

**Attachment 10.3**

**Contract award: Noarlunga library redevelopment project – Tender No 09006  
OT**

**2 pages**

## Tender Evaluation Summary

**Contract No:** 09006

**Contract Name:** Noarlunga Library Redevelopment

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
Andrew Furman	Major Projects Officer
Gill Galloway	Team Leader, Operations
Helen Walkden	Team Leader, Collection Management
Tanya Romeo	Property Services Officer
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	Axis Constructions		BE Building Services		Cox Constructions		ISIS Projects		Sitzler		Tagara Builders	
		Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score	Score (out of 10)	Weighted score
<b>Price</b> To assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether the tender represents value for money and</li> <li>Cost compared to budget</li> </ul>	35%	8.1	<b>28.2</b>	5.3	<b>18.5</b>	5.6	<b>19.4</b>	4.5	<b>15.7</b>	4.7	<b>16.5</b>	4.4	<b>15.3</b>
<b>Appreciation of Task</b> To assess the tenderer's understanding of the project outcomes and/or scope of work	15%	1	<b>1.5</b>	2	<b>3</b>	8	<b>12</b>	6	<b>9</b>	2	<b>3</b>	2.5	<b>3.8</b>
<b>Demonstrated Ability &amp; Experience</b> To assess the experience and capability of the tenderer to perform the Contract	15%	5.5	<b>8.3</b>	3.5	<b>5.3</b>	8	<b>12</b>	6.5	<b>9.8</b>	6	<b>9</b>	7.5	<b>11.3</b>
<b>Methodology</b> To assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the work methods proposed by the tenderer and</li> <li>the program of work proposed by the tenderer</li> </ul>	15%	1	<b>1.5</b>	6	<b>9</b>	9	<b>13.5</b>	5	<b>7.5</b>	2	<b>3</b>	1	<b>1.5</b>
<b>Current Commitments/Time</b> To assess the availability of the tenderer	10%	1.8	<b>1.8</b>	5.5	<b>5.5</b>	5.5	<b>5.5</b>	6.3	<b>6.3</b>	4	<b>4</b>	2	<b>2</b>
<b>Personnel/Expertise</b> To assess whether the tenderer has the personnel or staff with suitable qualifications or experience to manage the contract	10%	2.5	<b>2.5</b>	1.5	<b>1.5</b>	2.5	<b>2.5</b>	2	<b>2.0</b>	8	<b>8</b>	1.5	<b>1.5</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	100%		<b>43.8%</b>		<b>42.8%</b>		<b>64.9%</b>		<b>50.3%</b>		<b>43.5%</b>		<b>35.4%</b>