offices and workshops;
- Residential addresses of staff and company addresses of subcontractors;
- Requirement for new employees arising from award of the contract.

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	1
AC	3
WWC	4

Sub criteria c) Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) (sub weighting 2.5%)

An assessment was made to determine the ranking based on the responses provided that relate to:

- RELATIONSHIPS building positive relationships between indigenous and non-indigenous people.
- RESPECT recognising the contribution of Indigenous people to Australia and learning more about the history, culture and diversity in a two-way communication process.
- OPPORTUNITIES attracting, developing and retaining organisational talent to build opportunities for aboriginal employment, training, and development and mentoring.

All tenderers provided information specifying differing levels of actions in relation to indigenous reconciliation action with assessment resulting in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
WWC	1
CTS	2
AC	2
PBT	2

Sub criteria d) Access & Inclusion Plan (AIP) (sub weighting 2.5%)

An assessment was made to determine the ranking based on the responses provided that relate to:

- People with disabilities having the same buildings and facilities access opportunities as other people.
- People with disabilities receiving information in a format that will enable them to access information as readily as other people are able to access it.
- People with disabilities receiving the same level and quality of service from staff as other people receive.
- People with disabilities having the same opportunities as other people to make complaints.
- People with disabilities having the same opportunities as other people to participate in any employment opportunities.

All tenderers provided information specifying differing levels of consideration for access and inclusion provisions with assessment resulting in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
WWC	1
PBT	2
AC	3
CTS	3

Overall Sustainable Procurement Ranking Summary

The following presents the overall Sustainable Procurement criterion ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	1
AC	3
WWC	4

Evaluation Criteria 2 - Tenderer's Occupational Safety and Health Management (20%)

Evidence of safety management plans, policies and safety management practices defined in all tenderer's submissions was duly assessed based on the respondents' responses to an Occupational Health and Safety Management System Questionnaire included within the tender documentation.

The tenderers were ranked as shown below under this criterion:

Tenderer	Ranking
CTS	1
AC	2
PBT	3
WWC	4

Evaluation Criteria 3 - Tenderer's understanding of the Resources & Capacity to undertake the services (30%)

The tenderers' capacity and resources as presented in their tender submissions was assessed in order to evaluate their capacity to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment against this criterion considered the tenderers' staff resources, vehicles plant and equipment and approach to manage the contract.

The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	2
AC*	3
WWC*	4

^{*} AC & WWC failed to achieve the minimum acceptable score for this criterion.

Evaluation Criteria 4 - Demonstrated Experience of tenderer and personnel performing the service (30%)

The Tenderer's relevant experience in demonstrating the achievement of meeting client expectations as presented in their tender submission were assessed in order to evaluate their capability to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment of this criterion considered the tendering entity's credentials to fulfil the requirements of the contract.

The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	2
AC	3
WWC	3

Overall Qualitative Weighted Assessment

The overall qualitative weighted criteria assessment resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	2
AC	3
WWC	4

Price Assessment (Not Weighted)

Price assessment is based on fixed pricing over the initial three (3) year term as listed in Pricing Schedules. Tenderer ranking is from lowest cost to highest, with further details provided in the Confidential Attachment.

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	2
AC	3
WWC	4

Value for Money (VFM) Assessment

The combined assessment of Price vs Qualitative Scores resulted in the following tenderer ranking (highest to lowest):

Tenderer	Ranking
PBT	1
CTS	2

AC & WWC failed to meet minimum score for Evaluation Criteria 4 - Tenderer's understanding of the Resources & Capacity and therefore were not considered for the value for money assessment.

Overall Assessment and Comment

The tender submission from Paperbark Technologies Pty Ltd achieved the highest ranking in terms of overall qualitative criteria and provided the lowest price.

Paperbark Technologies submission satisfied the overall Value for Money Assessment and in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the Procurement and Evaluation Plan is recommended as the successful Tenderer.

Consultation

Ni

Statutory Compliance

Tenders invited were in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.57 of the *Local Government Act 1995*. The tendering procedures and evaluation complied with the requirements of Part 4 of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*.

Strategic Implications

The proposal aligns with the following objective with the Strategic Community Plan 2021 - 2031:

Goal 4: A sustainable City that balances the relationship between urban growth and the environment

Priority 4.2 - Manage natural assets and resources

Wanneroo will be a City that values its unique local vegetation, animals and eco-systems, ensuring their protection from future challenges. High quality local vegetation and habitat of significance is retained and used during the creation of new places and spaces, providing local nature experiences that are appreciated by all.

Priority 4.3 - Manage natural assets and resources

Wanneroo will be known for its successful management and use of natural assets and resources. The City will harness the use of water, wind and solar to benefit the community and natural assets such as beaches, reserves, parklands and wetlands will be managed in a way that enhances the connection of people to the natural landscape.

21234 Provision of Consultancy services for Arboricultural Consultancy Services

Enterprise Risk Management Considerations

Risk Title	Risk rating
CO-022 Environmental Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Planning & Sustainability	Manage
Risk Title	Risk rating
CO-020 Productive Communities	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Community & Place	Manage
Risk Title	Risk rating
CO-016 Risk Management	Low
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Executive Manager Governance & Legal	Manage
Risk Title	Risk rating
IN-029 Asset Maintenance	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Assets	Manage

Financial and Performance Risk

Financial Risk

A Financial and Performance Assessment of Paperbark Technologies Pty Ltd financials was sought form Equifax Australasia Credit Ratings Pty. Ltd. resulting in a 'Sound' rating.

Performance Risk

Paperbark Technologies Pty Ltd hold a number of Consultancy contracts for local government agencies. Independent reference checks have indicated that the recommended Tenderer is able to meet the requirements of the Tender. Refer to the Confidential Memo for details of the reference checks.

Policy Implications

Tenders invited were in accordance with the requirements of the City's Purchasing Policy.

Financial (Budget) Implications

The costs associated with 21234 Provision of Consultancy Services for Arboricultural Consultancy are included in the Annual Parks and Conservation Management Operational Budget.

Recommendation:

That the Chief Executive Officer, in accordance with Delegation 1.1.14 - Choice of Most Advantageous Tender of the Delegated Authority Register for the awarding of tenders ACCEPTS the tender submitted by Paperbark Technologies Pty Ltd T/A Paperbark Technologies for Tender 21234 Provision of Consultancy Services for Arboricultural Consultancy Services, as per the schedule of rates for a period of three (3) years, with two (2) twelve (12) month, or part thereof, options to extend at the City's discretion.