



## **TENDER RECOMMENDATION REPORT**

**TO:** CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

**FROM:** DIRECTOR ASSETS

**FILE REF:** 43098: 21/504334

**DATE:** 4 March 2022

### **TENDER 21145 – THE PROVISION OF TURF RENOVATION SERVICES**

#### **Issue**

To consider Tender 21145 – The Provision of Turf Renovation Services for a Period of three (3) Years with two (2), twelve month (or part thereof) options to extend at the City's discretion.

#### **Background**

Turf renovation services have been undertaken under contract for a number of years and it is proposed to continue with this practice in the future. In order to provide a wider range of services, this contract has been undertaken as a separable portion contract consisting of the following separable portions:

Separable Portion 1	Turf renovation services
Separable Portion 2	Field top maker
Separable Portion 3	Excavated sand slit drainage
Separable Portion 4	Injected sand slit drainage
Separable Portion 5	Recycle topdressing
Separable Portion 6	Earthquake decompaction
Separable Portion 7	Aeration - agri-vator

#### **Detail**

Tender 21145 – The Provision of Turf Renovation Services was advertised on 18 September 2021 and closed on 5 October 2021. No Addenda were issued.

Essential details of the proposed contract are as follows:

Item	Detail
Contract Form	Goods and Services
Contract Type	Schedule of Rates
Contract Duration	3 Years
Commencement Date	March 2022
Expiry Date	March 2025
Extension Permitted	2 x 1 year options to extend or part thereof

Tender submissions were received from the following companies:

Legal Name	Trading Name	Abbreviation
Green Options Pty Ltd	Green Options	Green Options
D & E Parker Trust	Lawn Doctor	Lawn Doctor
Profounder Turfmaster Pty Ltd	Profounder Turfmaster	Turfmaster
Jerra Nominees Pty Ltd & NB Norrish Pty Ltd	State Wide Turf Services	State Wide
Turfcare WA	Turfcare WA	Turfcare

The Tender Evaluation Panel comprised:

- Coordinator Parks Technical
- Project Officer Irrigation
- Senior Project Manager – Waste Services
- Coordinator Safety Systems

#### Probity Oversight

Oversight to the tender assessment process was undertaken by an external Probity Adviser (William Buck Consulting (WA) Pty Ltd) and in conjunction with the City's Contracts Officer.

#### Tender Evaluation

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

Criteria 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 & Inclusion 2.5%	20%
2	*Occupational Safety and Health	20%
3	*Demonstrated Experience in undertaking turf renovation practices as described in relevant separable portions	30%
4	* Demonstrated Capacity to undertake large amounts of turf renovations in condensed time periods to meet the needs of stakeholders	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.

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

### **Evaluation Criteria 1 – Sustainable Procurement (20%)**

Evidence of Sustainable (Corporate Social Responsibility) Procurement was assessed based on the Tenderers' responses provided within the Questionnaires provided in Schedules 3A, 3B, 3C and 3D that were included in the tender documentation.

#### **Sub Criteria a) - Environmental Considerations (sub weighting 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 quote.

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

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Green Options	1
Lawn Doctor	2
Turfcare	2
Turfmaster	4
State Wide	4

#### **Sub Criteria b) - Buy Local (sub weighting 10%)**

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

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

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

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Lawn Doctor	1
Turfmaster	2
Turfcare	3
Green Options	4
State Wide	5

#### **Sub Criteria c) - Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) (sub weighting 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.

All 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>
Lawn Doctor	1
Turfcare	2
Green Options	3
State Wide	4
Turfmaster	5

#### **Sub Criteria d) - Access & Inclusion Plan (AIP) (sub weighting 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.

All tenderers provided information specifying differing levels of consideration for access and inclusion provisions with assessment resulting in the following ranking:

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Lawn Doctor	1
Turfmaster	1
Turfcare	1
Green Options	4
State Wide	4

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

The following presents the overall Sustainable Procurement criterion ranking:

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Lawn Doctor	1
Turfmaster	2
Turfcare	2
Green Options	4
State Wide	5

**Evaluation Criteria 2 – Tenderer’s Occupational Safety and Health Management (20%)**

Evidence of safety management plans, policies and safety management practices defined in all tenderer’s submissions was duly assessed based on the respondents’ responses to an Occupational Health and Safety Management System Questionnaire included within the tender documentation.

The tenderers were ranked as shown below under this criterion:

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Turfcare	1
Green Options	2
Lawn Doctor	2
Turfmaster	4
State Wide	5

**Evaluation Criteria 3 – Demonstrated experience in undertaking turf renovation practices (30%)**

The tenderers’ relevant experience in demonstrating the achievement of meeting client expectations as presented in their tender submissions was assessed in order to evaluate their capability to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment of the tender submissions against this criterion closely examined the tendering entity’s credentials to fulfil the requirements of the contract. The tenderers were ranked as shown below under this assessment criterion:

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Turfcare	1
Lawn Doctor	2
State Wide	2
Turfmaster	4
*Green Options	5

\*Green Options failed to achieve the minimum acceptable qualitative score for the Demonstrated Experience evaluation criterion.

**Evaluation Criteria 4 – Demonstrated Capacity to undertake large amounts of turf renovations in condensed time periods to meet the needs of stakeholders (30%)**

The tenderers’ capacity and resources as presented in their tender submissions was assessed in order to evaluate their capacity to meet the requirements of the contract. Assessment against this criterion considered the tenderers’ staff resources, vehicles plant and equipment and supply approach to manage the contract.

The tenderers were ranked as shown below under this assessment criterion:

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Turfcare	1
Lawn Doctor	2
State Wide	2
Turfmaster	4
*Green Options	5

\*Green Options failed to achieve the minimum acceptable qualitative score for the Demonstrated Capacity evaluation criterion.

### Overall Qualitative Weighted Assessment

<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Turfcare	1
Lawn Doctor	2
Turfmaster	3
State Wide	4
*Green Options	5

\*Green Options failed to achieve an acceptable minimum score to at least one of the qualitative criteria and did not proceed to the Value for Money Assessment.

### Price Assessment

Due to the number of separable portions price comparisons were undertaken on each individual separable portion. Further details of individual pricing is available in the Confidential Memo.

<b>Price Assessment Separable Portion 1</b>	
<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Turfmaster	1
Lawn Doctor	2
State Wide	3
Green Options	4
Turfcare	5

<b>Price Assessment Separable Portion 2</b>	
<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Lawn Doctor	1
Turfcare	2
Turfmaster	3
State Wide	4
Green Options	5

<b>Price Assessment Separable Portion 3</b>	
<b>Tenderer</b>	<b>Ranking</b>
Turfcare	1
*Lawn Doctor	
*Turfmaster	
*State Wide	
*Green Options	

\*Tenderers did not tender on this separable portion

Price Assessment Separable Portion 4	
Tenderer	Ranking
*Green Options	
*Lawn Doctor	
*Turfmaster	
*State Wide	
*Turfcare	

\*Tenderers did not tender on this separable portion

Price Assessment Separable Portion 5	
Tenderer	Ranking
Turfcare	1
Lawn Doctor	2
Green Options	3
*Turfmaster	
*State Wide	

\*Tenderers did not tender on this separable portion

Price Assessment Separable Portion 6	
Tenderer	Ranking
Turfcare	1
Lawn Doctor	2
State Wide	3
Green Options	4
*Turfmaster	

\*Tenderer did not tender on this separable portion

Price Assessment Separable Portion 7	
Tenderer	Ranking
Lawn Doctor	1
Turfcare	2
*State Wide	
*Green Options	
*Turfmaster	

\*Tenderers did not tender on this separable portion.

### Value for Money Assessment

The combined assessment of Price vs Qualitative Assessment Scores on an overall value for money basis resulted in the following outcomes for each Separable Portion.

Based on the results of the overall weighted qualitative criteria and the assessed schedule of rates, the following value for money outcome and highest ranked tenderer results:

Separable Portion	Recommended Tenderer
Separable Portion 1*	Lawn Doctor
Separable Portion 2	Lawn Doctor
Separable Portion 3	Turfcare
Separable Portion 4	Not recommended for award
Separable Portion 5	Turfcare
Separable Portion 6	Turfcare
Separable Portion 7	Lawn Doctor

The Confidential Memo provides a detailed breakdown of the overall value for money assessment.

### Overall Assessment and Comment

Although Turfmaster provided the lowest price whilst demonstrating capacity to undertake the works under this Contract for Separable Portion 1, the subsequent risk assessment undertaken as part of the procurement process, returned an unacceptable result. The submission from Lawn Doctor affords the next best value for money option with a minimal financial and operational risk and is therefore recommended as the successful Contractor for Separable Portion 1.

The tender submissions from Lawn Doctor and Turfcare respectively satisfied the tender requirements in accordance with the assessment criteria and weightings as detailed in the Procurement and Evaluation Plan for the other Separable Portions and are recommended for award.

### Consultation

The primary stakeholders within Parks and Conservation Management were engaged in advance of the process to ensure procurement arrangements fully meet operational requirements.

### 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

Wanneroo will be a City known for having high quality new and existing asset that are well-managed, 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
CO-O23 Safety of Community	Moderate
Accountability	Action Planning Option
Director Community and Place	Manage

### Financial and Performance Risk

#### Financial Risk

A Financial (Credit) check of Lawn Doctor, Turfcare and Profounder Turfmaster's was sought from Equifax Australasia Credit Ratings Pty. Ltd relevant to the Contract values of the respective recommended Separable Portions.

The financial assessments resulted in a 'Satisfactory' rating for both Lawn Doctor and Turfcare.

#### Performance Risk

Independent reference checks were carried out for Lawn Doctor, Turfcare and Profounder Turfmaster with results identified within the Confidential Memo.

### Policy Implications

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

### Financial (Budget) Implications

The estimated expenditure across all separable portions is estimated to be \$950,000 per annum. These costs have been accounted for in the Parks and Conservation 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 Tenders submitted as per schedule of rates as follows:**

<b>D &amp; E Parker Trust trading as Lawn Doctor</b>	<b>Turfcare WA</b>
Separable Portion 1;	Separable Portion 3;
Separable Portion 2;	Separable Portion 5;
Separable Portion 7.	Separable Portion 6.

**and notes that no tender was submitted for Separable Portion 4.**