

**Attachment 10.2**

**Contract award: Sellicks Creek rehabilitation project stage 2 and 3 Tender No  
08104 OT**

**2 pages**

## Tender Evaluation Summary

**Contract No:** 08129

**Contract Name:** Sellicks Creek Rehabilitation Stages 2 & 3

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 following people listed in table 1 (below)

**Table 1**

Name	Position Title
Phil Bickley	Team Leader Design
Simon Pettman	Team Leader Projects
Mark Grundy	Project Officer
Jude Nirmalaraja	Stormwater Engineer
Kathryn Kuchel	Contracts Engineer

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

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

Where:

S = Score (Out of 10)

\$M = Median Price

\$T = Tendered Price

Scores for the remaining criteria were allocated qualitatively by the consensus of the evaluation panel using standard procedure based on scoring in the range of 0 to 10, with 4 being acceptable.

A full summary of the evaluation criteria, weightings and allocated scores is provided as table 2 (next page).

Table 2

Criteria	Weighting	ADCIV		Nevatire Civil		McMahon Services	
		Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score
<b>Price</b> <i>To assess:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the tender represents value for money; and</li> <li>Cost against budget</li> </ul>	30	5.6	<b>17.3</b>	5	<b>15</b>	.71	<b>2.1</b>
<b>Demonstrated Ability</b> <i>To assess</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the experience and capability of the tender to perform the Contract</li> </ul>	15	8	<b>12</b>	5	<b>7.5</b>	8	<b>12</b>
<b>Current Commitments / Time</b> <i>To assess:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the availability of the tenderer or where a specific program of work or construction program is required to be submitted</li> </ul>	15	6	<b>9</b>	6	<b>9</b>	6	<b>9</b>
<b>Methodology</b> <i>To assess:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the methods of work proposed by the tenderer</li> </ul>	20	7	<b>14</b>	6	<b>12</b>	5	<b>10</b>
<b>Resources</b> <i>To assess:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>whether the tender has the necessary plant or equipment and financial capability to perform the contract</li> </ul>	20	8	<b>16</b>	5	<b>10</b>	5	<b>10</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>100%</b>		<b>68.3%</b>		<b>53.5%</b>		<b>43.1%</b>