

Attachment 15.1

Contract 12019 Home Assist Tender

3 pages



Tender evaluation summary

Contract No: 12019

Contract Name: Home Assist Services

Tenders were invited by open process.

Tenders closed at 2pm 10 May 2012 at which time 10 tenders were received from the tenderers who are listed in table 1 (below)

Table 1—Tenders received from:

Name of Tenderer	Domestic Assistance	Home Maintenance	Home Modification
ACH Group Health Services	\$36.38	\$40.00	\$253.75
ARCS Care Alliance	\$35.30	\$45.00	\$250.00
Community Support Inc.	\$41.80	Not Provided	Not Provided
JP Support Services	\$40.00	\$55.00	\$55.00
Nationwide Facility Management Pty Ltd	Not Provided	\$60.50	\$60.50
Orana	Not Provided	\$130.00	Not Provided
RDNS	\$46.92	\$46.92	Not Provided
Resthaven Inc.	\$38.25	\$40.00	\$248.50
Stanhope Healthcare Services	\$30.56	\$30.76	\$38.65
Tailor Maids Pty Ltd	\$36.75	Not Provided	Not Provided

The evaluation panel discussed the benefit of a single contractor to fulfill the duties as per the specifications provided, and decided that only the providers that offered to do all the works would be carried through into the evaluation process.

These 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 (overleaf).

Table 2—Evaluation Panel Members

Name	Position Title
Alison Bowden	Team Leader Community Programs
Terra Lea Ranson	Manager Community Capacity

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 Aged Care and Housing Group Inc. as the preferred supplier and recommends that their Tender for the provided rates be accepted

Table 3—Evaluation Criteria, Weightings and Scores

Criteria	Weighting %	Tenderer									
		Aged Care and Housing Group Inc.		ARCS Nursing and Home Support P/L		JP Support Services		Resthaven Inc.		Stanhope Healthcare Services	
		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 %
Price **	40	4.93	19.72	4.66	18.64	5.09	20.36	4.83	19.32	7.97	31.88
Demonstrated Ability	20	8.00	16.00	6.00	12.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	16.00	6.00	12.00
Appreciation of Task	15	10.00	15.00	6.00	9.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	12.00	6.00	9.00
Personnel/Expertise	15	8.00	12.00	6.00	9.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	12.00	6.00	9.00
Value Added	5	8.00	4.00	6.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	4.00	4.00	2.00
Social Benefit	5	8.00	4.00	4.00	2.00	0	0	6.00	3.00	6.00	3.00
Totals	100		70.72		53.64		35.36		66.32		66.88

**** Please note that the pricing score has been calculated by using the formula for each category of work, and then the average score for each tenderer has been entered into the table for comparison.**