



Queenstown Lakes District Council

Procurement Plan

2025 Parks Maintenance Contracts:

1. Open Spaces Contract C-25-005
2. Arboriculture Contract C-25 -022
3. Tracks & Trails Contract C-25-023

Document development control	
Prepared by:	Paul Rogers & Adrian Hoddinott
Position / title:	Procurement Advisor + Operations and Contracts Manager Parks
Business unit:	Community Services
Document version:	R8
Document development control	
Date of last revision:	08 November 2024
Status:	FINAL for approval

Contents

1.	BACKGROUND.....	5
1.1	What we are buying and why.....	5
2.	REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS.....	6
2.1	Our requirements.....	6
2.2	Key dates.....	9
2.3	Estimated costs.....	9
3.	MARKET ANALYSIS.....	9
4.	KEY STAKEHOLDERS.....	11
4.1	Communications.....	11
5.	TENDERING PROCESS.....	12
5.1	Type of tender.....	12
5.2	Evaluation team.....	12
5.3	Proposed timeline.....	13
6.	EVALUATION METHODOLOGY.....	14
6.1	Evaluation method.....	14
6.2	Evaluation criteria and weightings.....	15
6.3	Conflicts of interest.....	19
6.4	Due diligence.....	19
7.	CONTRACT TYPE.....	20
8.	RISK MANAGEMENT.....	20
9.	PROBITY MANAGEMENT.....	21
10.	CONTRACT DELIVERY.....	21
	APPENDIX 1: PROPOSED CONTRACT TERMS AND CONDITIONS.....	22
	APPENDIX 2: RISK REGISTER.....	23

Acronyms

The following acronyms are used in this document.

Acronym	Term
QLDC	Queenstown Lakes District Council
RFP	Request for Proposal
NZTA	New Zealand Transport Agency
TET	Tender Evaluation Team
PARKS2025	New Parks maintenance contracts

Approvals

Approval of the Plan

Project sponsor	
Process type	RFP to open market
Tender start:	20 January 2025
Name:	Full Council via GM Report
Position/title:	Community Services General Manager, Kenneth Bailey
Signature:	Date: 12th December 2024

Authority to proceed to tender

Project sponsor	
Approval to:	Release to market and evaluate responses
Tender start:	20 January 2025
Contract start:	1 July 2025
Name:	Kenneth Bailey
Position/title:	Community Services General Manager and Project Sponsor
Signature:	Date: December, 2024

Authority to Award incl. term extension

Project sponsor	
Approval to:	Award contract post evaluation incl ability to approve term extension at year 5 (for a further three years maximum)
Tender start:	20 January 2025
Contract start:	1 July 2025
Name:	Full Council via GM Report
Position/title:	Community Services General Manager and Project Sponsor
Signature:	Date: April 2025

Approval of the budget

Notes

- Approved Project Budget OPEX - values are from TechOne and allow for all services associated across 3 contracts.
- Approved Project Budget CAPEX - values are from TechOne and allow for all services anticipated to be delivered across 3 contracts.

Delegated financial authority holder			
Total cost:	\$24M (CAPEX). \$93M (OPEX)		Cost code
Financial year:	Financial year	Amount	Funding type
	2025/26	\$ 3,000,000 \$10,000,000	Capex Opex
	2026/27	\$ 3,000,000 \$10,400,000	Capex Opex
	2027/28	\$ 3,000,000 \$11,000,000	Capex Opex
	2028/29	\$ 3,000,000 \$11,400,000	Capex Opex
	2029/30	\$ 3,000,000 \$11,800,000	Capex Opex
	2030/31	\$ 3,000,000 \$12,300,000	Capex Opex
	2031/32	\$ 3,000,000 \$12,700,000	Capex Opex
	2032/33	\$ 3,000,000 \$13,100,000	Capex Opex
Name:	Full Council		
Delegations:	For approving this procurement plan and allow the General Manager, Community Services to proceed to tender.		
Signatures:		Date: December 2024	

Approval of the proposed terms and conditions of contract

Legal advisor	
Contract type:	Term. NZS 3917
Contract term:	Five years plus a three-year extension (maximum eight-year term)
Name:	Brendan Peet / Harry Beaumont
Position/title:	General Counsel
Signature:	Date: December 2024

Note: The Terms and Conditions proposed are Standard QLDC terms and Conditions as per the QLDC NZS 3917 template.

1. Background

1.1 WHAT WE ARE BUYING AND WHY

Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) currently has various contracts in place for it’s Open Spaces, High Profile Turf, and Tracks and Trails maintenance, expiring in June 2025. We are moving to a more streamlined approach to enable optimised contract delivery where business requirements, roles and responsibilities are better considered.

The new contracts will be:

- Open Spaces;
- Arboriculture; and
- Tracks and Trails.

From Current Contract	Current contracts scope	To New Contract (5+3yr Term)	New Contracts
Open Spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horticulture • Safety and Hygiene • Mowing • Tree management • Response • Cemeteries and Internments 	Open Spaces	‘Open Spaces’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Horticulture • Safety and Hygiene • Mowing • Cemeteries and Internments • Playgrounds • Sports field management • Event delivery (international & domestic) • Delivery of renewals programs
High Profile Turf	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sports field Management, • High value amenity turf mowing, • Event delivery (international and domestic) 	<i>Rationalized and aggregated into the Open Spaces Agreement above</i>	<i>Absorbed into Open spaces</i>
-	-	New, Arboriculture - removed from Open spaces	‘Arboriculture and Vegetation’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree management services (street, reserve, trails, rural) • Tree planting • Pest plant programs
Tracks and Trails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trail maintenance • Pest plant programs 	Tracks and Trails	‘Tracks & Trails’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tracks and Trails maintenance • Delivery of minor civil works and related renewals programs

Each Contract contains its unique asset profile and maintenance approach.

Following Parks staff consultation, planning work has commenced on the new contract(s) Scope of Work (SOW), utilising the best elements from the current SOW and further enhancing and targeting business requirements.

The QLDC is seeking suppliers for these new contracts. The QLDC will consider one supplier across multiple contracts where they demonstrate full capability and a value for money solution, however a model of “delivery resilience” is that three separate contractors (one per contract) may be preferred.

Of note are the unique requirements of Tracks and Trails with its civil works scope, Arboriculture, Cemeteries interments, international sport provision and delivery of annual renewals/capital programs

2. Requirements and costs

2.1 OUR REQUIREMENTS

General Requirements

The overarching business objective is to secure a competent and resilient supply chain able to deliver all the three contract business requirements in full, on time, to specification and demonstrate good value for money.

Through the evaluation process, QLDC will select the best supplier for each specialised service. A single supplier across multiple contracts will be considered where a respondent can demonstrate sufficient capacity and capability in delivering all three services. Conversely, QLDC may end up with individual suppliers for each service. Risks associated with a single supplier across all three contracts would be considered.

Running an open-market Request for Proposals, with evaluation of both price and non-price attributes of respondents, will facilitate value for money in delivery of the Contract Works.

An alignment of contracts, delivery methodologies and roles and responsibilities, is a focus between Parks and Property and Infrastructure.

Through the PARKS2025; Proposed Contract model Scoping document, the key drivers were identified as:

- A need to meet our Bio-diversity and climate commitments, and to ensure we have the specific contract expertise to meet our needs
- Rationalize our roles and responsibilities to ensure the right people are doing the right job
- Delivering value for money. Our contractors understand the scope and the “ask” from day one with an emphasis on delivering capital work programs through the allocation provisional sums (based on good operational maintenance delivery services)
- Greater capacity and capability to deliver capital/renewal programs

The inclusion of provisional sums within the contracts that will include LTP renewals lines (CAPEX) in parallel with scheduled work (OPEX) will grow capacity within Parks (and Community services) to deliver larger Capital programs in an increasingly competitive market (both in availability of the contractors to do the work and affordability reached through more competition).

That is identified as being up to \$24,000,000 over the term of the contract. By ensuring this is accounted for in the overarching procurement plan/s, additional and smaller procurement plans will not be necessary from contract officers to undertake annually therefore reducing contract administration.

The form of Contract is the Council NZS3917. A mix of Lump Sum, Measure and Value and Target Cost delivery is preferred and is a shared model across not only Parks but also Property and Infrastructure.

Contract Initiatives

The contract will have a clearly specified output; in the simplest sense the output is that the work is undertaken in accordance with the Contract (including the Specifications).

For a NZS3917 contract (lump sum and measure & value), the submitted Contract Price for delivering the output includes:

- (1) The Respondent's forecast of the cost incurred to them in delivering what is required
- (2) The Respondent's forecast of the cost incurred to them for the general overall running of the Contract Works (On-site Overheads)
- (3) The Respondent's forecast of the cost incurred to them for the general overall running of the business and profit (Off-site Overheads and Profit)
- (4) An amount to account for the risk associated with getting these forecasts correct

Lessons learned from past infrastructure maintenance contracts is that we do not want to encourage Respondents to under-forecast (1) to (4) as this is not a sustainable business model and may make it harder to achieve the outputs as the Contractor will be looking to recover their losses and offers the potential to not meet defined business requirements. Having clearly defined requirements set out in the Contract (including the Specifications) in the environment of a competitive process encourages Respondents to put effort into to getting (1) to (3) right and therefore reducing (4).

Using the PQM evaluation model (NZTA) quantifies the financial value of "quality" through the evaluation of non-price attributes. Ultimately this means that Council is willing to pay a premium i.e. the Supplier Quality Premium (SQP) for a more suitable contractor.

That SQM is identified as within 10% of the total value of the contract anticipated.

Respondents are therefore encouraged to invest in aspects of capability and proposed method of delivery that are operationally and strategically important to us. It also means that we are willing to potentially pay a premium for this.

This means that the potential for financial benefit derived from the reduction in (4) above is somewhat reduced by the increase to (1) to (3) from the higher quality of the Proposals; the quality being the key attributes of the Proposals i.e. Relevant Experience, Track Record, Key Skills, Resources and Methodology.

Council is cognizant of the Government Rules of Source and align the following Rules with this procurement exercise by planning ahead for the best procurement outcomes:

- We are planning this sourcing event in this procurement plan in accordance with (Govt Rules of Sourcing Rule References) Rule 23

- A contract management plan will be started in the sourcing phase and be reviewed annually (Rule 72.4)

Identify and plan to mitigate risk through your procurement:

- Risks will be identified in accordance with Rule 22 and mitigated as set out in this plan and the Procurement Risk Assessment

Engage the open competitive market:

- We will engage the open market

Ensure our market documents contain information to allow suppliers to make best value offerings:

- There are key aspects of how the contract outputs will be delivered that will be determined by the Contractor; the non-price attributes will align with these key aspects as described in the plan
- Include criteria to evaluate both price and non- price factors including: quality; fit for purpose of the proposal and relevant experience
- Activities where there is an observable risk or specific need
- Ability to deliver renewals programs and priority areas will have greater weight applied to the evaluation. These include:
 - International and Domestic Sport delivery
 - Tree / vegetation maintenance and delivery
 - Civil works
 - Cemeteries and interments
 - Ability to deliver capital/renewals programs

Include sustainable outcomes as outputs of the procurement activity (also directly aligned to QLDC Climate and Biodiversity plan 2022-2025 inc recent iterations) :

- Sourcing
 - Organisational capability in terms of the following sustainable outcomes will be evaluated. Evaluation questions request evidence of dedicated plans for optimising and better managing these outcomes:
 - Energy Management
 - Greenhouse Gas Emission Management
 - Solid Waste Management
 - Water Management
 - Social benefits
 - Subcontractors
 - Contract Works specific proposals for the following sustainable outcomes for the above will be evaluated
- Contract Management
 - The organization's business requirement plans will be reviewed annually
 - Any suitable Contract Works specific proposals will be incorporated into the Contractor's Plan

Consider whole of life costs of the service, goods or works you are procuring:

- The whole life cost of the maintenance activity will be considered in the spend analysis by using the current contract cost information.

2.2 KEY DATES

We require the contract to commence by 1 July 2025.

We estimate that the sourcing of the supplier and contract negotiations will take 4-6 months.

This means that the RFP must be initiated by 22 January 2025.

That requires that we have all RFP documentation complete by mid-December 2024.

2.3 ESTIMATED COSTS

The table below provides details for the available budget to deliver the Parks Maintenance Services.

Financial year:	Financial year	Amount	Funding type
	2025/26	\$ 3,000,000 \$10,000,000	Capex Opex
	2026/27	\$ 3,000,000 \$10,400,000	Capex Opex
	2027/28	\$ 3,000,000 \$11,000,000	Capex Opex
	2028/29	\$ 3,000,000 \$11,400,000	Capex Opex
	2029/30	\$ 3,000,000 \$11,800,000	Capex Opex
	2030/31	\$ 3,000,000 \$12,300,000	Capex Opex
	2031/32	\$ 3,000,000 \$12,700,000	Capex Opex
	2032/33	\$ 3,000,000 \$13,100,000	Capex Opex

The total budget for the full 8 years is

OPEX TCO	\$93,000,000
CAPEX TCO	\$24,000,000

3. Market analysis

The national supply market for Parks Services is strong in the urban areas but less so in the regional areas.

Our current incumbent suppliers are:

Open Spaces	Recreational Services
High Profile Turf	Delta
Tracks and Trails	Asplundh

The current service supply is variable, particularly in the Parks space. Historically, tier one contractors have had a significant footprint in maintenance contracts nationally however as Council needs have developed, a more mature and involved approach has been required to meet community expectations specific to biodiversity and environmental considerations. With this has come a greater need for supplier investment in people and resources specific to these new requirements.

With an increased pressure to deliver core functions, many of the tier one contractors have been slow to adapt to these new demands with under investment in training and systems. The new QLDC Parks Contracts will be very clear in encouraging a step change in service delivery to better align Councils and the Community needs with the contractor's delivery programme.

The national market supply chain comprises:

	Open Spaces	Arboriculture	Tracks & Trails
National Suppliers	Recreational Services	Recreational Services	Asplundh
	Delta	Delta	Downers
	City Care	Asplundh	Fulton Hogan
	Ventia		Recreational Services
	Asplundh		
	Downers		
Central Otago Suppliers			Wilsons
			M3
			Wanaka Civil
			Wilsons

Our preference is to support and encourage the local supplier markets but also recognizing out of district, best for maintenance contract opportunities as well.

Council is open to responses that engage local contractors and suppliers with sound historical performance as part of the scope and schedule identified in the RFP. This does highlight a need for the lead / head tenderer to adequately communicate how they will manage subcontractors and suppliers. An expansion of control unmanaged leads Council to be distanced from the delivery of work.

Traditionally, Parks maintenance contractors have opted to subcontract some technical/specific activities which are undertaken more infrequently throughout the program or on a reactive basis. The main contractor then provides engineering management oversight of the sub-contractors.

This delivery model is favored by main contractors as sub-contractors possess specialist skills and equipment, enable the main contractor to adapt resourcing to suit specific project needs, and can provide greater cost certainty. However, self-performing teams are generally lower in cost as they avoid the compounding cost of margin on margin.

Tenderers will be asked to identify specifically who their key sub-contractors are and their specific roles for example: fencers, plumbers, electricians, engineering firms, main suppliers.

Specific consideration is required to ensure that the engagement of subcontractors does not lead to escalation in rates unnecessarily (management fees) for no further delivery of work.

Council and the contractor need to be better aligned for day-to-day workflow and key result areas so that Council and the Community can calibrate delivery, service levels and week x week costs. Improved use of technology will be important as well as a general lift in communications.

4. Key stakeholders

The key internal and external stakeholders are set out below.

Role	Name	Stakeholders
Responsible	The person or people responsible for undertaking the procurement.	Paul Rogers & Adrian Hoddinot
Accountable	The person or people who have authority to make decisions and are accountable for the outcomes.	Adrian Hoddinott Dave Winterburn
Supportive	The person or people who do the real work.	Paul Rogers Adrian Hoddinott Giulio Chapman-Olla Stu Cameron-Lee David Spencer
Consulted	The person or people who need to be consulted to review documentation, provide feedback, add value or get “buy-in”	Chloe Henry Martin Simon Mason Laura Gledhill Stefan Amston Ben Greenwood Tarsy Koentges Stef White Clare Tomkins
Informed	The person, people or group, groups that need to be kept informed of key actions and results but are not involved in decision-making or delivery.	Governance group Ken Bailey Paddy Crib Bill Nicol

4.1 COMMUNICATIONS

The QLDC will communicate with internal stakeholders through team briefings on procurement progress, final outcomes and project support needs.

5. Tendering process

5.1 TYPE OF TENDER

The recommended approach to the market is a one-step open process through the issue of 3 separate RFPs.

A separation of the three RFP's acknowledges the unique activities that Council has identified as important. By separating, we ensure that there are less barriers for new contractors to enter the market thus supporting a more competitive environment which ensures a delivery of value.

This is based on market analysis and an acknowledgement that potential respondents for specific contracts would not apply should it be related to areas outside of a usual scope of works. This would lead to less submissions and therefore a less competitive process.

The one-step open market RFP will target the most knowledgeable, and experienced green space maintenance providers with previous background and familiarity with our needs in an open competitive forum.

It may be the case that a single supplier is preferred for multiple contracts following evaluations at which point Council can negotiate more favorable terms where quality is not compromised or a diminished level of service and at the same time realize savings through reduced overheads.

This approach to market fits with the Councils procurement policies, the Government Procurement Rules and the New Zealand Government's procurement principles.

5.2 EVALUATION TEAM

A cross-functional team will be involved in the evaluation of proposals and recommending the preferred supplier.

TET members Open Spaces

Role	Name	Organisation
Chair / Facilitator of the Evaluation Panel	Paul Rogers	Spire Consulting
Probity Advisor	Shaun McHale	McHale Group
Voting Member	Operations and Contracts Manager	QLDC
Voting Member	Delivery Manager	QLDC
Voting Member	Contracts Officer	QLDC
Voting Member	Subject Matter Expert	External Advisor

TET members Arboriculture

Role	Name	Organisation
Chair / Facilitator of the Evaluation Panel	Paul Rogers	Spire Consulting
Probity Advisor	Shaun Mchale	McHale Group
Voting Member	Operations and Contracts Manager	QLDC
Voting Member	Contracts Officer	QLDC
Voting Member	Subject Matter Expert	External Advisor

TET members Tracks and Trails

Role	Name	Organisation
Chair / Facilitator of the Evaluation Panel	Paul Rogers	Spire Consulting
Probity Advisor	Shaun McHale	McHale Group
Voting Member	Operations and Contracts Manager	QLDC
Voting Member	Contract Officer	QLDC
Voting Member	Subject Matter Expert	External Advisor

5.3 PROPOSED TIMELINE

The proposed timeline for the procurement is as follows. Please note that this example is based on a one-step open tender.

Action	Indicative date
Pre-procurement	
Procurement plan approved	12 December 2024
Advance notice published on GETS (NOI)	13 December 2024
RFP documents approved	16 December 2024
Action	Indicative date
RFP	
Panel confidentiality & conflict of interest declarations signed	16 December 2024
RFP advertised on GETS	20 January 2025
Last date for respondent questions	10 March 2024
RFP closing date	Midday 17 March 2025
RFP Administrative Compliance review	18-19 March 2024
Evaluation	
Evaluation panel meets	28 March 2024
Post evaluation clarifications	By 15 th April 2024
Procurement recommendation to Council meeting 17 th April	April 2024
Contract award	By 1 May 2025
Post-Evaluation	
Contract signing	June 2024
Contract start date	1 July 2025

6. Evaluation methodology

6.1 EVALUATION METHOD

- The evaluation model to be used is Price Quality Method (PQM), utilising New Zealand Transport Agency procedures.
- PQM is a formula-based evaluation. It distinguishes the difference in quality between tenderers by translating the non-price attribute grades to a Supplier Quality Premium (SQP). The SQP is defined as 'the amount that the tendering authority is prepared to pay to secure a higher-quality tender relative to the lowest quality tender.'
- PQM allows the buyer to test the SQP to what is an acceptable amount to pay for quality while providing an open and transparent methodology for tenderers to use.
- Price will be a weighted criterion.
- A two-envelope process will be used, and respondents pricing will only be opened once the non-price criterion scoring is completed
- Once initial scoring has been undertaken, Respondents will be shortlisted for interactive interview.
- Participants will be provided with additional questions to answer at the interactive meetings.

- TET members will be provided with an opportunity to adjust their non price scores once the interactives have been completed.

6.2 EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTINGS

This plan identifies risks in procurement that could generally be addressed by including a number of fact-based eliminator/pre-condition questions along with a number of non-priced attributes to be scored. These are.

Preconditions

1.	The amount of public liability insurance required shall be \$20,000,000. The amount of the professional indemnity insurance shall be \$2,000,000.	All
2.	Supplier must accept all Councils RFP and Agreement Terms and Conditions.	All
3.	Classification 1 Health and Safety (H&S) work requires rigour on H&S i.e. a minimum threshold of acceptable capability in H&S.	All
4.	Financial requirements of the contract requires rigour on the financial viability i.e. a minimum threshold of acceptable financial viability.	All
5.	Confirm that you have visited all sites and location and that you have read all the documents relating to the RFP	All
6.	The Respondent has SiteWise Green accreditation or a health and safety pre-qualification of equal or higher standard	All
7.	ISO 14001 and Toitu	All
8.	The Respondent currently delivers Cemeteries interments or has done so within the last two years [Note the requirements of Relevant Experience attribute]	Open Spaces
9.	The Respondent currently delivers a District wide arboriculture maintenance program or has done so within the last two years [Note the requirements of Relevant Experience attribute]	Arboriculture
10.	The Respondent currently delivers to an international and domestic sports event program or has done so within the last two years [Note the requirements of Relevant Experience attribute]	Open Spaces
11.	The Respondent currently delivers a Civil works program (renewals & replacements) of similar size and scale as part of a wider Parks maintenance programme [Note the requirements of Relevant Experience attribute]	Tracks and Trails

Having met all the preconditions qualifying bids will be evaluated on their merits using the following evaluation criteria and weightings.

Criteria weightings summary- Evaluation Table

Evaluation criteria	Weighting %	Rationale
Relevant Experience	PASS/FAIL	This attribute requires the Respondents to comprehensively demonstrate their relevant

Evaluation criteria	Weighting %	Rationale
		experience in order to reduce the risk of inexperienced contractors being appointed to the contract without unduly precluding new players.
Track Record	PASS/FAIL	This attribute requires the Respondents to comprehensively demonstrate their track record in order to reduce the risk of inexperienced contractors being appointed to the contract without unduly precluding new players.
Broader Outcomes / Sustainability	PASS/FAIL	<p>Do you create quality employment opportunities for New Zealanders*, particularly displaced workers and traditionally disadvantaged groups (including as Maori, Pasifika, disabled and women). *New Zealanders means citizens or residents of New Zealand who are living and entitled to work in New Zealand.</p> <p>Do you follow good employment practices?</p> <p>Do you undertake initiatives to contribute to a low emissions economy and promote greater environmental responsibility?</p> <p>Outline the actions currently being taken to reduce your footprint including what materials can be sourced locally to avoid transportation to our district.</p> <p>List any prosecutions for environmental (including Resource Consent) infringements or prosecutions.</p> <p>List any Environmental/Sustainability Awards received in the last 2 years.</p> <p>Detail your effect on the local supplier market and communicate how you will engage local suppliers.</p> <p>Detail how you are positively contributing to community and outline specific community partnerships in each ward.</p>
Relevant Skills	20.00%	This attribute requires the Respondents to comprehensively demonstrate the key personnel the Respondent proposes to use to deliver the Contract in terms of each individual's technical skills, management skills, experience and track record relevant to the Contract Works, in order to reduce the risk of inexperienced

Evaluation criteria	Weighting %	Rationale
		contractors being appointed to the contract without unduly precluding new players.
Methodology	30.00%	There are some key elements of how the Contract Works that will be determined by the Contractor. In order to help ensure successful delivery of the Contract Works, this attribute allows evaluation of the Respondents' proposals for how they will deliver these aspects of the Contract Works.
H. Price	50.00%	In order to encourage sustainable tendered Contract Prices whilst still encouraging value-for-money via competitive tension, the weighting takes a 50% of the total weighting.
Total Weighting	100%	

The panel will use the following rating scale to evaluate suppliers' bids against the criteria:

- Scoring in increments of 5 applies
- A score of less than 40 for one attribute may exclude the respondent (at the discretion of the TET) from appointment.

Description	Definition	Rating
Excellent	Exceeds the requirement. Exceptional demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with strong supporting evidence.	90-100
Good	Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.	70-80
Acceptable	Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with supporting evidence.	50-60
Minor reservations	Barely adequate. Minor reservations of the supplier's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods /services, with little or no supporting evidence.	30-40

Description	Definition	Rating
Serious reservations	Satisfies the requirement with major reservations. Considerable reservations of the supplier's relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods /services, with little or no supporting evidence.	10-20
Unacceptable	Does not meet the requirement. Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the supplier has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence.	0

The panel will use the anchored scoring sheet to evaluate suppliers' bids against the criteria (and will be articulated in the RFP Response Form).

TET:

- The first evaluation team meeting will be scheduled for one week following the RFP close date.
- The Tender Secretary or their nominee will contact and undertake checks with the relevant referees.
- All reference checks shall be recorded, and information provided to the TET. If, despite negative information the decision is to proceed with the Respondent then the negative information will be noted, and discussion included in the proposal recommendation report to the Council for award of contract.
- All TET members will attend the meeting. Notes from discussions will be taken by the Administrator for feedback following the proposal process.
- The meeting will be held in person, if possible, but may be via videoconference.
- At the Evaluation Team Meeting any tags and assumptions will be reviewed by the TET. The team will also discuss if they have any queries regarding the content of proposals submitted. The Proposal Administrator shall, if requested by the PET, then seek clarification or removal of any tags and assumptions and confirmation of this in writing from the respective respondent.
- The evaluation shall consist of scoring each of the non-price attributes against criteria outlined in in the Evaluation Table. Each attribute shall be scored on a scale of 0 to 100.
- A summary of the TET's collective views on the key reasons for the Respondents' score for each of the attributes will be recorded.
- The mark for the evaluation of each proposal attribute will be reached by an agreed average or moderation of individual scores.

Presentations (at Councils discretion)

- The TET is permitted to seek clarifications from participants as part of the evaluation process, if necessary, to obtain clarification of the proposal and confirm attribute scores.
- One set of clarification questions, covering all services to which their proposal relates, will be sent per participant.
- To assist the TET in their marking and to seek clarifications on the proposals, Respondents are required to give a presentation of their submission. The Respondent shall also introduce key contract personnel. One presentation will be made per Respondent covering all relevant services.
- The maximum presentation time is 1.5 hours per Respondent including questions asked by the TET.
- It is proposed that presentations will take place in person where possible but may be held via video conference.
- Respondents will be given 5 days' notice of their allocated time.
- The non-price scores are to be finalised by the TET following the presentations, a review of the clarification responses, and any due diligence undertaken on suppliers; including additional checks for financial stability or health and safety management.

6.3 CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Respondents will be required to declare any actual or perceived conflicts of interest and their proposed management of the conflict. The probity officer for the procurement (to be advised) will be responsible for reviewing the conflicts in the first instance. If a conflict is deemed to be unacceptable this will constitute a 'fail', however the ability to discuss the conflict with the respondent will be retained.

6.4 DUE DILIGENCE

The following verification matrix will be used as part of the evaluation and due diligence process. The table shows how elements of the criteria will be verified by the panel.

Verification table

Evaluation and due diligence options	Criteria		
	Fit for purpose	Ability to deliver	Value for money
Written offer/Proposal documents	✓	✓	✓
Buyer clarifications of offer	✓	✓	✓
Reference checks	✓	✓	✓
Presentations	✓	✓	✓
Accepts proposed contract conditions	✓		

7. Contract type

The short-listed respondents will be offered the Councils NZS 3917 contract.

The proposed contract term is from July 2025 until end 2033, however this is dependent on the first term (5 years) performance, where an additional 3 years is available for performance.

An 8-year term allows for a return on the investment period required for the contract establishment and aligns with future long term planning processes.

8. Risk management

Key procurement risks and their mitigation actions are noted in the following table. Overall, this procurement is deemed to be medium value with medium risk. Key risks have been assessed against the risk framework detailed at *Appendix 2*. They have been assessed on the basis of likelihood (L) and consequence (C).

A key project risk is an increase in costs due to environmental court proceedings. Suppliers will be asked to give details on their proposed approach for monitoring this risk through the project delivery.

Risk to procurement process	Likelihood	Impact	Rating
Understatement / Overstatement of need	Possible	Moderate	High
Misinterpretation of need	Possible	Moderate	High
Accuracy of Spend Data	Likely	Moderate	High
Accuracy of Asset Data	Likely	Moderate	High
Timeframe is not sufficient	Likely	Major	Very High
Likelihood of Probity Issues	Very Unlikely	Moderate	Medium
Specification Undefined	Possible	Major	High
Specification Bias	Very Unlikely	Minor	Low

Limited Capable Suppliers in Market	Very Unlikely	Minor	Low
Potential for Challenge	Unlikely	Moderate	Medium

9. Probity management

It is essential that the agency demonstrates ethics and integrity in its procurements. This means:

- Acting fairly, impartially, and with integrity
- Being accountable and transparent
- Being trustworthy and acting lawfully
- Managing conflicts of interest
- Protecting the supplier's commercially sensitive and confidential information.

Probity in this procurement will be managed by:

- Ensuring compliance with the Councils code of conduct
- Ensuring that financial authority for the procurement is approved before proceeding to tender
- Ensuring everyone involved in the process signs a confidentiality agreement and declares any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest
- Identifying and effectively managing all conflicts of interest
- Ensuring that all bids are opened at the same time and witnessed
- Treating all suppliers equally and fairly
- Providing each supplier with a comprehensive debrief at the end of the tender process.

10. Contract delivery

The responsibility for managing delivery under the contract and supplier relationship management will pass to Adrian Hoddinott on the signing of the contract(s). This person will develop a contract and relationship management plan in consultation with the successful supplier.

Appendix 1: Proposed contract terms and conditions

The proposed form of Contract is Council's NZS 3917 Term Services Maintenance Contract

Appendix 2: Risk register

Diagram: Risk analysis framework

	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Extreme
Almost Certain	Medium	High	High	Very High	Very High
Likely	Medium	Medium	High	Very High	Very High
Possible	Low	Medium	High	High	Very High
Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	High	High
Very Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High