6.3 RFT IE436/2025 CONCRETE CROSSOVERS AND CAST IN-SITU CONCRETE PATHS

Attachments:
1. **IE436-2025 Concrete Crossovers and Cast In-Situ Paths - Confidential**
2. **Concrete Crossovers and Paths Price Comparison - Confidential**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. **NOTES the outcome of the evaluation process for Tender IE436/2025; and**

2. **ACCEPTS the tender submission of Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd for Tender IE436/2025 Concrete Corssovers and Cast In-Situ Concrete Paths.**

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

For Council to consider and determine the outcome of Tender IE436/2025 Concrete Crossovers and Cast In-Situ Concrete Paths.

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:

The City requires a concrete installation contractor for the purpose of supply and installation of concrete crossovers and cast in-situ concrete paths is an essential service that supports roadworks and maintenance and repairs. 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 8 May 2025.

A Request for Tender was publicly released on Saturday 24 May 2025 and closed on Thursday 19 June 2025.

DETAILS:

Tender Submissions
Submissions were received from five (5) 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	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	82%	1
Respondent 2	70%	4
Respondent 3	76%	2
Respondent 4	74%	3
Respondent 5	44%	5

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

The Evaluation Panel shortlisted Respondent 1, Respondent 2, Respondent 3, and Respondent 4 to progress to the price assessment stage.

Respondent 5 did not progress past the qualitative stage due to the low qualitative score and significant risk associated with the responses to the qualitative criteria.

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	1
Respondent 2	3
Respondent 3	2
Respondent 4	4

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	**Low** – Submission was well structured and addressed all criteria with a good level of detail. All references and supporting documents were included, showing clear understanding and adherence to the RFT requirements.	**Low** – Demonstrated strong service delivery processes, relevant experience with local government (including CoV), and has appropriate plant, equipment, and skilled staff. Slight concern around limited tenure of some staff and minor budget detail gaps, but overall risk is low.	**Moderate** – No contractual departures. History of successful delivery for other LGAs and excellent references indicate low contractual risk. Ownership of equipment and established internal teams further reduce dependency on third parties.	1
Respondent 2	**Low** – Submission was compliant, addressing all sections of the RFT. Provided relevant examples and referees. No major omissions identified.	**Moderate** – Strong in delivery methodology and resource flexibility. However, reliance on subcontractors and a relatively low percentage of safety-trained staff (21%) raise concerns about consistency and site control. Budget methodology also lacked clarity.	**Moderate** – No contractual departures. Subcontractor reliance may lead to variations in performance and responsiveness. However, being a large company with LG experience mitigates some of this risk. Risk is manageable but requires monitoring.	3
Respondent 3	**Low** – The response was well structured and addressed all required criteria. Provided sufficient references and examples, though limited to one referee.	**Low** – Demonstrated strong processes for planned works but lacked detail on managing ad hoc works. Resources and skilled staff were appropriate and in-house plant maintenance was a positive. Risk is manageable.	**Low** – No contractual departures. Long-standing relationship with City of Swan and relevant experience in kerbing and concrete works reduces contractual risk. Single reference limits independent validation but does not present significant concern.	2
Respondent 4	**Low** – Submission was compliant and provided quality responses to most criteria. Some gaps in scope alignment (more major works experience than minor works), but no critical compliance issues.	**Moderate** – Good plant detail, including condition and service dates, but lacked sufficient information on availability of on-ground personnel. Capacity may be stretched without clear visibility on crew numbers.	**Low** – Experience in large projects and clear management structure suggest ability to manage contractual obligations, but lack of demonstrated experience in minor concrete works introduces some delivery risk.	4

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	1	1	1	1	Respondent 1 offers the best overall value for money to the City. Their submission demonstrated strong capability across all qualitative criteria, with detailed service delivery methodology, relevant local government experience, and well-established internal resources. The respondent is well-resourced with owned plant and appropriately skilled staff, and presents a low risk in terms of compliance, service delivery, and contractual performance. Coupled with the most competitive pricing, Respondent 1 represents the most advantageous outcome for the City.
Respondent 2	4	3	3	3	Respondent 2 provides good value for money. Their submission demonstrated strong delivery methodology and organisational capacity, with flexibility supported by a large plant fleet and subcontractor network. However, a moderate risk rating was assigned due to concerns over subcontractor reliance, limited safety training coverage (21%), and a lack of detail on budget and equipment servicing. While they offer competitive pricing, the moderate risk profile means value is acceptable, but will require contract oversight and performance monitoring.
Respondent 3	2	2	2	2	Respondent 3 represents reasonable value for money. The submission showed solid experience, particularly in kerbing and concrete works, with adequate internal resources and servicing arrangements. While the qualitative response was sound, some gaps were identified in how ad hoc works would be managed and only one referee was provided. Their pricing was less competitive than the top two ranked respondents, but the relatively low risk profile and demonstrated capacity make them a viable option, albeit at a slightly higher cost.
Respondent 4	3	4	4	4	Respondent 4 offers limited value for money. While the submission included strong detail on plant condition and examples of major works, it lacked information on skilled on-ground personnel and demonstrated limited experience in minor works such as footpaths and crossovers. The risk profile is moderate and, when combined with the least competitive pricing among the shortlisted respondents, the overall value to the City is reduced. This respondent may be suitable for major works but presents a weaker fit for the scope of this contract.

Evaluation Summary
The panel concluded that **Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd** provides the best overall value for money to the City and is recommended for the provision of concrete crossovers and cast in-situ concrete paths (RFT IE436/2025) for the following reasons:

- Fully compliant with all submission and specification requirements;
- Ranked **1st** in the qualitative assessment, demonstrating strong capability, relevant experience with local governments (including past work with the City of Vincent), and a thorough understanding of the City's service requirements;
- Ranked **1st** in the pricing assessment, offering the most competitive rates across key service items and delivering the best overall value compared to other submissions;
- Submission reflects a well-resourced contractor with owned plant and equipment, experienced in-house staff, and flexibility to scale if required; and
- Identified risks were assessed as low, with the respondent demonstrating a reliable service delivery model, appropriate safety practices, and a proven track record in delivering similar works for neighbouring local governments.

Given the strong performance across all assessment criteria, it is therefore recommended that Council accepts the tender submitted by **Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd** for Request for Tender IE436/2025 Concrete Crossovers and Cast In-Situ Concrete Paths.

CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

This matter is subject to a statutory advertising requirement. The Request for Tender IE436/2025 Concrete Crossovers and Cast In-Situ Concrete Paths was advertised in the West Australian on 24 May 2025 and on both the City's website and VendorPanel between 24 May 2025 and 19 June 2025.

LEGAL/POLICY:

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

- Section 3.57 of the *Local Government Act 1995*;
- Part 4 of the *Local Government (Functions 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 appropriate level of experience and financial capacity.

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 Tender IE436/2025 Concrete Crossovers and Cast In-Situ Concrete Paths to **Cobblestone Concrete 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 third party (contractor) failure, including minor breaches or delays in service delivery. Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd has been assessed as presenting a low risk in this category, with the evaluation panel noting their proven track record in successfully delivering similar services for local governments, including the City of Vincent. The submission demonstrated:
  - A clear and practical service delivery methodology;
  - Sufficient owned plant and equipment with contingency options;
  - Appropriately skilled staff with strong safety awareness; and
  - A history of reliable service provision.

  These attributes align with the City's expectation for dependable third-party partners and reduce the likelihood of contractor failure impacting service delivery. The respondent's reputation, compliance with all specification requirements, and ability to meet contractual timeframes support a low-risk determination in this category.

- **Procurement Failure**
  The City has a low risk appetite for procurement failure that results in poor value for money, poor service quality, or financial loss. Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd ranked 1st in both the qualitative and pricing assessments, offering the most competitive pricing across key service items and demonstrating strong capacity to deliver. The submission:
  - Aligns with the City's approved operating budget per annum;
  - Demonstrates strong understanding of the scope and requirements;
  - Provides excellent value for money through a combination of competitive pricing and high-quality service delivery.

  The procurement process followed all required procedures and included thorough evaluation and risk consideration, aligning with the City's expectation for robust enquiry and planning. Accordingly, the decision to appoint this respondent is consistent with the City's procurement risk tolerance.

- **Zero Tolerance – Safety Risk**
  The City has zero tolerance for procurement decisions that may endanger staff or the community. Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd's submission provided clear evidence of:
  - A strong focus on safety;
  - Qualified and safety-aware staff;
  - Established procedures for identifying and mitigating operational risks.

  No safety concerns were identified by the evaluation panel, and the low risk rating confirms alignment with the City's zero-tolerance stance on safety. The contractor's practices are consistent with the City's duty of care obligations and safety expectations.

- **Reputational and Strategic Risk**
  Accepting a submission from a third party that performs poorly can lead to reputational damage or strategic misalignment. Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd demonstrated a solid understanding of the City's requirements, a history of working successfully with other local governments, and an overall professional and complete submission. Their:
  - Alignment with City values and service expectations;
  - History of service with local governments;
  - Low risk of performance or delivery issues;

  collectively mitigate any reputational or strategic risk. This appointment supports the City's strategic goal of delivering infrastructure services reliably and efficiently.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

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

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 Cobblestone Concrete's submission outlines a clear commitment to environmental performance and social responsibility that aligns with broader sustainability principles. Their concrete solutions are designed for long-term durability and reduced maintenance, contributing to improved life cycle performance and reduced environmental impact. The company recycles all waste concrete and asphalt for reuse as road base, sources materials from environmentally conscious local suppliers (including WA Premix and Eco Resources), uses recycled water for truck washouts, and maintains a 'zero print' policy in its administration. Additionally, Cobblestone Concrete operates under an Environmental Policy with carbon reduction targets and internal environmental management procedures.

From a social responsibility perspective, the company actively supports diversity and inclusion, including equal opportunity employment and prioritising procurement from local and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses. They also contribute to community development through local sponsorships and donations. These practices demonstrate alignment with the City's social procurement objectives and broader community values.

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 of approximately $320,000 has been identified and approved as part of the City's 2024/25 Operating and Capital Budgets. This allocation is supported by the City's endorsed Procurement Plan for concrete crossovers and paths. Over the initial three-year contract term, this equates to a total budget allocation of $960,000 (excluding any optional extension periods).

The rates submitted by the preferred respondent are considered competitive and represent good value for money as detailed within *"Price Comparison"* document (see confidential attachment 2). The pricing is expected to remain within the allocated budget over the life of the contract, ensuring the ongoing delivery of concrete crossover and path requirements without additional financial impact to the City.

COMMENTS:

The evaluation panel concluded that the submission from **Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd** provides the best overall value for money to the City and is recommended for the provision of concrete crossovers and cast in-situ concrete paths.

Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd was fully compliant with all submission and specification requirements and ranked 1st in the qualitative assessment, demonstrating strong technical capability, a well-developed understanding of the City's service requirements, and extensive experience working with local governments, including over 10 years' service with the City of Vincent. The respondent provided a comprehensive service methodology, clearly outlining risks and mitigation strategies, supported by a strong internal workforce and a wide range of owned plant and equipment.

The submission also ranked 1st in the pricing assessment, offering the most competitive pricing across key service items. The pricing is considered reasonable and aligns with the City's approved operating budget. As such, the offer represents the most advantageous outcome when assessed against the City's value for money principles.

A detailed risk assessment found the submission posed a low risk to the City. Cobblestone Concrete has a strong track record of delivery, well-established processes, and internal controls that align with the City's low risk appetite for third-party failure and procurement failure. The safety practices outlined also align with the City's zero tolerance for procurement decisions that may endanger staff or community members, providing further confidence in their suitability as the preferred contractor.

While the submission does not directly contribute to any specific sustainability outcomes within the City's Sustainable Environment Strategy 2019–2024, Cobblestone Concrete demonstrated a strong commitment to environmental and social responsibility. Their initiatives include recycling of concrete, use of recycled materials and water, local sourcing through environmentally responsible suppliers, emissions reduction through equipment management, and paperless administration. Socially, the company supports equal opportunity employment, procurement from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses, and contributes to local community groups—demonstrating alignment with the City's broader environmental and social procurement priorities.

In summary, the submission from Cobblestone Concrete Pty Ltd represents a high-quality, low-risk and cost-effective option for the City, with strong alignment to operational requirements, risk expectations, and community values.