

Attachment 11.1

**Confidential – contract award: drainage works Pridham Boulevard detention
basin – tender #09046 OT**

2 pages



City of
Onkaparinga

Tender Evaluation Summary

Contract No: 09046

Contract Name: PRIDHAM BOULEVARD DETENTION BASIN

Tenders were invited by OPEN process.

Tenders closed at 2pm 18th June 2009 at which time 5 tenders were received from the tenders who are listed in table 1 (below)

Table 1 – Tenders received from:

| Name of Tenderer | Price (inc GST) |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| ADCIV Pty Ltd | \$750,017.26 |
| Ertech Pty Ltd | \$869,982.43 |
| McMahon Services Australia Pty Ltd | \$1,019,370.00 |
| P D Excavations Pty Ltd | \$780,506.43 |
| SA Civil | \$975,376.88 |

The Tenders were assessed in accordance with Clause 23 "Evaluation of Tenders" of Council's Administration Procedure "Procurement". This procedure requires that tenders are assessed by an evaluation panel using a weighted matrix to rank the tenderers in order of preference.

The evaluation panel comprised the people listed as recommended by in table 2 (below).

Table 2 – Evaluation Panel Members

| Name | Position Title |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| Mr Jude Nirmalaraja | Stormwater Engineer |
| Mr Mark Grundy | Project Officer |
| Mr John Braun | Contracts Officer |
| Mr Simon Pettman | Team Leader Projects |

The scores for Price were automatically generated by the Tender Management System using the formula adopted from Association Consulting Engineers Australia (ACEA) as follows:

$$S = 5 + 10 \times \frac{(\$M - \$T)}{\$M}$$

Where: S = Score (Max 10), \$M = Median Price, \$T = Tendered Price

Scores for the remaining criteria were allocated qualitatively by agreement of the evaluation panel using standard procedure based on scoring in the range of 0 to 10, with 5 being acceptable. A full summary of the evaluation criteria, weightings and allocated scores is provided as table 3 (next page).

The evaluation panel has selected ADCIV Pty Ltd as the preferred supplier and recommends that their Tender for \$750,017.26 be accepted

Table 3 – Evaluation Criteria, Weightings and Scores

| Criteria | Weighting % | Tenderer | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|
| | | ADCIV Pty Ltd | | Ertech Pty Ltd | | McMahon Services | | P D Excavations | | S A Civil | |
| | | Score (Max 10) | Weighted Score % | Score (Max 10) | Weighted Score % | Score (Max 10) | Weighted Score % | Score (Max 10) | Weighted Score % | Score (Max 10) | Weighted Score % |
| Value for Money | 35 | 6.379 | 22.33 | 5 | 17.5 | 3.283 | 11.49 | 6.028 | 21.10 | 3.789 | 13.26 |
| Methodology | 20 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 16 | 7 | 14 | 6 | 12 | 7 | 14 |
| Physical Resources | 20 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 16 | 7 | 14 | 8 | 16 | 8 | 16 |
| Demonstrated Ability & Previous Experience | 15 | 9 | 13.5 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 9 |
| Personnel & Expertise | 10 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| Totals | 100 | | 75.8 | | 69.5 | | 59.5 | | 64.1 | | 58.3 |