



The Shire of Jerramungup

# RECOMMENDATION REPORT

RFQ 17/02

Design and Construction of a Skate Park Including Landscape Works for the  
Bremer Bay Civic Square and Paperbark Park

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Overview</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.1. Summary</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>1.2. Endorsement by Evaluation Panel</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>2. RFQ Process</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.1. Advertising Details</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.2. Invitations</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.3. RFQ Closing Date</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2.4. Responses Received</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>3. Evaluation Panel</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3.1. Participants</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3.2. Conflicts of Interest</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3.3. The Evaluation Process</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3.3.1. Summary</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3.4. Evaluation Criterion</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3.4.1. Compliance Criteria</b> .....	<b>7</b>
<b>3.4.2. Qualitative Criterion</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>3.4.3. Value Assessment</b> .....	<b>9</b>
<b>4. Evaluation Summary</b> .....	<b>10</b>
<b>4.1. Evaluation Meeting</b> .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>4.2. Outcome</b> .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>5. Recommendation</b> .....	<b>11</b>
<b>6. Appendix C Referee Checks</b> .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
<b>7. Appendix D Financial Assessment</b> .....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

# 1. Overview

## 1.1. Summary

The Shire of Jerramungup engaged the Procurement Service of WALGA to undertake procurement services to appoint a suitable Contractor for the Design and Construction of a Skate Park Including Landscape Works for the Bremer Bay Civic Square and Paperbark Park.

The scope of this engagement included:

- Document Preparation;
- Process Management;
- Provision of one (1) Evaluator;
- Management of the Evaluation Process;
- Provision of a Recommendation Report; and
- Contract Preparation.

Through the engagement of the Procurement Service of WALGA an invited Request for Quotation was undertaken through WALGA's Preferred Supply Arrangement C019\_13 Design, Supply and Installation of Landscape Infrastructure.

One (1) Tender was received by the Deadline of the Request for Quotation. The Responses were reviewed by an evaluation panel consisting of Shire and WALGA staff.

**At the conclusion of the evaluation process, the Evaluation Panel has recommended**

## 1.2. Endorsement by Evaluation Panel

Brent Bailey



Chief Executive Officer  
Shire of Jerramungup

---

Craig Grant



Procurement Specialist  
WALGA

---

---

---

## 2. RFQ Process

### 2.1. Advertising Details

The Request for Quotation was released to invited suppliers from WALGA's Preferred Supply Arrangement C019\_13 Design, Supply and Installation of Landscape through eQuotes on, Friday, 13 June 2017.

### 2.2. Invitations

The following Preferred Suppliers were invited to provide a quotation:

- Convic
- Playscape Creations
- Proludic
- Earthcare

### 2.3. RFQ Closing Date

This Request for Quotation closed on (Insert Deadline). The following officers attended the close and opening of Responses:

Name	Title	Organisation
Amy Green		WALGA
Craig Grant	Procurement Specialist	WALGA

### 2.4. Responses Received

One (1) Response was received from:

Item	Tenderer
1	Earthcare

### 3. Evaluation Panel

#### 3.1. Participants

An evaluation panel assessed each Response. Details on members of the panel are contained within the below table.

Name	Organisation	Role	Voting/ Nonvoting
Brent Bailey	Shire of Jerramungup	Evaluator	Voting
Craig Grant	WALGA	Evaluator/ Evaluation Panel Facilitator	Voting

#### 3.2. Conflicts of Interest

Upon closure of the receipt of Responses the Evaluation Panel was notified of the submitting organisations. At this point disclosure of conflicts of interest was sought prior to being provided with any evaluation material.

Declarations were received from all participating members with no conflicts identified at this point.

#### 3.3. The Evaluation Process

##### 3.3.1. Summary

Following the closing of quotations, panel members:

- Were provided a list of Respondents;
- Received an evaluation handbook;
- Declared any conflicts of interest prior to receiving any Respondents information; and
- Were provided access to the online E - Procurement platform upon completing and signing a confidentiality and conflicts of interest form.
- Individually scored each Response using a 0 – 10 rating scale;
- Considered Pricing structures,
- Discussed Scores to determine which Respondent presents the best overall value,
- Endorsed the resultant Recommendation report.

### 3.4. Evaluation Criterion

The evaluation components consisted of

- a) Compliance Criterion;
- b) Qualitative Criterion; and
- c) Value Assessment.

#### 3.4.1. Compliance Criteria

The compliance criterion is a non-weighted component of the assessment process. These criterion consisted of:

<p><b>a) Acknowledgement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Respondents are to provide acknowledgment that your organisation has submitted in accordance with the Conditions of this RFQ including completion of the Offer Form and provision of your pricing submitted in the format required by the Principal.</li> <li>ii. Respondents are to state if they or an authorised representative has viewed the works sites subject to his contract and satisfied themselves regarding the site conditions and the availability of townsite facilities.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes / No</p>
<p><b>b) Subcontract</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Do you intend to subcontract any of the Requirements? If Yes provide details of the subcontractor(s) including; the name, address and the number of people employed; and the Requirements that will be subcontracted.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes / No</p>
<p><b>c) Project Referees</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Provide at referees from your demonstrated projects including referee name, Email address, phone number and a brief description of the project conducted with the referee.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>d) Project Specifics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Respondents are to specify any exclusions regarding the requirements of this contract.</li> <li>ii. Respondents are to highlight any key areas of project risks that may impact this project.</li> </ul>	

<p><b>e) Contract Departures</b></p> <p>i. Respondents are to provide their departures/exclusions from the proposed Conditions of Contract if any.</p>	
<p><b>f) Insurance</b></p> <p>i. Respondents are to supply evidence of their Works insurance and Plant/Vehicle Insurance including, insurer, expiry date, value and type of insurance.</p> <p>ii. If the Respondent does not currently meet the minimum insurance requirements, does the Tenderer agree to amend its insurance policies to meet these requirements at no additional cost to the Principal prior to award of a Contract?</p>	<p>Yes / No</p>

### 3.4.2. Qualitative Criterion

The qualitative criterion is the weighted component of the assessment process. These criterion consisted of:

<p><b>A. Demonstrated Projects</b></p> <p>Respondents must address the following information in an attachment and label it “ Demonstrated Projects”:</p>	<p><b>Weighting</b></p> <p>&lt;25%&gt;</p>
<p>i. Respondents are to provide project examples that include similar design, construction and material elements as this contract including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A brief description of the requirements undertaken</li> <li>• Site Details</li> <li>• Approximate contract value</li> <li>• Contract Duration</li> </ul>	
<p><b>B. Delivery Teams</b></p> <p>Respondents must address the following information in an attachment and label it “Delivery Teams”:</p>	<p><b>Weighting</b></p> <p>&lt;30%&gt;</p>
<p>i. Provide details of the project team (in-house resources) that will work on this project. Include the relevant roles to be performed, relevant experience and qualifications, and the suitability of each project team member for this project.</p>	



<p>ii. Detail the sub-contractors, sub consultants and intended goods and materials suppliers to be utilised in this project. Provide a brief overview of why these particular organisations have been chosen.</p>	
<p><b>C. Project Timings/Methodology</b></p> <p>Respondents must address the following information in an attachment and label it “Project Timings/Methodology”:</p>	<p><b>Weighting</b></p> <p><b>&lt;30%&gt;</b></p>
<p>i. Provide a project programme / timeline scheduling highlighting the where the relevant design, construction and supply elements will be undertaken including any holding / approval points.</p> <p>ii. Provide your project methodology statement as to how you will undertake the relevant design, construction and supply elements relating to the project programme / timeline scheduling.</p>	
<p><b>D. Local Content</b></p> <p>Respondents must address the following information in an attachment and label it “ Local Content”:</p>	<p><b>Weighting</b></p> <p><b>&lt;15%&gt;</b></p>
<p>i. Detail the local content that will be used in this contract including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organisation name</li> <li>• Expected contract spend</li> <li>• Type of good services to be supplied</li> <li>• Estimated percentage of work represented</li> </ul>	

### 3.4.3. Value Assessment

The non-weighted cost method was used to consider Respondents presented value. The Evaluation Panel made a series of value judgements based on the capability of the Respondents to complete the Requirements.

## 4. Evaluation Summary

A brief summary for Respondents follows.

The summary is not meant to cover all criteria and issues discussed by the Evaluation Panel.

<b>Earthcare</b>		
<b>Overall Qualitative Score</b>	64.5%	
<b>Price (Exc GST)</b>	Civic Square	\$990,853
	Paperbark Park	\$115,865
	Skate Park	\$508,250
<b>Overall Summary</b>	<p>Earthcare has demonstrated suitable experience within general landscaping projects in regional coastal locations. The demonstrated works elements included supply and installation of furniture, small infrastructure items, Play areas including nature play and general landscape elements. No direct skate park experience was demonstrated.</p> <p>The in – house resources will manage the following roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project Director</li> <li>• Contract Administration</li> <li>• Site Supervisor</li> <li>• Site Supervisor Assistant</li> <li>• Environmental Manager</li> </ul> <p>The individual members allocated to these roles have relevant experience and skills.</p> <p>The nominated subconsultants and roles include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enlocus - Skate Park Design</li> <li>• UDLA - Landscape Design</li> <li>• Natural Play Environments - Playground Design</li> </ul> <p>Limited supporting detail was provided on these subconsultants in particular UDLA and Natural Play.</p> <p>The nominated subcontractors and roles include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Goin Hard – Concrete Supply</li> <li>• Black &amp; White Concrete - Concrete</li> <li>• Gramax – Fill and Plant Hire</li> <li>• Local Builder – Structure</li> <li>• Rones Plumbing – Plumbing</li> <li>• Downing Electrical – Electrical</li> <li>• Waterlink - Irrigation</li> </ul> <p>Minimal details were provided regarding the nominated subcontractors suitability. Some local content is represented within the subcontractors.</p> <p>An approximate works duration of 8 months was identified from August 2017 – March 2018.</p>	

## **4.1. Evaluation Panel Meeting Summary**

A sole Response to this RFQ was provided by Earthcare.

An evaluation meeting was held with all evaluation panel members to discuss the Earthcare submission.

In general Earthcare demonstrated an ability to undertake the project, this was reflected with a qualitative score of 64%. Previous projects highlighted by Earthcare, demonstrated their experience in the landscaping, playground and furniture supply and install works elements. However, their experience in skate park design development and construction was highly reliant upon their nominated sub-consultants and sub-contractors.

Whilst the overall project fee submitted by Earthcare exceeded the Shire budget, Earthcare identified through their submission several potential cost saving opportunities for consideration by the Shire.

### **4.1.1. Outcome**

The evaluation panel agreed that Earthcare be accepted as the preferred Respondent, and that the CEO be given delegated authority to explore and negotiate the potential cost savings identified, and the potential to remove, and conduct a new procurement process relative to the skate park requirements of the Request.

## **5. Recommendation**

The Evaluation Panel recommends that Earthcare be accepted as the Preferred Respondent to the Shire of Jerramungup for the landscaping, playground and furniture supply and install works relative to RFQ 17/02.

It is further recommended that the Chief Executive Officer be given delegated authority to explore and negotiate the potential cost savings identified, and the potential to remove, and conduct a new procurement process relative to the skate park requirements of the Request.