

TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT

TO: CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

CC: MANAGER ASSET MAINTENANCE

FROM: DIRECTOR ASSETS

FILE REF: 20/580671

DATE: 31 March 2021

TENDER 20148: Irrigation Design and Consultancy Services

Issue

To consider Tender No: 20148 for Irrigation Design and Consultancy Services for an initial period of three (3) years with two (2) twelve (12) month options to extend at the City's discretion.

Background

The City has a requirement to install new and alter existing irrigation systems on its active and passive parks and streetscapes. Irrigation design and consultancy services are required to ensure the efficient design and installation of irrigation systems to specification and that use of the City's ground water resources is also efficient. The Contract will be utilised internally by Infrastructure Capital Works, Parks Contracts and Parks Technical service units.

Detail

Tender 20148 for Irrigation Design and Consultancy was advertised on 14 November 2020 and closed on 1 December 2020.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

Item	Detail
Contract Form	Consultancy
Contract Type	Schedule of Rates
Contract Duration	3 Years
Commencement Date	March 2021
Expiry Date	March 2024
Extension Permitted	Yes, Two (2) periods of Twelve (12) months.

Tender submissions received from the following companies:

Legal Name	Trading Name	Abbreviation
Hill and Canning Consulting Engineers Pty Ltd	SPORTENG	Sporteng
Elliotts Irrigation Pty Ltd	Elliotts Irrigation	Elliotts

The Tender Evaluation Panel comprised:

- | | |
|---|------------------------------|
| • Specialist Parks Contracts | Parks Maintenance |
| • Technical Officer – Turf and Irrigation | Parks Maintenance |
| • Acting Project Officer Irrigation | Parks Maintenance |
| • Building Project Officer | Infrastructure Capital Works |

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 Final Probity Advisor Report.

The evaluation of Tender submissions is in accordance with the approved Procurement and Evaluation Plan (PEP), which included the following qualitative selection criteria:

Price is Non Weighted			
	Criteria Description	Weighting	Schedule
Qualitative Criteria 1:	Sustainable Procurement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental Considerations 5% • Buy Local 20% 	25 %	3A 3B
Qualitative Criteria 2:	*Demonstrated experience of tenderer and personnel performing the services	40%	3E
Qualitative Criteria 3:	*Capacity to meet contract requirements within specified timeframes	30%	3E
Qualitative Criteria 4:	*OSH demonstrated working documents	5%	2
TOTAL 100%			

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 considered as part of the overall value for money assessment.

Evaluation Criteria 1 – Sustainable Procurement (25%)

Evidence of Sustainable (and Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement was assessed based on the responses provided to the questionnaires in Schedules 3A, and 3B as included in the Tender documentation.

a) Environmental Considerations (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 Request for Tender.

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

Tenderer	Ranking
Sporteng	1
Elliotts	2

b) Buy Local Considerations (20%)

The City encourages the development of competitive local businesses within the geographical boundaries of the City first and secondly within the broader region. This commitment includes, but is not limited to:

- Purchasing locally made and sourced goods/services;
- Inviting local businesses to participate in quotation, tender and expressions of interest opportunities;
- Providing an advantage to businesses based within the City's boundaries;
- Providing an advantage to businesses, which can demonstrate economic benefit to the City's community such as employing local residents/sub-contractors and/or purchasing goods/services from local providers.

Respondents provided details of their Buy Local considerations within Schedule 3B, with the following ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Sporteng	1
Elliotts	2

Evaluation Criteria 2 - Demonstrated experience of tenderer and personnel performing the services (40%)

The tenderer's relevant demonstrated experience as presented in their tender submission 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
Sporteng	1
Elliotts*	2

*Elliotts failed to meet the minimum acceptable qualitative score for this criterion.

Evaluation Criteria 3 -- Capacity to meet contract requirements within specified timeframes (30%)

The tenderer's resources as presented in their tender submission 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
Sporteng	1
Elliotts	2

Both tenderers achieved the minimum acceptable qualitative score for this criterion.

Evaluation Criteria 4 - OSH - Respondent's Safety Management Systems (5%)

Evidence of safety management policies and practices assessed on the tenderers' responses to an Occupational Health and Safety Management System Questionnaire included within the tender documentation.

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

Tenderer	Ranking
Sporteng	1
Elliotts	2

Both tenderers achieved the minimum acceptable qualitative score for this criterion.

Overall Qualitative Weighted Assessment and Ranking

The assessment of Tenderer's submissions is in accordance with the Procurement and Evaluation Plan with the following key observations:

- Price is not weighted and is included in the overall value for money assessment; and
- The Tender Submission from Sporteng was evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria as to having the necessary resources, previous experience, capability and safety management systems to undertake the contract; and
- *The Tender submission from Elliotts did not satisfy the minimum score requirements for relevant experience criterion and did not progress to the Value for money assessment.

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

Tenderer	Ranking
Sporteng	1
Elliotts*	2

Price Assessment

The assessment of submitted pricing is against a schedule of rates and anticipated utilisation over the initial three (3) year term of the contract resulting in the following tenderer ranking:

Tenderer	Ranking
Elliotts	1
Sporteng	2

Overall Value for Money Assessment and Comment

The tender submission from Sporteng satisfies the overall value for money assessment in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the Procurement and Evaluation Plan and recommended as the successful tenderer.

Consultation

Nil

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 2017 – 2027:

- 3. Environment – Built Environment
 - 3.2 – Enhanced Environment
 - 3.4 – Activated Places”

Enterprise Risk Management Considerations

Risk Title	Risk Rating
ST-S05 Water Availability	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Planning & Sustainability	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-O22 Environmental Management	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Planning & Sustainability	Manage
Risk Title	Risk Rating
CO-O20 Productive Communities	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Community & Place	Manage

Financial and Performance Risk

Financial Risk

No financial risk assessment was undertaken, as the anticipated expected value of the contract is relatively low over the initial three-year term with payment made following satisfactory completion of services.

Performance Risk

Sporteng do not have any history of current and/or previous performance with the City and do not have any history of notices of disputes and/or claims.

Independent reference checks have also indicated that the recommended tenderer has the relevant experience and capacity to meet the requirements of the Contract.

Policy Implications

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

Financial (Budget) Implications

The costs associated with Tender 20148 Irrigation Design and Consultancy are included in the 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 Hill and Canning Consulting Engineers P/L T/A SPORTENG for Tender 20148, for Irrigation Design and Consultancy Services, as per the schedule of rates in the tender submission