

# TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT

EXECUTIVE OFFICER
GER PARKS AND CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT
TOR ASSETS
23/129936
2023

# **TENDER No. 23014 PROVISION OF TREE PLANTING SERVICES**

#### lssue

To consider Tender No. 23014 for the Provision of Tree Planting Services.

#### Background

The City is seeking to appoint a suitably qualified and experienced contractor to provide tree planting services throughout the City's parks, residential verges and road reserves. Environmental Industries currently provide these services under Contract No. 19030 which is due to expire on 4 May 2023.

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

#### Detail

Tender No. 23014 for the Provision of Tree Planting Services was advertised on 11 March 2023 and closed on 28 March 2023. One (1) addendum was issued in response to questions raised.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

Item	Detail
Contract Form	Goods and Services
Contract Type	Schedule of Rates
Contract Duration	Two (2) years
Commencement Date	5 May 2023
Expiry Date	6 May 2025
Extension Permitted	Yes, Two (2) periods of 12 months.

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

Legal Name	Trading Name	Abbreviation
Ultimate Blue Pty Ltd	Ultimate Blue	Ultimate
Environmental Industries Pty Ltd	Environmental Industries	EI
Baroness Holdings Pty Ltd	Tree Planting and Watering	TPW

All tender submissions were deemed conforming.

# 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%	20%
	c. Reconciliation Action Plan 2.5% Disability Access and Inclusion 2.5%	
2	*Work Health & Safety (WHS)	20%
3	*Resources and Capacity	30%
4	*Experience	30%

All tenderers must meet the City's minimum requirements 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.

#### **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
El	1
TPW	2
Ultimate	3

# 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
El	1
Ultimate	1
TPW	3

# 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
El	1
TPW	2
Ultimate	3

#### 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
El	1
TPW	2
Ultimate	2

#### **Overall Sustainable Procurement Ranking Summary**

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

Tenderer	Ranking
El	1
Ultimate	2
TPW	3

# Evaluation Criteria 2 - Tenderer's 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:

Tenderer	Ranking
El	1
TPW	2
Ultimate *	3

\* Ultimate did not meet the City's minimum requirements for this criterion.

# Evaluation Criteria 3 - Tenderer's resources and capacity to meet the requirements of the Contract (30%)

The tenderer's resources as presented in their tender submission were assessed 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
El	1
TPW	2
Ultimate *	3

\* Ultimate did not meet the City's minimum requirements for this criterion.

# Evaluation Criteria 4 - Tenderer's relevant experience with achievement of meeting client expectations (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
TPW	1
El	2
Ultimate *	3

\* Ultimate did not meet the City's minimum requirements 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	
EI	1	
TPW	2	
Ultimate *	3	

\*Ultimate did not meet the City's minimum requirements for each of the mandatory qualitative criteria.

# Pricing for the Services (Not Weighted)

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
El	1
Ultimate*	2
TPW	3

\*Ultimate did not meet meet the City's minimum requirements for each of the mandatory qualitative criteria and therefore did not proceed to the Value for Money Assessment.

#### Value for Money Assessment

The value for money assessment (price and qualitative criteria) resulted in the following tenderer ranking (highest to lowest):

Tenderer	Ranking	
El	1	
TPW	2	

# **Overall Assessment and Comment**

The tender submission from Environmental Industries satisfied the overall value for money assessment in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the PEP 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 4: A sustainable City that balances the relationship between urban growth and the environment

Priority: Priority 4.3 - Manage natural assets and resources

#### **Risk Appetite Statement**

In pursuit of strategic objective goal 4, we will accept a Medium level of risk. The nature of the City being 'pro-growth' means that commercial opportunities will be explored in areas identified for development, potentially challenging perceptions of the City as an environmental steward.

#### **Enterprise Risk Management Considerations**

Risk Title	Risk Rating	Accountability	Action Planning Option
CO-022			
Environmental			
Management	High	Director Planning & Sustainability	Manage
ST - S26 Resilient			
& Productive			
Communities	Medium	Director Community & Place	Manage
CO-016 Risk		Executive Manager Governance &	
Management	Moderate	legal	Manage
CO-O08 Contract		Director Corporate Strategy &	
Management	Moderate	Performance	Manage

#### Financial and Performance Risk

#### Financial Risk

A financial risk assessment was not undertaken as part of the tender evaluation process as a recent financial assessment achieved a "strong" financial capacity to

meet the requirements of the contract. All payments are made on satisfactory provision of the services.

#### Performance Risk

Environmental Industries hold several contracts for local, state and government agencies.

Independent reference checks have also 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 were invited in accordance with the requirements of the City's Purchasing Policy.

#### **Financial (Budget) Implications**

# If Operational Budget:

The costs associated with the 23014 Tree Planting Services are included in the Annual Parks & Conservation management Operational 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 Environmental Industries Pty Ltd for Tender 23014, for the PROVISION OF TREE PLANTING SERVICES as per the schedule of rates in the tender submission, subject to appropriate funding availability, for each of the financial years within the two (2) year contract term with two (2) twelve (12) month, or part thereof, options to extend at the City's discretion.