6.1 RFT IE476/2025 TREE WATERING AND TREE PLANTING SERVICES

Attachments: **1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE476-2025 - Confidential**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE476/2025; and

2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Leo Heaney Pty Ltd for Tender IE476/2025 Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services.

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

For Council to consider and determine the outcome of Tender IE476/2025 Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services.

DELEGATION:

The decision to accept or reject tenders with a value exceeding $250,000 requires a decision of Council in accordance with Council's adopted register of delegations, authorisations and appointments.

BACKGROUND:

Tree watering and planting services are an essential operational requirement for the City's parks, streetscapes, and urban canopy maintenance programs. The City requires a suitably qualified and experienced contractor to deliver these services to ensure the health, establishment, and longevity of newly planted and existing street trees.

The current contract for tree watering services expires on 6 November 2025. To ensure continuity of service, a Procurement Plan for the engagement of a new contractor through a public Request for Tender process was approved by the Executive Director Infrastructure and Environment on 29 August 2025.

The Request for Tender (RFT IE476/2025 – Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services) was publicly released on 3 September 2025 and closed on 2 October 2025. The tender sought submissions from experienced contractors with the capacity, equipment, and expertise to deliver scheduled and ad hoc tree watering and planting services across the City in accordance with its operational and environmental standards.

DETAILS:

Tender Submissions
Submissions were received from three (3) Respondents.

Evaluation Panel
The Evaluation Panel comprised of four (4) members, being:

- three with appropriate operational expertise and involvement (voting); and
- one with tender preparation skills and probity advice provided by a Procurement and Contracts Officer (non-voting).

Compliance Assessment
A compliance assessment was undertaken, and all submissions were deemed compliant and progressed to the qualitative assessment stage.

Evaluation Method and Weighting
The qualitative weighting method of tender evaluation was selected to evaluate the offer. The qualitative criteria and weighting used in evaluating the submission received were as follows:

Qualitative Criteria		Weighting
1	Relevant experience of the Contractor	50%
2	Resources, Key Personnel and Skills	40%
3	Environmental and Social	10%

Qualitative Assessment
Each submission was evaluated against the qualitative criteria outlined in the Request for Tender. The qualitative assessment focused on each respondent's demonstrated experience and capability to deliver the Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services to the City's required standards.

Specifically, the assessment considered the respondent's relevant experience in the care and management of trees within parks and streetscapes, organisational and management structure, examples of similar and local government contracts, and the availability of qualified personnel and suitable plant and equipment.

The panel also assessed each respondent's environmental and social practices, including alignment with the City's *Reconciliation Action Plan 2022–2024 Innovate*, *Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019–2024*, and proposed initiatives for recycling, low carbon output and other environmentally beneficial practices.

Each submission was scored and ranked against the evaluation criteria, with the results reflecting the respondent's overall capability, capacity, and commitment to delivering the services efficiently and sustainably in accordance with the City's requirements.

The results of the qualitative assessment are summarised below:

Respondent #	Weighted Percentage Score	Qualitative Ranking
Respondent 1	67%	2
Respondent 2	69%	1
Respondent 3	65%	3

Refer to **Confidential Attachment 1** for further details.

All submissions achieved a qualitative score of greater than 60%, meeting the minimum threshold required under the Request for Tender. In accordance with the RFT evaluation methodology, all three respondents therefore progressed to the **Price Assessment** stage for further evaluation and comparison.

Price Assessment
Each submission was assessed against the pricing schedule provided in the Request for Tender. The price assessment involved a comparative analysis of the respondents' rates for tree watering, tree planting, ad hoc works, and after-hours or emergency callouts. Prices were evaluated on the basis of competitiveness, reasonableness, and overall value for money in relation to the scope of services required.

All submissions were found to be compliant and free from contractual departures. Respondent 2 submitted the lowest overall pricing and achieved the highest price ranking, followed by Respondent 1, with Respondent 3 submitting the highest rates across all service categories. The pricing outcomes, in combination with the qualitative and risk assessments, informed the overall value for money determination.

The total price breakdown is included in **Confidential Attachment 1**.

Respondent #	Price Assessment Rank
Respondent 1	2
Respondent 2	1
Respondent 3	3

Refer to **Confidential Attachment 1** for further details.

All submissions were found to be compliant and free from contractual departures. Respondent 2 submitted the lowest overall pricing and achieved the highest price ranking, followed by Respondent 1, with Respondent 3 submitting the highest rates across all service categories. The pricing outcomes, in combination with the qualitative and risk assessments, informed the overall value for money determination.

Risk Assessment
The evaluation panel conducted a comprehensive risk assessment of each submission, considering compliance with specifications, potential service delivery risks, and contractual risk exposure.

Respondent #	Compliance with RFT	Operational/Service Delivery Risk	Contractual Risk	Risk Rank
Respondent 1	**Low –** Fully compliant submission with no contractual departures or assumptions. All requested information was provided in accordance with the RFT requirements.	**High –** While the submission was strong in experience and capability, the inability to guarantee the availability of water trucks presents a significant operational risk to the City. This uncertainty may affect the continuity of tree watering programs during peak periods. Despite otherwise strong project management and supervisory capability, the lack of equipment assurance represents a major service delivery risk.	**Moderate –** No contractual departures were identified; however, the potential for non-availability of essential equipment could impact contractual performance and compliance with service level requirements if not effectively managed**.**	3
Respondent 2	**Low –** Fully compliant with no departures or assumptions. Submission included all required information and demonstrated a strong understanding of the RFT scope and obligations.	**Low –** The submission demonstrated sound operational systems, adequate resourcing, and qualified personnel. Equipment ownership and recent maintenance history reduce the likelihood of downtime or service disruption. Demonstrated history of on-time delivery with other local governments indicates low operational risk.	**Low –** No contractual risks identified. The respondent has a proven track record of meeting performance obligations, with clear management systems in place to ensure contract compliance.	1

Respondent #	Compliance with RFT	Operational/Service Delivery Risk	Contractual Risk	Risk Rank
Respondent 3	**Low –** Conforming submission with no contractual departures and all required information provided.	**Moderate –** The submission demonstrated relevant experience; however, a lack of Stop/Go traffic management qualifications and existing commitments to other large watering contracts pose potential delivery risks. The need to engage external traffic management services could lead to higher costs or scheduling delays.	**Moderate –** No contractual issues were identified, though reliance on external traffic management providers and concurrent large-scale commitments may affect delivery timeframes or resource availability.	2

Value for Money Assessment
The Evaluation Panel undertook a comprehensive value for money assessment, considering the combined outcomes of the qualitative evaluation, pricing analysis, and risk assessment. This holistic approach ensured that the recommended submission offers the optimal balance of quality, cost-effectiveness, and low delivery and contractual risk to the City.

Respondent #	Qualitative Rank	Price Rank	Risk Rank	Value for Money Rank	Comment
Respondent 1	2	2	3	2	Respondent 1 submitted a strong qualitative response demonstrating extensive experience and sound environmental practices. However, the inability to guarantee availability of water trucks poses a significant operational risk to the City, particularly during critical watering periods. While pricing was competitive, the elevated delivery risk reduces overall value for money when compared to the other respondents.
Respondent 2	1	1	1	1	Respondent 2 provided the strongest overall submission, achieving the highest qualitative score, the most competitive pricing, and the lowest assessed risk. The company demonstrated proven local government experience, strong operational capability, qualified personnel, and clear alignment with the City's environmental and social objectives. Their submission represents the best overall value for money to the City of Vincent through a balance of capability, cost-effectiveness, and delivery confidence.

Respondent #	Qualitative Rank	Price Rank	Risk Rank	Value for Money Rank	Comment
Respondent 3	3	3	2	3	Respondent 3 demonstrated relevant experience and adequate resources; however, their pricing was the highest of all respondents, and their qualitative submission was comparatively weaker. While assessed as lower risk than Respondent 1, the lack of Stop/Go traffic management qualifications and potential overcommitment to other contracts reduce confidence in service delivery. Despite these limitations, the respondent presents moderate value for money given their industry experience and reasonable risk profile.

Evaluation Summary
The evaluation panel concluded that **Leo Heaney Pty Ltd** provides the best overall value for money to the City and is recommended for the provision of **RFT IE476/2025 Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services** for the following reasons:

- Fully compliant with all submission and specification requirements, with no contractual departures or assumptions;
- Ranked **1st in the qualitative assessment**, demonstrating a strong level of capability, extensive local government experience, and clearly defined organisational structure and methodology for service delivery;
- Ranked **1st in the pricing assessment**, offering the lowest overall rates across all service categories, providing excellent cost efficiency for the City;
- Assessed as having the **lowest overall risk**, with demonstrated internal resources, qualified and experienced personnel (including traffic management accreditation), and well-maintained plant and equipment; and
- The submission represents the best balance between price, quality, and risk, providing the City with a high degree of confidence in the respondent's ability to deliver the services reliably, efficiently, and to a high standard.

Leo Heaney Pty Ltd.'s proven performance in delivering similar contracts for local governments, including the City of Vincent, further supports their capability to deliver this contract successfully. The evaluation panel determined that **Leo Heaney Pty Ltd** presents the strongest overall offer and represents the best value for money outcome for the City.

CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

This matter is subject to a statutory advertising requirement. The Request for Tender IE476/2025 Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services was advertised in the West Australian on 3 September 2025 and on both the City's website and VendorPanel between 3 September 2025 and 2 October 2025.

LEGAL/POLICY:

The Request for Tender was prepared and advertised in accordance with:

- Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995;
- Part of the *Local Government (Function and General) Regulations 1996;* and
- City of Vincent Purchasing Policy

RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Low: It is low risk for Council to accept the preferred Respondent as they have demonstrated relevant local government experience, provided good reference information, and submitted a well-priced offer that aligns with the City's budget, with no major concerns identified during the evaluation.

CITY OF VINCENT

RISK APPETITE & TOLERANCE STATEMENTS

Risk Category	Risk Appetite / Tolerance Statement	Descriptor /clarification
		festival. Other projects may include working with developers.
3rd party Partner (Contractor) failure	The City has a ***low risk appetite*** for third party partner (contractors) failure.	The City utilises many outside organisations in delivering on its mandate. This low appetite means that even minor or insignificant breaches in contracts or delays in delivery of products and services will be taken seriously. Accordingly, third party risk must be considered before entering into any contract, including reputation of third party, financial viability, audit clauses etc.
Procurement		
Procurement failure	The City has a ***low risk appetite*** for procurement failures that lead to poor value for money or financial loss, poor quality of service; incorrect or substandard products or delayed delivery; wastage of funds or services.	This ties into the above point; and thereby requires appropriate procedures in the procurement process to ensure the required outcomes for the City and appropriate enquiry and planning prior to purchases. Note, appropriate delegations must exist to support this.
	The City has ***zero tolerance*** for procurement decisions that endanger our staff and community.	Procurement decision making must consider the risk of injury or harm to the staff & community of Vincent. An example of this would be allowing the Beatty Park pool to use unregulated or unauthorised chemicals.

In accordance with the City of Vincent's adopted *Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statements*, the recommendation to award the contract for **RFT IE476/2025 Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services** to **Leo Heaney Pty Ltd** presents a **low risk** to the City and is consistent with the organisation's risk position in the following areas:

- **Third Party (Contractor) Failure**
  The City has a *low-risk appetite* for contractor failure, reflecting the importance of engaging reliable and capable service providers to ensure continuity in tree watering and planting services. The preferred respondent, **Leo Heaney Pty Ltd**, demonstrated strong experience in delivering similar contracts for local governments, including the City of Vincent. The company maintains ownership of suitable plant and equipment, employs experienced and qualified staff (including traffic management accreditation), and has a long-standing track record of timely and high-quality service delivery. These factors provide confidence in the contractor's ability to meet contractual obligations and mitigate the risk of service interruptions or delivery delays. Accordingly, the risk of third-party failure is considered **low** and within the City's risk tolerance.

- **Procurement Failure**
  The City has a low-risk appetite for procurement failures that lead to poor value for money, low service quality, or financial loss. Leo Heaney Pty Ltd achieved the highest qualitative score (69%) and submitted the lowest overall pricing, offering the best balance between cost, quality, and risk. Their demonstrated local government experience, qualified personnel, and reliable plant and equipment reduce the likelihood of budget overruns, substandard service quality, or delays.
  The procurement process has been conducted in full compliance with the City's purchasing policies, and the outcome represents a low-risk procurement consistent with the City's established tolerance in this area.

- **Zero Tolerance – Safety Risk**
  The City has *zero tolerance* for procurement decisions that could endanger staff or the community. Leo Heaney Pty Ltd.'s submission demonstrated strong safety systems, qualified operators, and adherence to relevant safety standards. No safety concerns were identified in the submission, and the company's history of working within public environments for local governments further supports their compliance with occupational health and safety requirements.
  This contract award aligns with the City's *zero tolerance* for safety-related risk.

- **Reputational and Strategic Risk**
  Engaging a reliable, professional contractor supports the City's reputation for effective and transparent procurement and contributes to achieving strategic outcomes in environmental management and community satisfaction. Leo Heaney Pty Ltd has an established reputation within the local government sector for reliability, responsiveness, and quality service delivery.

Awarding the contract to this respondent aligns with the City's strategic objectives and risk appetite by ensuring consistent, high-standard service delivery and maintaining public confidence in the City's procurement integrity.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the City's *Strategic Community Plan 2022-2032*:

Enhanced Environment

Our urban forest/canopy is maintained and increased.

Thriving Places

Our town centres and gathering spaces are safe, easy to use and attractive places where pedestrians have priority.

Innovative and Accountable

Our decision-making process is consistent and transparent, and decisions are aligned to our strategic direction.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the following key sustainability outcomes of the *City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024.*

Urban Greening and Biodiversity

This contract contributes to the sustainability objectives of the City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019–2024 by supporting efficient water use, waste reduction, and sustainable operational practices in the delivery of tree watering and planting services. Respondents were requested to provide information on their environmental performance and social responsibility practices, including initiatives that align with the City's Reconciliation Action Plan 2022–2024 Innovate.

Leo Heaney Pty Ltd provided a well-considered response demonstrating a commitment to both environmental sustainability and social responsibility. The company outlined a range of sustainable practices including the use of efficient water tanks to minimise water waste, recycling of green waste into mulch, and reducing vehicle emissions through regular maintenance and route optimisation. Leo Heaney also indicated plans to progressively upgrade its vehicle fleet to lower-emission models, aligning with the City's carbon reduction goals.

From a social responsibility perspective, Leo Heaney Pty Ltd expressed support for reconciliation and cultural inclusion, acknowledging the City's Reconciliation Action Plan 2022–2024 Innovate. The company stated a commitment to engaging Indigenous suppliers where possible and promoting cultural awareness within its workforce.

While not based within the City of Vincent, Leo Heaney Pty Ltd has experience working with the City and other neighbouring local governments and expressed a willingness to employ local residents and source materials from local suppliers wherever practical. These commitments contribute positively to local economic participation and environmental stewardship, consistent with the City's sustainability priorities.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:

This does not contribute to any public health outcomes in the *City's Public Health Plan 2020-2025.*

FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

An annual budget allocation of approximately **$1,000,000 (ex GST)** has been identified and approved through the City's **2025/26 Operating Budget** and associated **Procurement Plan** for the provision of tree watering and tree planting services. Over the initial three-year contract term, this equates to a total budgeted allocation of **$3,000,000 (ex GST)**.

The pricing submitted by **Leo Heaney Pty Ltd** is considered **reasonable and within the City's approved budget**, representing strong value for money given the scope of services required and the competitive nature of the tendered rates. The respondent submitted the **lowest overall pricing** of all respondents, with rates that are consistent with current market conditions and the City's historical expenditure for comparable services.

The rates provided are expected to remain within the allocated budget over the life of the contract and will enable the continued and cost-effective delivery of tree watering and planting services without additional financial impact to the City. The pricing details and comparative analysis are outlined in the **Price Comparison** document (see Confidential Attachment 1).

COMMENTS:

Leo Heaney Pty Ltd is recommended for award of the contract for RFT IE476/2025 – Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services, as their submission provides the best overall value for money to the City of Vincent. The Respondent submitted a fully compliant and well-presented tender that demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the City's operational requirements. Leo Heaney Pty Ltd ranked 1st in the qualitative assessment, with the evaluation panel noting their extensive local government experience, demonstrated capability, and strong commitment to reliable service delivery. Their submission provided detailed information on qualified personnel, well-maintained plant and equipment, and clear operational processes that support timely and high-quality service outcomes.

The company's pricing submission was assessed as the most competitive, ranking 1st in the price assessment. The rates submitted are considered reasonable and well within the City's approved annual budget of approximately $1,000,000 (ex GST), resulting in a projected expenditure of $3,000,000 (ex GST) over the initial three-year contract term. The pricing represents strong value for money given the scope of works and the City's historical expenditure for comparable services.

The risk rating for Leo Heaney Pty Ltd was assessed as Low, with no material delivery or contractual risks identified. The company's established experience, qualified staff (including traffic management accreditation), and ownership of required equipment support a low likelihood of service disruption or non-performance. This aligns with the City's low risk appetite for third-party failure and procurement failure, as outlined in the City's adopted Risk Appetite and Tolerance Statements.

In terms of sustainability and social responsibility, Leo Heaney Pty Ltd demonstrated a sound commitment to environmental and social outcomes. Environmentally, the company promotes efficient water use, green waste recycling, and emission reduction through fleet maintenance and route optimisation. Socially, they expressed support for reconciliation and inclusion initiatives aligned with the City's Reconciliation Action Plan 2022–2024 Innovate, including engagement with Indigenous suppliers and efforts to build cultural awareness within their workforce.

Based on their high-quality submission, competitive pricing, alignment with the City's risk and sustainability frameworks, and proven capability to deliver these services to a high standard, Leo Heaney Pty Ltd is recommended as the preferred supplier for RFT IE476/2025 – Tree Watering and Tree Planting Services.