6.2 RFT IE430/2025 LITIS STADIUM FLOODLIGHTING UPGRADE

Attachments: **1. Evaluation Worksheet RFT IE 430/2025 - Confidential**

RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

1. NOTES the outcome of the evaluaion process for Tender IE430/2025; and

2. ACCEPTS the tender submission of Stiles Electrical & Communications Services Pty Ltd for Tender IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade.

PURPOSE OF REPORT:

For Council to consider and determine the outcome of Tender IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade.

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 floodlighting at Litis Stadium has deteriorated since its installation in 2002. The current lighting infrastructure is no longer compliant with standards set by Football West which prevents Floreat Athena Football Club (FAFC) being able to host night matches – including hosting home matches in the annual night series competition.

Since 2022 FAFC in consultation with the City has advocated to the State Government for support to upgrade the floodlighting to the 200 lux minimum requirement for night matches whilst also meeting relevant Australian Standards.

In 2024 FAFC were approached by Football Australia for Litis Stadium to be a potential training site for the AFC Asian Women's World Cup in February 2026. For Litis Stadium to be considered a training venue for this tournament 500 lux lighting would be required. The City then initiated a 200 lux lighting and electrical design that was upgradable to 500 lux should future investment eventuate.

In 2025 as part of a Cook-Labor Government election commitment this project received $800,000 grant funding which has allowed the 500 lux upgrade to be delivered and ensure the project would be ready in preparation for the AFC Asian Women's World Cup in 2026.

The required works for this project is as follows:

- removal of:
  - 6 existing floodlighting poles; and
  - Metal halide lamps.
- Supply and installation of new:
  - Floodlighting poles
  - LED luminaries
  - Lighting system distribution board
  - All associated electrical cabling and conduits

The specification for these works were developed in collaboration with an independent lighting design consultant who has extensive experience in floodlighting. All design elements were considered in line with Football Australia guidelines.

The lighting design and increased pole height combined with new LED lighting technology will significantly reduce light spill (both glare and perceived glare) comparatively to the existing metal halide floodlights.

Administration staff worked closely with the design consultants to ensure the proposed design would limit obtrusive light as much as reasonably possible.

A procurement plan to develop and realise a public request for tender was approved 8 April 2025. A public request for tender was released 10 May 2025 and closed 9 June 2025.

DETAILS:

Tender Submissions
Submissions were received from seven (7) respondents. Two (2) respondents submitted conforming and alternate submissions making a total of nine (9) submissions. One (1) submission was deemed non-compliant and did not proceed to the evaluation stage.

Evaluation Panel
The Evaluation Panel comprised of five (5) members, being:

- three with appropriate operational expertise and involvement (voting);
- one external consultant with expertise in the project specifications (non-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 on all respondents. Six (6) respondents were deemed compliant and progressed to the qualitative assessment, one (1) was deemed non-compliant and did not progress to the qualitative assessment.

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	22.5%
2	Demonstrated understanding of the project	22.5%
3	Experience and Product Compliance	20%
4	Capacity, Skills and Experience	15%
5	Warranty, Support and Proprietary Material	15%
6	Environmental & Social	5%

Qualitative Assessment
Each submission was evaluated against the qualitative criteria outlined in the Request for Tender, which included demonstrated experience, capacity to deliver the services, understanding of the requirements, and commitment to environmental and social objectives. The results of the qualitative assessment are summarised below:

Respondent #	**Weighted Percentage Score**	**Qualitative Ranking**
Respondent 1	80.38%	2
Respondent 2 – Conforming Response	77.38%	3
Respondent 2 – Alternative Response	75.13%	4
Respondent 3	67.00%	7
Respondent 4	83.63%	1
Respondent 6 – Conforming Response	67.13%	6
Respondent 6 – Alternative Response	68.63%	5
Respondent 7	64.13%	8

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

The Evaluation Panel shortlisted Respondent 1, Respondent 2 – Conforming Submission, Respondent 2 – Alternate Submission, and Respondent 4 to progress to the price assessment stage. While the remaining Respondents achieved a score above the minimum threshold, only the four highest-ranked submissions were shortlisted for further consideration.

Price Assessment

The panel carried out an assessment of the submitted pricing offered by the top four (4) ranked submissions. The total price breakdown is included in **Confidential Attachment 1**.

Respondent #	Fixed Price (excl GST)	Rank
Respondent 1	$624,418.22	4
Respondent 2 - Conforming	$621,189.00	3
Respondent 2 - Alternate	$566,974.00	1
Respondent 4	$572,079.48	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	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	**Low** – Clear methodology and sound capability; no critical assumptions raised.	**Low** – No contractual departures. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation.	1
Respondent 2 – Conforming	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	**Low** – Strong submission with relevant project experience and no critical assumptions.	**Low** – No contractual departures. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation.	2
Respondent 2 - Alternate	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	**Moderate** – Alternate offer introduces some risk regarding product comparability and compliance.	**Low** – No contractual departures. Acceptable and industry-standard risk allocation.	3
Respondent 4	Fully compliant with specifications and contractual terms.	**Medium** – Multiple critical assumptions identified; some may impact delivery if not managed closely.	**Moderate** – Assumptions impact scope, cost, and risk allocation. Several items would require contract variation if triggered.	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	2	4	1	2	Submitted the highest priced offer, but demonstrated a comprehensive and high-quality response. The submission is considered good value for money despite the higher cost, given the strong qualitative and risk profile.
Respondent 2 – Conforming	3	3	2	3	Offered a competitive price and a well-considered submission with low risk. However, the qualitative submission was not as strong as the top-ranked Respondents. Represents reasonable value for money.
Respondent 2 - Alternate	4	1	3	4	Provided the lowest priced offer but received the lowest qualitative score among the shortlisted submissions. While the pricing is attractive, the overall value for money is reduced by the lower qualitative performance.
Respondent 4	1	2	4	1	Achieved the highest overall evaluation score, offered a competitive price, and was assessed as providing very good value for money. While critical assumptions were noted, the panel considered these to have limited impact on service delivery.

Evaluation Summary
The panel concluded that the **Stiles Electrical & Communication Services Pty Ltd** tender provides the best overall value for money to the City and is recommended for the provision of IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade for the following reasons:

- Fully compliant with all submission and specification requirements;
- Ranked **1st** in the qualitative assessment, demonstrating a high level of capability, experience, and understanding of the project requirements;
- Ranked **2nd** in the pricing assessment, with a competitive submission that is within the City's approved budget;
- Submission demonstrates the best balance between quality and cost, with strong risk mitigation strategies and a detailed delivery methodology tailored to the project; and
- The company has a proven track record of delivering similar complex floodlighting projects at a comparable scale, providing confidence in their ability to deliver a high-quality outcome for the City.

While the submission included a number of critical assumptions, the evaluation panel carefully assessed these and determined they do not pose a significant risk to the delivery of the contract. The respondent has demonstrated a sound understanding of the site and the City's operational requirements, with the assumptions largely representing clarifications rather than exclusions.

Given the strong performance across all assessment criteria, it is therefore recommended that Council accepts the tender submitted by **Stiles Electrical & Communication Services Pty Ltd** for Request for Tender IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade.

CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

1. There has been extensive stakeholder engagement in scoping the floodlighting upgrade at Litis Stadium. FAFC members have maintained consistent and regular correspondence with the City through advocacy efforts. In turn this has ensured the City could build an appropriate scope to meet the needs of the club, whilst also recognising the City's Strategic Objectives. The Department of Local Government, Sport and Cultural Industries have been regularly consulted in the development of this project.

2. This matter is subject to a statutory advertising requirement.

3. The Request for Tender IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade was advertised in the West Australian on 10 May 2025 and on both the City's website and VendorPanel between 10 May 2025 and 9 June 2025

4. Subject to the outcome of this report, the City will undertake an inform campaign to advise neighbouring residents of the proposed project. In light of the election commitment and the constrained timeframe required to deliver the project in advance of the AFC Asian Women's World Cup in February 2026, an informing approach has been identified as the most appropriate and efficient method for communicating the project's delivery timeline and potential impacts to surrounding residents.

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.

Section 6.8 of the Local Government Act 199 provides that –

(1) A local government is not to incur expenditure from its municipal fund for an additional purpose except where the expenditure —

(a) is incurred in a financial year before the adoption of the annual budget by the local government; or

(b) is authorised in advance by resolution; or*

(c) is authorised in advance by the mayor or president in an emergency.

** Absolute majority required.*

(1a) In subsection (1) —

***additional purpose** means a purpose for which no expenditure estimate is included in the local government's annual budget.*

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.

RISK APPETITE & TOLERANCE STATEMENTS

CITY OF VINCENT

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 IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade to Stiles Electrical & Communication Services 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 maintains a low appetite for contractor failure, including risks such as delays, breaches of contract, or underperformance that could impact project delivery. The recommended contractor demonstrated the highest ranking in both qualitative and value for money assessments, evidencing strong capability, relevant experience, and a thorough understanding of the project requirements.

  The contractor has a proven history of successful delivery on similar projects, including those in complex community settings, providing confidence in their capacity to meet the City's quality and timeliness expectations. Although the submission contained a number of critical assumptions, the Evaluation Panel concluded that these would not materially affect delivery or contractual obligations. Any potential risks identified are manageable through clear contract administration and pre-construction clarifications, ensuring continuity and minimising delivery risk.

- **Procurement Failure**
  The City has a low risk appetite for procurement outcomes that result in poor value for money, substandard service, or financial loss. The recommended contractor offered the most competitive pricing combined with a compliant and high-quality submission, ranking highest in both qualitative and price evaluations. This outcome reflects a robust and transparent procurement process that aligns with the City's commitment to securing value, quality, and reliability in its contracts. The contractor's full compliance with specifications and contractual terms, with no departures identified, further mitigates procurement failure risks.

- **Zero Tolerance – Safety Risk**
  The City has zero tolerance for any procurement decisions that could lead to harm to staff or the community. The recommended contractor has demonstrated adherence to relevant safety standards, regulatory compliance, and effective risk mitigation procedures. No safety concerns or risks to the City's workforce or community were identified in the evaluation process. This alignment with safety expectations supports the City's mandate to protect all stakeholders throughout the project duration.

- **Reputational and Strategic Risk**
  In addition to operational and safety considerations, the contractor's submission supports the City's broader sustainability and reconciliation objectives. This alignment mitigates reputational risk by ensuring that the project is delivered in a manner consistent with the City's values and strategic goals, enhancing community confidence and stakeholder engagement.

Given the above, the recommended decision to award the contract to Stiles Electrical & Communication Services Pty Ltd is considered low risk, aligns with the City's risk appetite and tolerance statements, and ensures delivery of a critical community infrastructure project in a financially sound, safe, and operationally robust manner.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

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

Enhanced Environment

Our parks and reserves are maintained, enhanced and are accessible for all members of the community.

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

Sustainable Energy Use/Greenhouse Gas Emission Reduction

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPLICATIONS:

This is in keeping with the following priority health outcomes of the City's *Public Health Plan 2020-2025*:

Increased mental health and wellbeing

Increased physical activity

FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

Funding for the Litis Stadium Floodlighting is as follows:

- State Government Election Commitment - $800,000
- City of Vincent 2025/2026 Budget - $140,000

Total - $940,000

COMMENTS:

The tender submission from **Stiles Electrical & Communication Services Pty Ltd** complies fully with all tender requirements and was presented to a consistently high standard. The submission demonstrated a comprehensive and detailed understanding of the project requirements, responding to the specifications in a clear, thorough, and professional manner. The Evaluation Panel assessed the response as well-structured, credible, and closely aligned with the City's expectations regarding capability, capacity, and relevant experience.

Stiles Electrical & Communication Services Pty Ltd achieved the highest ranking in the qualitative assessment and submitted a competitive price that is below the City's approved budget. The submission presents an optimal balance between quality and cost, while maintaining strong risk mitigation strategies and a detailed delivery methodology tailored to the project.

While the tender included several critical assumptions, the Evaluation Panel carefully reviewed these and concluded that they do not pose a material risk to the successful delivery of the contract. These assumptions primarily reflect clarifications rather than exclusions and demonstrate the respondent's sound understanding of the site and the City's operational requirements.

Consistent with the City's low risk appetite for third-party and procurement failure, the submission presents a low level of contractual and operational risk.

Accordingly, the Evaluation Panel recommends the award of Request for Tender IE430/2025 Litis Stadium Floodlighting Upgrade to **Stiles Electrical & Communication Services Pty Ltd**.