





**TABLE 1 – RECOMMENDED CONTRACTORS**

<b>Category 1 - Urban Planning and Policy Development</b>	<b>Category 2 - Architecture, Landscape and Urban Design</b>
<b>Tenderer 3: Better Places Consultants</b>	Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia
<b>Tenderer 10: Ethos Urban</b>	Tenderer 11: GHD
<b>Tenderer 13: Hansen Partnership</b>	Tenderer 13: Hansen Partnership
<b>Tenderer 17: Judith Stubbs &amp; Associates</b>	Tenderer 27: Paul Morgan
	Tenderer 30: Pollen Studio
<b>Category 3 - Heritage</b>	<b>Category 4 - Economic and Social Research and Analysis</b>
<b>Tenderer 6: Context</b>	Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia
<b>Tenderer 11: GHD</b>	Tenderer 17: Judith Stubbs & Associates
	Tenderer 31: SGS Economics and Planning
	Tenderer 34: Urban Enterprise
<b>Category 5 - Environmentally Sustainable Development</b>	<b>Category 6 - Transport Strategy, Planning and Policy Development</b>
<b>Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia</b>	Tenderer 1: Advisian
<b>Tenderer 7: Design Flow</b>	Tenderer 11: GHD
<b>Tenderer 8: E2Designlab</b>	Tenderer 15: Institute for Sensible Transport
<b>Tenderer 11: GHD</b>	Tenderer 20: Martyn Group
<b>Tenderer 33: Urban Digestor</b>	Tenderer 23: Mott MacDonald Australia
	Tenderer 28: Phillip Boyle & Associates



## ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018

### 3. RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 3.1 Awards Contract No 2095 - Panel for Strategic Planning and Advisory Services to Advisian, Ethos Urban, GHD, Hansen Partnership, Institute for Sensible Transport, Judith Stubbs & Associates, AECOM Australia, Martyn Group, Mott MacDonald Australia, Paul Morgan, Phillip Boyle & Associates, Better Places Consultants, Pollen Studio, SGS Economics and Planning, Urban Digestor, Urban Enterprise, Context, Design Flow, and E2Designlab for an initial period of three (3) years commencing on April 15 2018 with an option to extend by a further two (2) years.
- 3.2 Notes that the contract sum is based on a schedule of rates and has a projected value of \$1,000,000 exclusive of GST over the five-year period.
- 3.3 Affixes the Common Seal of the Port Phillip City Council to Contract No. 2095 between Council and Advisian, Ethos Urban, GHD, Hansen Partnership, Institute for Sensible Transport, Judith Stubbs & Associates, AECOM Australia, Martyn Group, Mott MacDonald Australia, Paul Morgan, Phillip Boyle & Associates, Better Places Consultants, Pollen Studio, SGS Economics and Planning, Urban Digestor, Urban Enterprise, Context, Design Flow, and E2Designlab.

### 4. KEY POINTS/ISSUES

- 4.1 A panel of 19 contractors across the six categories provides Council with a varied choice of contractors which will provide specialist services based on an agreed schedule of rates. The panel contractors will be expected to provide quotations for each statement of works provided to ensure best value is being obtained. There will be no guarantee of allocated work for any contractor.
- 4.2 The tender was advertised in The Age on 9 September 2017 and closed on 3 October 2017.
- 4.3 The specification requested strategic planning and advisory services in the following categories:

#### **Category 1: Urban Planning and Policy Development**

Requirements will include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- urban strategy and policy development
- preparation/review of planning scheme amendment documentation, and
- expert witness representation at independent panel, advisory committee or Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) hearings.

#### **Category 2: Architecture, Landscape and Urban Design**

Requirements will include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- including design work,
- preparation of urban design frameworks or reports,
- strategic policy development, and



## ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018

- expert witness representation at independent panel, advisory committee or Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) hearings.

### **Category 3: Heritage**

Requirements will include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- undertaking of heritage reviews,
- strategic policy development,
- heritage advice, and
- expert witness representation at independent panel, advisory committee or Victorian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (VCAT) hearings.

### **Category 4: Economic and Social Research and Analysis**

Requirements will include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- impact assessments,
- strategic market advice,
- infrastructure funding / finance and feasibility investigations
- Strategic analysis of employment and demand, factors affecting employment land and floor space provision, broader well-being, and drivers of change in the composition and performance of the urban economy.

### **Category 5: Environmentally Sustainable Development**

Requirements will include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- research, analysis and advice on policy development and implementation;
- consulting for and review of capital works projects; and
- provision of referral support for assessing Sustainable Design Assessments and Sustainable Management Plans as part of the planning application process.

### **Category 6: Transport Strategy, Planning and Policy Development**

Requirements will include, but shall not be limited to the following:

- research, analysis and advice;
- strategy and policy development and implementation, and
- integrated land use and transport planning.

4.4 The composition of the Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) is shown in Table 2 below.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>Craig McLean</b>	Coordinator City Design (TEP Chairperson)
<b>Kate Cornwall</b>	Senior Contracts Advisor
<b>Damian Dewar</b>	Manager Place and Design
<b>Brett Walters</b>	Manager Sustainability and Transport
<b>Andrew Scarlett</b>	Senior Urban Economist

- 4.5 All TEP members signed the standard form indicating they had no conflict of interest to declare and that they would keep the tender information confidential. Prior to the tender being advertised, evaluation criteria were established and an evaluation plan was developed to summarise the evaluation approach for reviewing responses to the tender. The evaluation criteria and weightings are detailed in Table 3 below.

<b>TABLE 3 – TENDER EVALUATION CRITERIA</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Percentage Weighting</b>
<b>Price</b>	40
<b>Capacity to meet the requirements of the technical specification</b>	15
<b>Relevant experience and track record</b>	30
<b>Corporate Social Responsibility</b>	5
<b>Occupational Health and Safety</b>	10

- 4.6 Thirty-seven (37) organisations responded to the tender. Three tenders were deemed non-conforming however the non-conformances were minor and these submissions were included in the evaluation. One tenderer withdrew due to a possible conflict of interest. Tenderers nominated in their submissions the categories they were bidding for.
- 4.7 For the financial evaluation, Tenderers were asked to provide a daily rate for the nominated resources they put forward for each category. Two resources from each category were chosen for the financial evaluation, which was modelled on 10 hours for each resource type (20 hours each per category). The two resource types chosen were those the TEP considered to be most likely to be required within the category. Details are shown in Column 1 of Tables 4 to 9 below (1. Projected Total excl. GST). The pre- and post-interview weighted scores inclusive of price and qualitative evaluation criteria are shown in Column 2 and 3 of Tables 4 to 9 below (2. TEP Weighted Scoring Initial out of 1000, and 3. TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview out of 1000)
- 4.8 The TEP interviewed a short list comprising of the top 21 scored tenderers across the six categories. Several tenderers were interviewed for more than one category. Prior to the evaluation commencing the TEP agreed there would be no more than six tenderers in any category. This was to reduce the likelihood that successful tenderers would not be offered work during the contract period.
- 4.9 The interviews focused on the Tenderer's capability and experience applicable to servicing this contract over the term. An emphasis was also placed on the tenderer's professional and consultancy services specific to Council's strategic projects, key issues and challenges.
- 4.10 Some adjustments were made to the qualitative scores of several of the tender submissions, in all categories after the interviews. After post-interview evaluations incorporating the pricing and the qualitative assessment, the scoring (out of 1000) is shown in Column 3 of Tables 4 to 9 below (3. TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview out of 1000)



ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL  
4 APRIL 2018

**TABLE 4 - TENDERS RECEIVED**  
**Category 1 - Urban Planning and Policy Development**

<b>Tenderer's Name</b>	<b>1. Projected Total (\$ excl. GST)</b>	<b>2.TEP Weighted Scoring Initial (out of 1000)</b>	<b>3.TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview (out of 1000)</b>
<b>Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia</b>	33,200.00	688.55	673.55
<b>Tenderer 3: Better Places Consultants</b>	26,000.00	689.62	689.62
<b>Tenderer 4</b>	37,130.00	438.30	-
<b>Tenderer 5</b>	66,000.00	240.00	-
<b>Tenderer 8: E2Designlab</b>	33,600.00	460.71	-
<b>Tenderer 10: Ethos Urban</b>	37,300.00	707.33	707.33
<b>Tenderer 11: GHD</b>	40,480.00	645.65	-
<b>Tenderer 12</b>	56,320.00	590.63	-
<b>Tenderer 13: Hansen Partnership</b>	37,840.00	674.30	674.30
<b>Tenderer 14</b>	70,400.00	532.50	-
<b>Tenderer 16</b>	19,800.00	650.00	-
<b>Tenderer 17: Judith Stubbs &amp; Assoc.</b>	21,000.00	722.14	767.14
<b>Tenderer 21</b>	28,586.20	577.06	-
<b>Tenderer 26</b>	32,560.00	582.43	-
<b>Tenderer 28: Phillip Boyle &amp; Assoc.</b>	30,800.00	487.14	-
<b>Tenderer 29</b>	34,200.00	626.58	-
<b>Tenderer 31: SGS Economics and Planning</b>	66,000.00	495.00	-
<b>Tenderer 33: Urban Digestor</b>	28,800.00	560.00	-
<b>Tenderer 34: Urban Enterprise</b>	43,200.00	603.33	-
<b>Tenderer 37</b>	47,300.00	482.68	-



ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL  
4 APRIL 2018

**TABLE 5 - TENDERS RECEIVED**  
Category 2 - Architecture, Landscape and Urban Design

Tenderer's Name	1. Projected Total (\$ excl. GST)	2.TEP Weighted Scoring Initial (out of 1000)	3.TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview (out of 1000)
Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia	33,200.00	686.02	686.02
Tenderer 3: Better Places Consultants	26,000.00	448.08	-
Tenderer 4	37,130.00	409.22	-
Tenderer 5	66,000.00	223.64	-
Tenderer 8: E2Designlab	33,600.00	428.57	-
Tenderer 10: Ethos Urban	37,300.00	588.38	-
Tenderer 11: GHD	40,480.00	618.97	603.97
Tenderer 13: Hansen Partnership	37,840.00	645.76	645.76
Tenderer 22	41,800.00	288.64	-
Tenderer 26	32,560.00	467.56	-
Tenderer 27: Paul Morgan	17,100.00	865.00	880.00
Tenderer 30: Pollen Studio	27,200.00	601.47	646.47

**TABLE 6 - TENDERS RECEIVED**  
Category 3 - Heritage

Tenderer's Name	1. Projected Total (\$ excl. GST)	2.TEP Weighted Scoring Initial (out of 1000)	3.TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview (out of 1000)
Tenderer 4	37,130.00	580.08	-
Tenderer 6: Context	44,000.00	779.64	779.64
Tenderer 11: GHD	32,960	805.00	805.00
Tenderer 31:	66,000.00	469.76	-





ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL  
4 APRIL 2018

**TABLE 7 - TENDERS RECEIVED**  
**Category 4 - Economic and Social Research and Analysis**

<b>Tenderer's Name</b>	<b>1. Projected Total (\$ excl. GST)</b>	<b>2.TEP Weighted Scoring Initial (out of 1000)</b>	<b>3.TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview (out of 1000)</b>
<b>Tenderer 1: Advisian</b>	56,320.00	479.15	-
<b>Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia</b>	33,200.00	673.01	673.01
<b>Tenderer 4</b>	37,130.00	451.23	-
<b>Tenderer 5</b>	66,000.00	562.27	-
<b>Tenderer 9</b>	37,150.00	631.11	-
<b>Tenderer 11: GHD</b>	40,480.00	552.51	-
<b>Tenderer 14</b>	70,400.00	539.32	539.32
<b>Tenderer 17: Judith Stubbs &amp; Assoc.</b>	21,000.00	775.00	775.00
<b>Tenderer 19</b>	28,000.00	600.00	-
<b>Tenderer 24</b>	42,000.00	620.00	-
<b>Tenderer 25</b>	36,400.00	650.77	-
<b>Tenderer 28: Phillip Boyle &amp; Assoc.</b>	30,800.00	502.73	-
<b>Tenderer 29</b>	34,200.00	626.58	-
<b>Tenderer 31: SGS Economics and Planning</b>	66,000.00	607.27	617.27
<b>Tenderer 32</b>	30,800.00	452.73	-
<b>Tenderer 34: Urban Enterprise</b>	43,200.00	603.33	644.44
<b>Tenderer 37</b>	47,300.00	652.59	-





ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL  
4 APRIL 2018

**TABLE 8 - TENDERS RECEIVED**  
**Category 5 - Environmentally Sustainable Development**

<b>Tenderer's Name</b>	<b>1. Projected Total (\$ excl. GST)</b>	<b>2.TEP Weighted Scoring Initial (out of 1000)</b>	<b>3.TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview (out of 1000)</b>
<b>Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia</b>	33,200.00	651.45	651.45
<b>Tenderer 4</b>	37,130.00	529.00	-
<b>Tenderer 5</b>	66,000.00	221.33	-
<b>Tenderer 7: Design Flow</b>	31,240.00	845.00	860.00
<b>Tenderer 8: E2Designlab</b>	33,600.00	753.33	798.33
<b>Tenderer 11: GHD</b>	40,480.00	743.33	683.33
<b>Tenderer 18:</b>	30,400.00	-	-
<b>Tenderer 31: SGS Economics and Planning</b>	66,000.00	431.33	-
<b>Tenderer 32</b>	30,800.00	382.14	-
<b>Tenderer 33: Urban Digestor</b>	28,800.00	667.22	667.22
<b>Tenderer 37</b>	47,300.00	631.40	-



# ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018

**TABLE 9 - TENDERS RECEIVED**  
**Category 6 - Transport Strategy, Planning and Policy Development**

<b>Tenderer's Name</b>	<b>1. Projected Total (\$ excl. GST)</b>	<b>2.TEP Weighted Scoring Initial (out of 1000)</b>	<b>3.TEP Weighted Scoring Post Interview (out of 1000)</b>
<b>Tenderer 1: Advisian</b>	56,320.00	819.84	819.84
<b>Tenderer 2: AECOM Australia</b>	33,200.00	711.69	-
<b>Tenderer 4</b>	37,130.00	532.96	-
<b>Tenderer 5</b>	66,000.00	293.25	-
<b>Tenderer 11: GHD</b>	40,480.00	762.47	732.47
<b>Tenderer 14</b>	70,400.00	582.42	-
<b>Tenderer 15: Institute for Sensible Transport</b>	32,380.00	788.13	833.13
<b>Tenderer 20: Martyn Group</b>	9,700.00	795.00	795.00
<b>Tenderer 21</b>	28,586.20	765.00	-
<b>Tenderer 23: Mott MacDonald Australia</b>	40,480.00	777.47	777.47
<b>Tenderer 24</b>	42,000.00	692.25	-
<b>Tenderer 25</b>	36,400.00	539.13	-
<b>Tenderer 28: Phillip Boyle &amp; Assoc.</b>	30,800.00	826.25	826.25
<b>Tenderer 31: SGS Economics and Planning</b>	66,000.00	458.25	-
<b>Tenderer 32</b>	30,800.00	536.25	-
<b>Tenderer 35</b>	36,890.00	704.96	-
<b>Tenderer 37</b>	47,300.00	731.74	-

4.11 Following the interviews, the TEP members agreed that the preferred tenderers offered best value to Council for the following reasons:

- Their overall proposal to deliver the specified outputs was superior and demonstrated an excellent understanding of Council's needs
- A depth of understanding of the Local Government sector was evident in their written and verbal engagement with Council.
- They demonstrated a superior availability of specialist skills relevant to the requirements of the contact, with the core teams having a good mix of skills, experience and a broad depth of understanding



## ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018

- In some cases, demonstrating highly specialist skills in a niche specifically relating to Council's needs
- Demonstrated strong technical capability in the nominated categories

4.12 Comprehensive financial evaluations were conducted on preferred tenderers. An Equifax Report prepared by the Council's Financial Compliance Accountant (TRIM Ref: 14/01/2095) confirmed acceptable risk scores for all tenderers, thereby determining all shortlisted tenderers able to provide the services in accordance with Council's requirements.

4.13 Reference checks were conducted for the preferred tenderers. All referees provided confirmation of the capability of the organisations as a service provider, spoke highly of the competency of staff engaged on projects, and the quality of advice provided to their businesses.

- Tenderer 01: Advisian

Advisian provided advice, including day to day project management and input into strategic thinking to a major Victorian Statutory Authority. The overall quality of service was high. Staff were attentive and understood working in a government context. They would recommend them to us without hesitation.

- Tenderer 02: AECOM Australia

A Metropolitan Municipal Council engaged AECOM on their park water management project. The quality of staff involved was consistently good. The advice provided was solid and the project was successfully implemented in a challenging context. Recommended.

- Tenderer 03: Better Places Consultants

An international development authority employed Better Places as key strategic advisor and manager of a team of advisors. They considered Better Places a worthy candidate and recommend them.

- Tenderer 06: Context

A Western Metropolitan Council utilises Context for regular heritage advisory services. Staff engaged are of high quality, providing logical and clear advice. The City of Brimbank found the work of Context very reliable and would recommend them for the panel.

- Tenderer 07: Design Flow

A Metropolitan Municipal Council employed Design Flow for a range of projects including detailed storm water harvesting design and strategic WSUD projects. Design Flow produced a strategic advice document for developers which has proved very useful. Their technical skills are of high quality, professional and reliable and the referee council would absolutely recommend them.

# ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018



- Tenderer 08: E2Designlab

E2Designlab assisted a Metropolitan Municipal Council to assess their entire asset base of WSUD sites, including streetscape raingardens, tree pits, wetlands and sediment basins. They have also produced a blue green infrastructure manual for streetscapes which has been highly valued. Work was described as great quality which was delivered consistently on time. E2 were described as being happy to work within Council processes while providing consistent intellectual input. Highly recommended.

- Tenderer 10: Ethos Urban

A Southern Metropolitan Council employed Planosphere, a previous iteration of Ethos Urban as consultants on two major strategy based projects. Planosphere delivered really good work on both projects. The individual consultants assigned to the projects were of high quality. The advice provided was highly valuable and an excellent working relationship was developed. There was no problem with reliability and the consultants were able to be adaptable. The referee Council have continued to work with Planosphere since this time and have a strong level of support in recommending them.

- Tenderer 11: GHD

GHD have been engaged over a number of years by a Victorian Statutory Authority as technical advisors for a major infrastructure project. GHD delivered urban design guidelines for sites, as well as analysis, review, community consultation, and participation on a design advisory panel. They were generally good to work with and really care about the outcomes they are working for. Personnel have been good and provide a good quality of work. There is an added benefit when they are able to draw on other multidisciplinary internal teams. They understand the complex environment including limitations and opportunities. GHD are recommended, good operators.

- Tenderer 13: Hansen Partnership

A Metropolitan Municipal Council engaged Hansen Partnership on a major Street Structure Plan which is one of the major activity centres. Staff of varying levels from senior to junior were professional. Hansen were also involved in the consultation and were sensitive when dealing with the public. Overall very positive communication, amenable, flexible and understanding of the challenges of local government. The work delivered was appropriate and useful for the purpose. No hesitation in recommending them.

- Tenderer 15: Institute for Sensible Transport

A Metropolitan Municipal Council engaged the Institute for Sensible Transport to investigate the impacts and implications for Local Government of emerging transport technology. This included investigating how technologies such as smart payments, driverless cars, and parking issues, could affect local government in the future. The work delivered was deemed fantastic, and the competency of the staff 100%. The referee Council have engaged them again on current projects, and for



seminars for public and staff. They are a small organisation delivering consistently good work and relationships specialised for Local Government. Highly recommended.

- Tenderer 17: Judith Stubbs & Associates

Judith Stubbs & Associates completed several studies relating to housing, population and infrastructure for a NSW City Council. The work produced was of high standards. They have a strong commitment to their work, possibly overdelivering on what is asked. The small size of the consultancy meant high quality staff were allocated to the project. The office was professional and worked well when clear parameters were given. Local government experience means they understand the context. Would use again and definitely recommended.

- Tenderer 20: Martyn Group

Martyn Group assisted an Eastern Metropolitan Council with their first Integrated Transport Strategy. The project was described as an excellent experience and they were so happy with the personalised service tailored just for them. Martyn Group took on board comments and followed direction well. Work was adapted as it progressed. They were excellent at presenting and speaking about the work, able to address residents as well as Councillors. Work was completed within a tight timeframe and every deadline was met. Absolutely would recommend them. They know their stuff.

- Tenderer 23: Mott MacDonald Australia

Mott MacDonald Australia were employed by a state government authority to deliver guidelines for the consideration of Vulnerable Road Users around construction sites. This was proactive guidance for designing traffic management systems and included stakeholder engagement, and useful checklists. The work was very practical and had good buy-in from stakeholders. Good quality and range of staff who delivered on time and on budget. Experienced and understanding of the context. Yes, recommended.

- Tenderer 27: Paul Morgan

A Metropolitan Municipal Council has engaged Paul Morgan for a number of contracts recently including DDA compliance work on a local library and community hall. Certainly competent who delivered on the clear briefs provided. Everything he did, he did well. Paul Morgan were professional and reliable with everything on time. Experienced with Council work and works well in within Council frameworks. Recommended, difficult to fault.

- Tenderer 28: Phillip Boyle & Associates

Phillip Boyle & Associates are on a metropolitan council panel of consultants. They have recently been engaged to prepare a background paper on cycling to go into a transport strategy, contributing to a major ITS, and have delivered great work on a bike and motorbike parking study to inform a planning scheme amendment.



Consistent work from them, professional and timely. The referee council have a long professional association and would recommend.

- Tenderer 30: Pollen Studio

Pollen Studio has been engaged by a number of Councils to work from concept design to contract documentation for play, park and landscape projects. Personnel were readily available and willing to attempt to meet tight timeframes. Consultants were able to listen and are able to listen and interpret Council and community feedback. Referees recommended Pollen Studio but recommended a confident project manager and regular oversight to ensure quality and suggested suitability for design rather than contract administration.

- Tenderer 31: SGS Economics and Planning

A Metropolitan Municipal Council wanted to introduce open space contributions into the planning scheme and engaged SGS to conduct a tailored analysis of existing open space, benchmarking and needs testing, particularly in relation to activity centres in comparison to residential areas. SGS also prepared expert evidence and witnesses at planning panel hearings. Staff were confident and flexible, and tailored work to the needs of the client. Absolutely reliable and responsive and have used them again. Yes, would recommend.

- Tenderer 33: Urban Digestor

A Metropolitan Municipal Council engage Urban Digestor to provide regular referral advice on ESD components of planning applications. The advice provided by Urban Digestor is professional and pragmatic. They are flexible and work well in the Council environment. Communication is great and they consistently deliver on time. The referee council have used them for more than four years and look to continue. They would definitely recommend Urban Digestor – so long as we don't take them away.

- Tenderer 34: Urban Enterprise

Urban Enterprise was engaged as sub-contractors by a metropolitan development taskforce to assess funding options for open space in the area for an implementation plan, including through development and open space contributions. The work produced was thorough and of good standard. Professional, flexible and accommodating in responding to revisions. They addressed everything required and were able to substantiate and justify their work. Staff allocated to the project were capable and good to work with. Would recommend.

## 5. CONSULTATION AND STAKEHOLDERS

- 5.1 Council officers undertook consultation with key stakeholders to understand the professional services required to meet current and future business needs. The category specifications were developed by assessing the planning and strategic requirements of Council now and into the future, input from managers and coordinators across the division and reference to the Council Plan and 10-year plan.



## ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018

- 5.2 The Contract Manager will ensure the key stakeholders are updated throughout the term of the Contract.

### 6. LEGAL AND RISK IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Council will obtain quotations for each statement of works from the required number of organisations for each engagement under the Panel contract, thereby ensuring the Best Value solution is achieved for each engagement. Council is not obliged to use the Panel for Strategic Planning and Advisory Services where it may be more appropriate to undertake a public tender or RFQ process.
- 6.2 All tenderers complied with the insurance requirements of \$10,000,000 public liability and \$5,000,000 professional indemnity.

### 7. FINANCIAL IMPACT

- 7.1 The projected gross cost of using the preferred contractors under the panel arrangement over the next three years is \$1,000,000 (excluding GST).
- 7.2 A financial evaluation prepared by Council's Financial Compliance Accountant confirmed the capacity of the preferred tenderers to provide the service in accordance with Council's requirements.

### 8. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

- 8.1 N/A

### 9. COMMUNITY IMPACT

- 9.1 N/A

### 10. ALIGNMENT TO COUNCIL PLAN AND COUNCIL POLICY

Panel consultants will contribute to the development of several of Council's strategic planning, place management and sustainability projects and services. In particular, the outputs of this Contract align with the outcomes and priorities of Direction 4, We are growing and keeping our character, including Fishermans Bend.

Services pertaining to water management and Environmentally Sustainable Design align with Direction 3, We have smart solutions for a sustainable future.

### 11. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

#### 11.1 TIMELINE

- 11.1.1 The contracts between Council and the successful tenderers will be executed as soon as practicable following the Council meeting on 4 April 2018.





## ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL 4 APRIL 2018

11.1.2 The panel contract will commence on 15 April 2018 for a term of three years with an option to extend for a further two years at Council's discretion.

### 11.2 COMMUNICATION

11.2.1 Contract documentation shall be prepared and forwarded to the contractors for execution.

11.2.2 The Contracts and Procurement Unit shall notify all unsuccessful tenderers.

## 12. OFFICER DIRECT OR INDIRECT INTEREST

12.1 No officers involved in the preparation of this report have any direct or indirect interest in the matter.

**TRIM FILE NO:** 14/01/2095

**ATTACHMENTS** Nil