

TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT

TO: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CC: MANAGER ASSET MAINTENANCE

FROM: DIRECTOR ASSETS

FILE REF: 45710: 22/399009

DATE: 20 OCTOBER 2022

TENDER 22102 – PROVISION OF PEST CONTROL SERVICES

Issue

To consider Tender No: 22102 for the Provision of Pest Control Services for an initial contract term of 32 months and with two x 12 month options to extend at the City's discretion.

Background

The tender is for provision of pest control services to all Council assets. The services are licensed specialist activities and were previously performed by Termitrust under contract 17053 which expired on 31 August 2022.

The scope of services was reviewed prior to this Tender and the specification and schedule of rates were updated to include all identified relevant services for building assets and parks management activities reflecting the City's current requirements.

Following the review of pest control services requirements it is proposed that a new tender be awarded for an initial period of 32 months with an option of two 12-month extension periods. This is intended to provide both budgetary and operational stability over the contract duration.

Detail

Tender 22102 was advertised on 10 September 2022 and closed on 27 September 2022. Two (2) addenda were issued in response to bidder clarifications and which did not change the intent or scope of work included to the original tender document.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

| Item | Detail |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Contract Form | Goods and Services |
| Contract Type | Schedule of Rates |
| Contract Duration | 32 Months |
| Commencement Date | 1 November 2022 |
| Expiry Date | 30 June 2025 |
| Extension Permitted | Yes, two periods of 12 months |

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

| Legal Name | Trading Name | Abbreviation |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| Rol-WA Pty Ltd | Allpest WA | Allpest |
| Competitive Pest Control Pty Ltd | Competitive Pest Services | CPS |
| Flick Anticimex Pty Ltd | Flick Anticimex Pty Ltd | Flick |
| David Roy Cull | Northern Districts Sanitizer Services | NDSS |
| Rentokil Initial Pty Ltd | Rentokil Pest Control | Rentokil |
| The Trustee for G&S Blazeski Family Trust | Tiger Pest and Weed Control | Tiger |

Probity Oversight

Oversight to the tender assessment process was undertaken by the City's Contracts Officer.

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 Procurement (Corporate Social Responsibility) a. Environmental Considerations 5% b. Buy Local 10% c. Reconciliation Action Plan 2.5% d. Disability Access and Inclusion 2.5% | 20% |
| 2 | * Demonstrated Experience | 30% |
| 3 | * Methodolgy, Resources and Capacity | 30% |
| 4 | * WHS Demonstrated Working Documents | 20% |

All tenderers must achieve a minimum acceptable score (as determined by the City) for each of the qualitative criteria detailed above (*) in order 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.

All received tenders were accepted on the basis that they were compliant and worthy of inclusion to the tender evaluation process.

Evaluation Criteria 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 Criteria a) 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 details of their environmental considerations within Schedule 3A, with the following ranking:

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|-----------------|----------------|
| CPS | 1 |
| Flick | 1 |
| Rentokil | 1 |
| NDSS | 4 |
| Tiger | 5 |
| Allpest | 6 |

Sub Criteria b) 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 3B, with the following ranking:

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|-----------------|----------------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Allpest | 2 |
| Flick | 2 |
| Tiger | 2 |
| Rentokil | 5 |
| CPS | 6 |

Sub Criteria c) 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 |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Rentokil | 1 |
| Allpest | 2 |
| CPS | 2 |
| NDSS | 4 |
| Flick | 4 |
| Tiger | 6 |

Sub Criteria d) 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 |
|-----------------|----------------|
| CPS | 1 |
| Rentokil | 1 |
| NDSS | 3 |
| Flick | 3 |
| Allpest | 5 |
| Tiger | 5 |

Overall Sustainable Procurement Ranking Summary

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

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|-----------------|----------------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Flick | 2 |
| Allpest | 3 |
| Rentokil | 4 |
| Tiger | 5 |
| CPS | 6 |

Evaluation Criteria 2 – Demonstrated Experience (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 |
|-----------------|----------------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Allpest | 1 |
| Flick | 1 |
| Rentokil | 4 |
| CPS | 5 |
| Tiger | 5 |

Evaluation Criteria 3 – Methodology, Resources and Capacity (30%)

The tenderer’s 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.

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

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|-----------------|----------------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Flick | 1 |
| Allpest | 3 |
| Rentokil | 3 |
| CPS | 5 |
| ** Tiger | 6 |

** The submission from Tiger did not meet the minimum requirement for this criterion.

Evaluation Criteria 4 – WHS Demonstrated Working Documents (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.

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

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|-----------------|----------------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Allpest | 2 |
| Flick | 3 |
| Tiger | 4 |
| ** CPS | 5 |
| ** Rentokil | 6 |

** The submissions from CPS and Rentokil did not meet the minimum requirement for this criterion.

Overall Qualitative 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 |
|--------------|---------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Flick | 2 |
| Allpest | 3 |
| *** Rentokil | 4 |
| *** CPS | 5 |
| *** Tiger | 6 |

*** Indicates tenderers who did not meet the minimum requirement for the mandatory qualitative criteria.

Pricing for the Goods/Services/Works Offered

An assessment was made to determine the ranking based on the schedule of rates provided with the tender documentation.

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

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|--------------|---------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| *** Tiger | 2 |
| All pest | 3 |
| *** CPS | 4 |
| Flick | 5 |
| *** Rentokil | 6 |

*** Indicates tenderers who did not meet the minimum requirement for the mandatory criteria and did not proceed to the Value for Money assessment stage.

Value for Money (VFM) Assessment

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

| Tenderer | Ranking |
|----------|---------|
| NDSS | 1 |
| Allpest | 2 |
| Flick | 3 |

Overall Assessment and Comment

The tender submission from Northern Districts Sanitizer Services achieved the highest overall qualitative ranking and satisfied the overall value for money assessment in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the Procurement and Evaluation Plan and is therefore recommended by the TEP as the successful tenderer. Northern Districts Sanitizer Services' submission is assessed as having suitable safety systems, experience, resources and capacity to carry out the requirements of the contract.

Consultation

Collaboration occurred with Parks and Conservation Management to define the required scope and specification.

Statutory Compliance

Tenders were invited 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 5

Priority 5.3

Wanneroo will be a City known for having high quality new and existing assets that are well maintained to be fit for purpose and valued by local communities. The City’s assets will be future proofed by design and also provide maximum return on investment into the future.

Enterprise Risk Management Considerations

| Risk Title | Risk Rating |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|
| IN-029 - CO-O23 Safety of Community | Moderate |
| Accountability | Action Planning Option |
| Director Community and Place | Manage |

Financial and Performance Risk

Financial Risk

A financial risk assessment report is not considered necessary. A strong mitigating factor is the contract conditions, which stipulate for payment being made only after satisfactory completion of services.

Performance Risk

Northern Districts Sanitizer Services have previously provided this service to the City over an extended period. During their recent previous tenure they provided a satisfactory quality of service, maintained good working relationships and aligned to budgeting and scheduling requirements without dispute or incident.

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 Pest Control services are included in the Assets Directorate Annual 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 Northern Districts Sanitizer Services for Tender 22102, for the PROVISION OF PEST CONTROL SERVICES, as per the schedule of rates in the tender submission, for an initial contract term of thirty two (32) months with 2 x 12 month, or part thereof options to extend.