6.2 RFT IE355/2024 SUPPLY AND LAYING OF KERBING

Attachments: **1. Evaluation Worksheet IE355-2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing - Confidential**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE355/2024; and

2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete for Tender IE355/2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing.

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

For Council to consider and determine the outcome of Tender IE355/2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing.

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:

Supply and laying of kerbing is an essential requirement for the City's roads. The City requires a kerbing installation contractor for the purpose of supply and installation of new kerb to support roadworks and for maintenance and repairs to damaged kerb. There is currently no contract in place for this service. A procurement plan to undertake a public Request for Tender to engage a suitably experienced and qualified supplier through a contractual arrangement was approved on 26 May 2025.

A Request for Tender was publicly released on Saturday 7 June 2025 and closed on Thursday 3 July 2025.

DETAILS:

Tender Submissions
Four (4) submissions were received from three (3) Respondents. Respondent 1 submitted a conforming and alternate response.

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	Demonstrated understanding of the required service	30%
2	Capacity, Skills and Experience	40%
3	Resources	30%

Qualitative Assessment
Each submission was evaluated against the qualitative criteria outlined in the Request for Tender. These criteria included the respondent's demonstrated understanding of the service requirements, specifically their identification of key delivery risks and corresponding mitigation strategies, their proposed methodology for delivering the service within the required timeframes and budget, their demonstrated capacity and experience to successfully deliver the services and demonstrated resources, plant and equipment to undertake the services successfully.
The results of the qualitative assessment are summarised below:

Respondent #	Weighted Percentage Score	Qualitative Ranking
Respondent 1 – Conforming Submission	70%	3
Respondent 1 – Alternate Submission	70%	3
Respondent 2	77%	2
Respondent 3	85%	1

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

Respondent 1 submitted an alternate offer which included pricing only for additional services and items not requested in the original scope of the RFT. The alternate submission was otherwise identical in terms of qualitative content. As the pricing did not align with the specified scope and did not allow for a like-for-like comparison with the other submissions, the evaluation panel determined that the alternate offer could not be fairly assessed and elected not to progress it to the pricing assessment stage. All other submission progressed to the pricing assessment stage.

All other submissions progressed to the price assessment stage.

Price Assessment
The panel carried out an assessment of the submitted pricing offered by the submissions. The total price breakdown is included in **Confidential Attachment 1**.

Respondent #	Rank
Respondent 1 – Conforming Submission	3
Respondent 2	1
Respondent 3	2

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

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 – Conforming Submission	**Moderate** – The submission met the minimum requirements. Several pricing clarifications were also submitted.	**Medium** – While the delivery approach was clearly outlined, the lack of detail on machinery condition, operator experience, and day-to-day risk mitigation strategies (e.g. supply delays, breakdowns, QA) limits assurance. The heavy reliance on subcontractors and low percentage of trained staff present potential service delivery risks.	**Moderate** – No significant contractual departures were noted. However, gaps in operational details, staff training levels, and subcontractor oversight suggest there may be risks related to meeting timeframes or compliance obligations without stronger contract and performance management controls.	3
Respondent 2	**Low** – Fully compliant with no departures or major assumptions. Submission included all required information and demonstrated a clear understanding of the RFT requirements.	**Moderate** – Strong submission with good systems and technology (e.g. GPS tracking, in-house plant), but would benefit from more detail on how risks are managed operationally on-site. Use of proprietary systems adds value and helps reduce service disruption risks.	**Low** – No contractual concerns were identified. Adequate detail provided regarding internal capabilities, equipment ownership, and proven experience. Demonstrated ability to meet contractual obligations and performance expectations.	2
Respondent 3	**Low** – Fully compliant with the RFT. All requested information was clearly provided. No assumptions or contractual departures.	**Low** – The submission demonstrated a high level of readiness and detail. Risks were appropriately identified and supported by clear mitigation strategies. Equipment is owned and maintained, and the team is experienced and trained. Overall, the risk of service failure is minimal.	**Low** – The submission reflects a very low contractual risk. All contractual obligations appear to be well understood, and the respondent has a proven track record with similar local government contracts. Strong team and equipment resourcing further reduce delivery and compliance risks.	1

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 – Conforming Submission	3	3	3	3	While Respondent 1 demonstrated relevant experience and capacity, their submission was the highest priced across almost all line items. The qualitative score was moderate compared to the other respondents, and several aspects of their resource and delivery methodology lacked sufficient detail. The risk assessment identified medium levels of operational and contractual risk due to limited evidence of upskilling, reliance on subcontractors, and unclear machinery condition. As a result, the submission offers lower value for money when compared to the other respondents.
Respondent 2	2	1	2	2	Respondent 2 submitted the lowest overall pricing, with a clear and compliant submission demonstrating solid experience and internal resourcing. Their qualitative score was slightly lower than Respondent 3 but still strong. Risk was assessed as low to medium, with some minor gaps in operational risk mitigation detail. Overall, Respondent 2 offers good value for money, particularly in terms of cost competitiveness and compliance.
Respondent 3	1	2	1	1	Respondent 3 provided a high-quality submission with well-documented experience, capacity, and resourcing. They achieved the highest qualitative score, and while their pricing was slightly higher than Respondent 2, the difference was not considered material. Importantly, they were assessed as having low risk across all evaluation categories, with strong evidence of internal capability, equipment ownership, and robust service delivery processes. As such, Respondent 3 represents the best overall value for money and is recommended for contract award.

Evaluation Summary
The panel concluded that **The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete** tender provides the best overall value for money to the City and is recommended for the provision of IE355/2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing for the following reasons:

- Fully compliant with all submission and specification requirements;
- Ranked **1st** in the qualitative assessment, demonstrating a strong level of capability, extensive local government experience, and clearly articulated delivery methodology;
- Ranked **2nd** in the pricing assessment and submitted competitive pricing that is comparable to other respondents and considered reasonable and within the City's approved budget;
- Assessed as having the lowest overall risk, with demonstrated internal resources, well-maintained plant and equipment, and ongoing staff training and upskilling; and
- Submission demonstrates the best balance between price, quality, and risk, offering the City strong confidence in the respondent's ability to deliver the contract requirements efficiently and to a high standard.

The respondent's experience with similar contracts, including work with the City of Vincent, further supports their capability to deliver this contract successfully. The evaluation panel determined that by **The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete** provides the strongest overall offer and presents the best value for money for the City.

Given the strong performance across all assessment criteria, it is therefore recommended that Council accepts the tender submitted by **The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete** for Request for Tender IE355/2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing.

CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

This matter is subject to a statutory advertising requirement. The Request for Tender IE355/2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing was advertised in the West Australian on 7 June 2025 and on both the City's website and VendorPanel between 7 June 2025 and 3 July 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 IE355/2024 Supply and Laying of Kerbing to **The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete** 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. This reflects the importance of selecting reliable and capable providers to ensure continuity in service delivery. The preferred Respondent, Allstate Kerbing and Concrete, has demonstrated strong experience in delivering kerbing works for local governments, including specific examples involving the City of Vincent. The company maintains its own plant and equipment, employs experienced staff, and has documented processes for maintaining plant condition and upskilling personnel. These capabilities support confidence in the contractor's ability to meet contractual obligations, minimising the likelihood of delivery delays, performance issues, or service interruptions.
  Accordingly, the risk of third party failure associated with this procurement is considered low and within the City's risk tolerance.

- **Procurement Failure**
  The City has a low appetite for procurement failure, including outcomes that lead to poor value for money, low service quality, or financial loss. Allstate Kerbing and Concrete achieved the highest qualitative score (90%) in the evaluation, demonstrating strong capability, capacity, and a thorough understanding of the City's project requirements.
  While not the lowest priced respondent, the pricing differences were found to be not material, and the submission offers a strong balance of cost, quality, and risk mitigation. The company's proven track record, resourcing, and alignment with contract requirements reduce the risk of budget overrun, delivery delay, or substandard outcomes. This procurement is considered low risk and is consistent with the City's low risk appetite in this area.

- **Zero Tolerance – Safety Risk**
  The City has zero tolerance for procurement decisions that could endanger the safety of staff or the community. Allstate Kerbing and Concrete's submission did not present any safety concerns. The contractor is experienced in delivering similar works in public environments, with appropriately skilled staff and industry-compliant equipment. No safety-related risks or exclusions were identified in the response, and their history with local government delivery adds to the confidence that safety protocols and community impact considerations are adequately managed.
  This recommendation aligns with the City's zero tolerance for safety-related procurement risk.

- **Reputational and Strategic Risk**
  Entering into a contract with an underperforming or high-risk contractor can damage the City's reputation and undermine strategic objectives. Allstate Kerbing and Concrete has demonstrated a positive track record with other local governments and appears well-regarded within the sector. The panel's assessment confirms the company's ability to deliver high-quality outcomes consistent with the City's service standards.
  Awarding the contract to this respondent supports the City's strategic priority of working with reliable, professional contractors and maintaining public trust in procurement integrity. The reputational and strategic risk associated with this decision is therefore considered low and within acceptable tolerance levels.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

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

Connected and Healthy Community

Our community facilities and spaces are well known and well used.

Thriving Places

Efficiently managed and maintained City assets in the public realm.

Innovative and Accountable

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

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS:

This does not contribute to any specific sustainability outcomes of the *City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019-2024,* however Respondents were requested to provide information on the environmental performance of their product or service in terms of life cycle impacts, and on their company's approach to social responsibility, including support for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, people with disability, and gender diversity.

Allstate Kerbing & Concrete provided a comprehensive response that demonstrates a commitment to environmental sustainability and social responsibility. The company has a documented *Environmental Sustainability Policy* and outlined several initiatives that reflect responsible environmental practices, including the exclusive use of *Ecomax Concrete Products*, which are designed to conserve natural resources and improve energy efficiency. Allstate also recycles all office, workshop and concrete waste materials through appropriate recycling streams.

From a social responsibility perspective, the company supports a diverse workforce that includes employees of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander descent, as well as from various cultural backgrounds. It maintains a suite of workplace policies that promote equity, respect, and wellbeing, and offers above-award wages and flexible working arrangements. The submission also outlines a sustainable procurement approach aligned with the *United Nations Global Compact*, requiring ethical and environmentally conscious standards from its suppliers.

While Allstate Kerbing & Concrete is not based within the City of Vincent, it currently employs residents from within the City and expressed a commitment to hiring locally where possible. The company also supports local businesses through regular expenditure on fuel, meals, and other goods when operating within the City, and has indicated a willingness to promote and support local events and initiatives.

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 $250,000 (ex GST) has been identified and approved through the City's 2024/25 Operating Budget and associated Procurement Plan for pavement marking services. Over the initial three-year contract term, this equates to a total budgeted allocation of $750,000 (ex GST). The recommended respondent's pricing is considered reasonable and within the City's approved budget, representing value for money based on the scope of services required and historical expenditure.

The rates submitted by the preferred respondent are considered competitive and represent good value for money based on the scope of services required. The pricing is expected to remain within the allocated budget over the life of the contract, ensuring the ongoing delivery of pavement marking services without additional financial impact to the City.

COMMENTS:

The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete, is recommended for award of the contract for RFT IE355/2024 – Supply and Laying of Kerbing, 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 requirements. Allstate Kerbing and Concrete ranked 1st in the qualitative assessment, with the evaluation panel noting their strong project experience, particularly in delivering similar kerbing works for local governments. Their submission detailed sufficient capacity and resources, a clear and methodical approach to delivery, and a proven track record that instils confidence in their ability to perform to the City's expectations.

Allstate's pricing submission was assessed as competitive and reasonable, with rates that are comparable to other submissions and well aligned with the City's allocated annual budget of $250,000 (ex GST), resulting in a total projected expenditure of $750,000 (ex GST) over the three-year initial contract term. This demonstrates strong alignment with the City's financial planning and procurement objectives.

The risk rating for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete was assessed as Low, with no material risks identified in their submission. Their clear methodology, demonstrated experience, and strong delivery history support a low likelihood of contractor failure, aligning 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, Allstate Kerbing and Concrete has demonstrated a genuine commitment to environmental management, underpinned by a formal Environmental Sustainability Policy. Their practices include the exclusive use of sustainable concrete products (Ecomax), recycling of materials, and sourcing through environmentally responsible suppliers. While these measures do not directly contribute to specific outcomes of the City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019–2024, they do represent sound environmental stewardship.

On the social responsibility front, Allstate actively promotes workplace diversity and inclusion, employing staff from a range of cultural backgrounds, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander employees. They are committed to equal opportunity, above-award wages, flexible working arrangements, and engaging local businesses wherever possible, including within the City of Vincent. This reflects well on their alignment with the City's broader strategic community and economic objectives.

Based on their high-quality submission, strong alignment with the City's financial, risk, and sustainability objectives, and proven ability to deliver works of this nature to a high standard, **The Trustee for Allstate Kerbing and Concrete Trust t/a Allstate Kerbing and Concrete** is recommended as the preferred supplier for this contract.