

TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT

TO: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CC: MANAGER PARKS AND CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT

FROM: DIRECTOR ASSETS

FILE REF: 45041 22/312824

DATE: 9 September 2022

**TENDER 22050: PROVISION OF SLASHING SERVICES AT NOMINATED SITES
WITHIN THE CITY OF WANNEROO**

Issue

To consider Tender No 22050 for the Provision of Slashing Services at Nominated Sites within the City of Wanneroo.

Background

The City is seeking to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced contractor required to provide slashing services primarily for non-irrigated broad acre natural areas and road reserves. Environmental Industries currently provides these services under Contract 18141, due to expire on 28 October 2022.

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

Detail

Tender 22050 for the Provision of Slashing Services at Nominated Sites within the City of Wanneroo was advertised on 4th June 2022 and closed on 5th July 2022.

One (1) Addendum was issued in response to questions raised.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

Item	Detail
Contract Form	Goods & Services
Contract Type	Schedule of Rates
Contract Duration	Two (2) years
Commencement Date	29 October 2022
Expiry Date	30 October 2024
Extension Permitted	Yes, Three (3) periods of 12 months

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

Legal Name	Trading Name	Abbreviation
Intelife Group Ltd	Intelife Group	Intelife
Environmental Industries Pty Ltd	Environmental Industries	EI

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 Attachment for reference to the external Probity Advisor Final Report.

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

Item No	Description	Weighting
1	Sustainable (Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement a. Environmental Considerations 5% b. Buy Local 10% c. Reconciliation Action Plan 2.5% d. Disability Access and Inclusion 2.5%	20%
2	*WHS Demonstrated working documents	20%
3	*Demonstrated Experience of tenderer and personnel providing the services	30%
4	*Methodology, resoures and capacity	30%

Tenderers 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.

Pricing is not included in the qualitative criteria and is considered as part of the overall value for money assessment.

Both tenders were accepted on the basis that they were compliant and worthy of inclusion in the tender evaluation process.

Evaluation Criterion 1 – Sustainable Procurement (20%)

Evidence of Sustainable (Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement was assessed based on the Tenderer's responses provided to the Questionnaires within Schedules 3A, 3B, 3C and 3D which formed part of the tender documentation.

Sub Criterion 1a) Environmental Considerations (5%)

The City is committed to procuring goods and services that provide 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.

Tenderers provided adequate details of their environmental considerations within Schedule 3A, with the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
EI	1
Intelife	2

Sub Criterion 1b) Buy Local (10%)

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

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

Tenderers provided details of their "Buy Local" considerations within Schedule 3A, with the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
EI	1
Intelife	2

Sub Criterion 1c) Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) (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.

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

Tenderer	Ranking
Intelife	1
EI	1

Sub Criterion 1d) Access & Inclusion Plan (AIP) (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.

Tenderers provided information specifying considerations for access and inclusion provisions with assessment resulting in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Intelife	1
EI	2

Overall Sustainable Procurement Ranking Summary

The overall assessment of the Sustainable Procurement criteria has resulted in the following overall ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
EI	1
Intelife	2

Evaluation Criterion 2 – WHS Working Documentation (20%)

Evidence of WHS management policies and practices was assessed from the tender submissions. The assessment for safety management was based on the tenderer's responses to a specific Questionnaire included within the tender documentation.

Tenderers provided details of their safety management systems with the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
EI	1
Intelife	2

Evaluation Criterion 3 – Tenderer's demonstrated experience and personnel providing the services (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
EI	1
Intelife	2

Evaluation Criterion 4 – Tenderer’s methodology, resources and capacity to meet the requirements of the Contract (30%)

The tenderer’s methodology, resources as presented in their tender submission were assessed in order to evaluate their capacity to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment of this criterion considered the tenderer’s staff resources, vehicles, plant/equipment and workshop support to manage the contract. The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
EI	1
Intelife	2

Overall Qualitative Criteria Weighted Assessment and Ranking

Tenderer’s submissions were reviewed in accordance with the Procurement and Evaluation Plan. The overall assessment of qualitative weighted criteria resulted in the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
EI	1
Intelife	2

Pricing for the Goods/Services/Works Offered

An assessment was made to determine the ranking based on the schedule of rates for the initial two (2) year contract term as provided with the tender documentation.

Based on the information provided, tenderers are ranked as follows:

Tenderer	Ranking
Intelife	1
EI	2

Value for Money Assessment

Relative Value for Money Assessment

The combined assessment of Price vs Overall Qualitative scores undertaken on a relative value for money basis, resulted in the following tenderer ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Intelife	1
EI	2

Overall Assessment and Comment

The tender submission from Intelife satisfied the overall value for money assessment, in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the Procurement and Evaluation Plan and recommends as the successful tenderer.

Consultation

Nil

Strategic Implications

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

“5 – A well-planned, safe and resilient City that is easy to travel around and provides a connection between people and places.

5.3 – Manage and maintain assets”

Enterprise Risk Management Considerations

Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-001 Relationship Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Corporate Strategy and Performance	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-008 Contract Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Corporate Strategy and Performance	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-011 People Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Corporate Strategy and Performance	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-017 Financial Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Corporate Strategy and Performance	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-020 Productive Communities	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Community and Place	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-022 Environmental Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Planning and Sustainability	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-023 Safety of Community	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Community and Place	Manage

Financial and Performance Risk

Financial Risk

A recent financial risk assessment with the outcome of this independent assessment advising that Intelife has been assessed with a ‘strong’ financial capacity to meet the requirements of the contract. All payments will be made on satisfactory provision of the services.

Performance Risk

Intelife holds a number of maintenance contracts for local, state government and agencies. Independent reference checks confirm that the recommended tenderer is able to meet the requirements of the tender.

Policy Implications

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

Financial (Budget) Implications

The costs associated with the provision of Slashing Services 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 Intelife Group Ltd for Tender 22050, for the Provision of Slashing Services at Nominated Sites within the City of Wanneroo, as per the schedule of rates in the tender submission for an initial term of two (2) years with three (3) x twelve (12) month options (or part thereof) to extend at the City's discretion.