

## **TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT**

**TO:** CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

**CC:** MANAGER PARKS & CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT

**FROM:** DIRECTOR ASSETS

**FILE REF:** 45530 22/436260

**DATE:** 12 December 2022

---

**TENDER 22089 SUPPLY OF SOFTFALL MULCH AND SAND AND SOFT SURFACES CLEANING AND MAINTENANCE**

---

### **Issue**

To consider Tender No: 22089 for the Supply of Softfall Mulch and Sand and Soft Surfaces Cleaning and Maintenance.

### **Background**

The City is seeking to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced contractor to provide mechanical and manual servicing and supply of softfall sand/mulch and soft surfaces throughout the City of Wanneroo for an initial period of two years with options to extend, at the City's discretion for a further two (2) x twelve month (or part thereof) terms.

### **Detail**

Tender 22089 for Supply of Softfall Mulch, Sand and Soft Surfaces Cleaning and Maintenance was advertised on 14 September 2022 and closed on 4 October 2022. No Addenda were issued.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

| <b>Item</b>         | <b>Detail</b>                     |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Contract Form       | Goods and Services                |
| Contract Type       | Schedule of Rates                 |
| Contract Duration   | 2 Years                           |
| Commencement Date   | December 2022                     |
| Expiry Date         | December 2024                     |
| Extension Permitted | Yes, 2 x 12 month or part thereof |

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

| <b>Legal Name</b>             | <b>Trading Name</b>   | <b>Abbreviation</b> |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Twin Cleaning Company Pty Ltd | Twin Cleaning Company | Twin Cleaning       |
| Madeleine Corp Pty Ltd        | Safer Sands WA        | Safer Sands         |
| Intelife Group Ltd            | Intelife Group        | Intelife            |
| Chelley Hawley Pty Ltd        | Sifting Sands         | Sifting Sands       |

The Tender Evaluation Panel comprised:

- Acting Coordinator Parks Contracts
- Technical Officer Horticulture
- Technical Officer Contracts Administration

**Probity Oversight**

Probity oversight to the tender assessment process was undertaken by William Buck Consulting (0/VA) Pty Ltd and the City's Contract 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 |
|---------|---|-----------|
| a       | Criteria  | Weighting |
| 1       | Sustainable (Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement<br>a. Environmental Considerations 5%<br>b. Buy Local 10%<br>c. Reconciliation Action Plan 2.5%<br>Disability Access & Inclusion 2.5% | 20%       |
| 2       | -WHS  | 20%       |
| 3       | * Demonstrated experience relative to the provision of these services   | 20%       |
| 4       | * Methodology - demonstrated understanding of the methodology to provide the services   | 20%       |
| 5       | *Demonstrated Capacity and Resources - to undertake all services as specified in the Scope and Specification  | 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 tender submissions were deemed conforming.

**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:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Sifting Sands   | 1              |
| Intelife        | 2              |
| Safer Sands     | 2              |
| Twin Cleaning   | 4              |

#### **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 38, with the following ranking:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Twin Cleaning   | 1              |
| Sifting Sands   | 1              |
| Safer Sands     | 1              |
| Intelife        | 4              |

#### **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:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Intelife        | 1              |
| Safer Sands     | 2              |
| Twin Cleaning   | 3              |
| Sifting Sands   | 4              |

**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:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Intelife        | 1              |
| Safer Sands     | 2              |
| Twin Cleaning   | 2              |
| Sifting Sands   | 2              |

**Overall Sustainable Procurement Ranking Summary**

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

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Sifting Sands   | 1              |
| Safer Sands     | 2              |
| Twin Cleaning   | 3              |
| Intelife        | 4              |

**Evaluation Criteria 2 - tenderer's Work Health and Safety Management Systems (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:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Intelife        | 1              |
| Safer Sands     | 1              |
| Sifting Sands   | 3              |
| *Twin Cleaning  | 4              |

\*Twin Cleaning did not meet the minimum requirement for this criterion.

### Evaluation Criteria 3 - Tenderer's relevant experience with achievement of meeting client expectations (20%)

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 |
|----------------|---------|
| Sifting Sands  | 1       |
| Intelife       | 2       |
| Safer Sands    | 3       |
| *Twin Cleaning | 4       |

\*Twin Cleaning did not meet the minimum requirement for this criterion.

### Evaluation Criteria 4- Tenderer's methodology to meet the requirements of the Contract (20%)

The tenderer's methodology as presented in their tender submission were assessed in order to evaluate their understanding to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment of this criterion considered the proposed methodology. The assessment of this criterion has resulted in the following ranking:

| Tenderer       | Ranking |
|----------------|---------|
| Sifting Sands  | 1       |
| Intelife       | 2       |
| Safer Sands    | 2       |
| *Twin Cleaning | 4       |

\*Twin Cleaning did not meet the minimum requirement for this criterion

### Evaluation Criteria 5 - Tenderer's resources and capacity to meet the requirements of the Contract (20%)

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

| Tenderer       | Ranking |
|----------------|---------|
| Sifting Sands  | 1       |
| Safer Sands    | 2       |
| Intelife       | 3       |
| *Twin Cleaning | 4       |

\*Twin Cleaning 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:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Siftino Sands   | 1              |
| Safer Sands     | 2              |
| Intelife        | 3              |
| *Twin Cleaning  | 4              |

\*Twin Cleaning did not meet the minimum requirement for all relevant criteria and therefore did not progress to the Value for Money assessment stage.

### **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:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Intelife        | 1              |
| Sifting Sands   | 2              |
| Safer Sands     | 3              |

### **Relative Value for Money Assessment**

The combined assessment of Price vs Qualitative criteria on a Relative Value for Money basis resulted in the following tenderer ranking:

| <b>Tenderer</b> | <b>Ranking</b> |
|-----------------|----------------|
| Intelife        | 1              |
| Sifting Sands   | 2              |
| Safer Sands     | 3              |

### **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 is therefore recommended as the successful tenderer.

### **Consultation**

Nil

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

Priority 5.3 - Manage and maintain assets"

**Risk Appetite Statement**

In pursuit of strategic objective goal 7, we will accept a Medium level of risk as the City balances the capacity of the community to fund services through robust cost-benefit analysis and pursues evidence-based decision making to be effective stewards of the Council and City for future generations.

**Enterprise Risk Management Considerations**

|                                      |                                |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Risk Title</b>                    | <b>Risk Rating</b>             |
| CO-O22 Environmental Management      | Moderate                       |
| <b>Accountability</b>                | <b>Action Planning Option</b>  |
| Director PlanninQ & Sustainability   | Manaae                         |
| <b>Risk Title</b>                    | <b>Risk Rating</b>             |
| CO-O20 Productive Communities        | Moderate                       |
| <b>Accountability</b>                | <b>Action Planning Option</b>  |
| Director Community & Place           | Manage                         |
| <b>Risk Title</b>                    | <b>Risk Rating</b>             |
| CO-016 Risk Management               | Low                            |
| <b>Accountability</b>                | <b>Action Planning Option</b>  |
| Executive Manager Governance & Legal | Manage                         |
| <b>Risk Title</b>                    | <b>Risk Rating</b>             |
| IN-029 Asset Maintenance             | Moderate                       |
| <b>Accountability</b>                | <b>Action Plannling Option</b> |
| Director <b>Assets</b>               | Manage                         |

**Financial and Performance Risk**

Financial Risk

A financial risk assessment was not undertaken as part of the tender evaluation process as a recent report for the recommended tenderer resulted in a 'strong' rating and services under this contract are paid on satisfactory completion of the services.

Performance Risk

A reference requested from City of Rockingham for Intelife returned a good reference and the City's experience with Intelife was also considered satisfactory.

**Policy Implications**

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

**Financial (Budget) Implications**

The costs associated with the Supply of Softfall Mulch and Sand and Soft Surfaces Cleaning and Maintenance are included in the Parks Annual Operating Budget.

**Recommendation:**

**That the Chief Executive Officer, in accordance with Delegation 1.1.13 - 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 22089, for the SUPPLY OF SOFTFALL MULCH AND SAND AND SOFT SURFACES CLEANING AND MAINTENANCE, as per the schedule of rates in the tender submission for an initial period of two (2) years with two (2) twelve (12) month, or part thereof, options to extend at the discretion of the city and subject to appropriate funding availability, for each of the financial years within the contract term.**