

INDEX
(28 January 2003)

ITEM	REPORT DESCRIPTION	PAGE
7.1	Perth Oval, Pier Street, Perth – Final Settlement of Embassy Caterers’ Sub-Lease and Agreement	3
7.2	Independent Organisational Review Tender 247/02 - Appointment of Consultant	7
14.	CLOSURE	31

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Council of the Town of Vincent held at the Administration and Civic Centre, 244 Vincent Street, Leederville, on Tuesday, 28 January 2003 commencing at 6.03pm.

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Presiding Member, Mayor Nick Catania, JP declared the meeting open at 6.03pm.

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/MEMBERS ON APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

(a) Apologies/Absent:

Nil.

(b) Present:

Mayor Nick Catania, JP	Presiding Member
Cr Simon Chester	Mt Hawthorn Ward
Cr Caroline Cohen	North Perth Ward
Cr David Drewett, JP	Deputy Mayor - Mt Hawthorn Ward
Cr Helen Doran-Wu	Mt Hawthorn Ward
Cr Basil Franchina	Mt Hawthorn Ward
Cr Kate Hall	North Perth Ward
Cr Ian Ker	North Perth Ward
Cr Marilyn Piper, JP	North Perth Ward
John Giorgi, JP	Chief Executive Officer
Rob Boardman	Executive Manager, Environmental and Development Services (until 6.45pm)
Rick Lotznicher	Executive Manager, Technical Services
Mike Rootsey	Executive Manager, Corporate Services
Debbie Winfield	Minutes Secretary
Mark Fletcher	Journalist - Voice News
Ryan Sturman	Journalist - Guardian Express
Members of the Public	Nil.

(c) Members on Leave of Absence:

Nil.

3 (a) PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND RECEIVING OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Nil.

(b) RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTION TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil.

4. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

- 4.1 Cr Caroline Cohen requested leave of absence for the Special Meeting of Council to be held on 18 February 2003, and for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 25 February 2003, due to overseas travel.

Moved Cr Ker, Seconded Cr Hall

That Council approve Cr Cohen's request for leave of absence for the Special Meeting of Council to be held on 18 February 2003, and for the Ordinary Meeting of Council to be held on 25 February 2003.

CARRIED (9-0)

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

Mayor Nick Catania advised that the Australia Day Citizenship Ceremony, held on 26 January 2003, at Royal Park, had been well attended. It was held in conjunction with the highly successful Vincent Photographic Competition.

6. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

- 6.1 Cr Ian Ker declared an interest of impartiality in Item 7.2 relating to Tender No. 247/02 – Independent Organisational Review. His interest being that he has worked with some of the consultants and may do so in the future.
- 6.2 Chief Executive Officer, John Giorgi, declared an interest of impartiality in Item 7.2 relating to Tender No. 247/02 – Independent Organisational Review. His interest being that he has had a professional association with a number of the tenderers. The association being that, in his capacity as Chief Executive Officer, he has had previous professional dealings or contact with a number of the persons associated with the tenders as follows;
- Stamford Advisors and Consultants Pty Ltd - the Client Relationship Manager, Mr Greg Allard was a previous employee at the former City of Perth in the early-mid 1980s - the CEO, in his former capacity at the City of Perth, had minor dealings with Mr Allard - there has been no further contact with him since the mid 1980s.
 - Corporate and Regional Enterprise Consulting - the CEO is aware of two of the Directors, Mr Gary Brennan and Mr Murray Jorgensen - he has met both of these gentlemen professionally on one or two occasions at professional conferences over the previous 10 years.
 - Ernst and Young - the Project Specialist Advisor, Mr Garry Hunt, was a former CEO for over seven years at the City of Perth. There was extensive professional contact from 1994 to 2000 during the re-structure of the City of Perth and the formation of the Town of Vincent.
 - Deloitte Touche Tomatsu - this organisation were the Town's auditors from 1994 to 2001. A Director of this organisation, Mr Graham McHarrie, is the Project Advisor in this tender - the CEO has had a reasonable amount of professional contact with Mr McHarrie during his role as the Town's auditor.

As a consequence, there may be a perception that his impartiality in this matter may be affected. He declared that he has considered the tender on its merits and prepared the report without any bias.

7.1 Perth Oval, Pier Street, Perth – Final Settlement of Embassy Caterers’ Sub-Lease and Agreement

Ward:	North Perth	Date:	24 January 2003
Precinct:	Beaufort, P13	File Ref:	RES0051
Reporting Officer(s):	D. Brits, R Boardman		
Checked/Endorsed by:	John Giorgi		
Amended by:	-		

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council;

- (1) *RECEIVES the Progress Report relating to the final settlement of Embassy Caterers’ sub-lease and agreement at Perth Oval, Pier Street, Perth;*
- (2) *APPROVES BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY to re-allocate \$5,000 from the Town’s Emergency Building Fund for the purchase from Embassy Caterers of the listed catering items and equipment at Perth Oval (as detailed in this report); and*
- (3) *NOTES that;*
 - (i) *the Special Facility Liquor Licence held by Embassy Caterers at Perth Oval is to be removed in accordance with the Liquor Licensing Act, 1988 (as amended); and*
 - (ii) *subject to Council approval, Embassy Caterers will vacate Perth Oval by Friday, 31 January 2003.*

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 7.1

Moved Cr Drewett, Seconded Cr Ker

That the recommendation be adopted.

CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY (9-0)

BACKGROUND:

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 26 March 2002, the Council;

- “(i) *approved the use of Perth Oval by Perth Glory Soccer Club (PGSC) (other than the areas used by East Perth Football Club’s office and the former caretaker’s house and an area in the upper grandstand which is to be set aside specifically for use by the Town) on a monthly basis from 1 April 2002 until 1 October 2003, for use for soccer games, training and other associated purposes.*
- (ii) *approved of Embassy Caterers to continue as monthly tenants at Perth Oval, until 1 February 2003.”*

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 27 August 2002, Council resolved inter-alia;

“That the Council NOTES that agreement has been reached between Embassy Caterers and Perth Glory Soccer Club for the use of the Perth Oval Function Hall for use period 1 September 2002 to 1 February 2003.”

An "Agreement for the Interim Use of the Perth Oval Function Hall" was signed by Embassy Caterers, Perth Glory Soccer Club Pty Ltd and the Town on 19 August 2002. This has been most satisfactory to all parties.

The Town's current "Agreement for the Interim Use of the Perth Oval Function Hall" expires on 1 February 2003. Essential kitchen/catering equipment, fittings and fixtures belong to Embassy Caterers.

Embassy Caterers wrote to the Town on 11 December 2002 advising that they intend to surrender their Special Facility Licence, effective from 1 February 2003. In addition, they indicated that they would remove their catering fittings or alternatively these can be purchased by the Town.

On 6 January 2003 Messrs Ray Harby and Alan Burgess of Embassy Caterers requested a site meeting with the Town's Acting Manager Health Services, and Property Maintenance Officer to progress matters. Consequently, the meeting was conducted and a negotiated agreement was reached.

DETAILS:

The City of Perth approved of Embassy Caterer's original sub-lease agreement in 1986. This sub-lease agreement did not adequately itemise Council equipment details. Furthermore, fixture description or the future ownership of fixtures was omitted. Clause 11.1.3 of the sub-lease states that; *"the Lessee may remove from the demised premises all or any of the Lessee's partitions or Lessee's fixtures and fittings subject to the Lessee making good any damage to the demised premises caused thereby."*

Embassy Caterers advised that costs incurred to provide minimum catering facilities since 1986 included \$23,000 for the Main Function Hall (Loton Hall), \$10,230 for necessary plant and equipment, \$4,000 for coolroom and \$1,000 for alarm system. Documentary evidence was submitted to verify this claim.

Whilst many of the items are old and at the end of their useful life, they nevertheless are required for use at Perth Oval and meet the Town's needs until the Multi Purpose Rectangular Sports Stadium is constructed.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

An assessment was conducted by the Town of relevant items, and tentative valuation figures are as follows:

No	Function Hall Kitchen	Embassy Caterers Valuation	Officer Recommendation
1	Arcus walk-in Coolroom	\$ 2,500	\$ Nil <i>(Considered a Fixture)</i>
1	Goldstein 8 burner stove with oven	1,500	1,000
1	Waldorf deep fryer	500	400
1	Eswood X A model dishwasher	100	Nil <i>(Requires Repair)</i>
2	Stainless steel benches with shelf under	1,000	500
1	Fire Extinguisher	150	150
1	Fire Blanket	20	20
1	Freestanding shelving in Coolroom	350	350
1	Security System	500	Nil <i>(Considered a Fixture)</i>

	Function Hall Men's Toilet		
1	Bobrick hot air hand dryer	Nil	Nil
1	Safe	Nil	Nil
	Function Hall Bar		
1	Norris model E glass washer	450	450
	Function Hall		
4	Evaporative air conditioners	No charge	Nil; Replacement due
1	Fire Extinguisher	150	130
1	Carpet as laid	2,000	2,000
	Total	\$9,220	\$5,000

Embassy Caterers indicated in writing that a settlement figure of \$5,000 will be accepted for all the above items.

Written agreement was received from Embassy Caterers on 23 January 2003, as follows;

"We, Messrs Raymond Arthur Harby and Alan Burgess on behalf of Embassy Caterers/Lamberg Pty Ltd/New Embassy Caterers on 23 January 2003 accept the "job lot" offer for all our catering equipment/fixtures at Perth Oval as itemised and submitted to the Town for a full, total, and final \$5,000 payment, and surrender all keys, agreements, lessee rights, and sub-lease rights particularly those obtained through the East Perth Football Club/Council concerning Perth Oval, and will vacate accordingly by Friday 31 January 2003."

The Town's Budget 2002-2003 does not contain any monies for the purchase of catering equipment at Perth Oval, as this was unforeseen. Accordingly, an Absolute Majority decision of the Council to re-allocate monies is required.

The monies can be re-allocated from the "Emergency Building Fund Account" which currently has funds of \$38,709.99. Once approved by the Council, the equipment will become the property of the Town and will be recorded as assets.

LEGAL/POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

Sub-Lease Conditions upon Vacation

The sub-lease states;

"11.1.2 The Lessee shall peaceably and quietly deliver up possession of the demised premises in such good and substantial repair, order and condition as shall be consistent with the covenants herein contained in that behalf;

11.1.3 The Lessee may remove from the demised premises all or any of the Lessee's partitions or Lessee's fixtures and fittings subject to the Lessee making good any damage to the demised premises caused thereby."

The "Agreement for the Interim Use of the Perth Oval Function Hall" expires on 1 February 2003.

The Director of Liquor Licensing of the Department of Racing, Gaming and Liquor should be advised that the Liquor Licence in relation to Perth Oval is to be surrendered and removed in accordance with the Liquor Licensing Act, 1988 (as amended).

COMMENTS:

It is considered reasonable for the Town to pay for items at Perth Oval, which were provided by Embassy Caterers. As much of the equipment is old and nearing the end of its useful life, a payment of \$5,000 has been accepted by Embassy Caterers.

To replace the necessary items will be more expensive for the Town. Accordingly, it is mutually beneficial for both Embassy Caterers and the Town for the negotiated agreement to be approved by the Council.

7.2 Independent Organisational Review Tender 247/02 - Appointment of Consultant

Ward:	Both	Date:	24 January 2003
Precinct:	-	File Ref:	ADM0061
Reporting Officer(s):	John Giorgi		
Checked/Endorsed by:	-		
Amended by:	-		

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION:

That the Council ACCEPTS the tender submitted by Corporate and Regional Enterprise Consulting (CARE) at a cost of \$79,500 (plus \$7,950 GST) as being the most acceptable to the Town to carry out the Independent Organisational Review.

COUNCIL DECISION ITEM 7.2

Moved Cr Drewett, Seconded Cr Piper

That the recommendation be adopted.

Debate ensued.

At 6.24pm **Moved Cr Piper, Seconded Cr Hall**

That STANDING ORDERS be suspended in order to discuss this matter.

CARRIED (9-0)

Debate ensued.

At 6.55pm **Moved Cr Franchina, Seconded Cr Hall**

That STANDING ORDERS be resumed.

CARRIED (9-0)

MOTION CARRIED (5-4)

For

Mayor Catania
Cr Chester
Cr Cohen
Cr Doran-Wu
Cr Ker

Against

Cr Drewett
Cr Franchina
Cr Hall
Cr Piper

BACKGROUND:

At the Council Meeting held on 3 December 2002, the Council received a report relating to the proposed Independent Organisational Review and resolved inter alia as follows:

“That the Council;

- (i) APPROVES of the Independent Organisational Review Project Objectives, Outcomes, Project Brief and Selection Criteria, as shown in Appendix 10.4.2;*
- (ii) AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise a tender inviting suitably qualified and experienced persons and/or organisations to carry out the Independent Organisational Review;*
- (iii) calls a Special Meeting of Council to be held on 28 January 2003 to consider the awarding of the tender for the Independent Organisational Review; and*

PRE TENDER ENQUIRIES:

The tender was advertised on 7, 11 and 14 December 2002. The CEO met with six (6) organizations who requested a meeting and also responded to telephone calls and enquiries.

TENDERS RECEIVED:

Documentation was requested by approximately forty-two (42) consultants/persons and at the close of the tender period (24 December 2002) twelve (12) tenders were received as follows:

	COMPANY	QUOTED AMOUNT (Inc GST)
1	Equal Management Services	\$45,496.00
2	Stamford's Advisers & Consultants Pty Ltd	\$65,428.00
3	Estill & Associates Pty Ltd	\$71,227.00
4	Westmorland Consulting Group	\$72,435.00
5	Corporate and Regional Enterprise (CARE) Consulting	\$87,450.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	\$99,000.00
7	Newshore Consortium Pty Ltd	\$101,226.00
8	Ernst & Young Australia	\$102,465.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	\$108,460.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	\$108,900.00
11	Crew Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	\$127,193.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers (Alternative Tender)	\$165,000.00

EVALUATION PANEL:

The Evaluation Panel consisted of Chief Executive Officer, John Giorgi, Executive Manager Environmental & Development Services, Rob Boardman, and Executive Manager Corporate Services, Mike Rootsey.

All tenderers were interviewed by the Evaluation Panel on 27 and 28 December 2002 for one hour each. This enabled the panel to verify various aspects of the tender documentation and also for the tenderers to explain their tender.

Each tender was assessed in accordance with an Evaluation Assessment Matrix as shown below:

0-1	Inadequate or non-appropriate offer, critical or disqualifying deficiencies, does not meet criterion, unacceptably high risk to Principal.
2-3	Marginal offer, some deficiencies, partly meets criterion, high risk to Principal.
4-5	Fair offer, few deficiencies, almost meets criterion, medium risk to Principal.
6-7	Good offer, no deficiencies, meets criterion, medium to low risk to Principal.
8-9	Very good offer, exceeds criterion, low risk to Principal.
10	Outstanding offer, greatly exceeds criterion, very low risk to Principal.

(Scoring was calculated using the criterion weighting)

TENDER EVALUATION:

The following weighted criteria was used for the selection of the consultant for this project.

Criteria	%	Weighting
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge and experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>10</p> <p>15</p>	<p>25%</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person(s)</p> <p>Credentials (i.e. formal qualifications and experience) of key person(s)</p> <p>Role of the key person(s) in the project</p>	<p>5</p> <p>5</p>	<p>10%</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>10</p> <p>5</p> <p>5</p>	<p>20%</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Demonstrate your understanding of the required service by identifying the key issues associated with delivering the project</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues.</p>	<p>8</p> <p>7</p>	<p>15%</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal</p> <p>This contract is offered on a lump sum fee basis. Include in the lump sum fee all fees, any other costs and disbursements to provide the required service and the appropriate level of the Goods and Services Tax (GST)</p>	<p>30</p>	<p>30%</p>
<p>TOTAL</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>100%</p>

TENDER EVALUATION:

The tender weighted criteria was used for the selection of the consultants for this project. Consultants addressed the selection criteria in their tender. All tenders were assessed by the Evaluation Panel and the following is a summary;

TENDER EVALUATION SUMMARY:

Criteria	%	Equal	Samford	Estill	Westmorland	CARE Consult	Hall Chadwick	Newshore	Ernst & Young	Mainsheet	Deloitte	Crew Sharp
1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews												
Demonstrated knowledge and experience in organisational reviews	10	5.67	7.0	7.83	7.17	9.00	9.00	8.00	9.00	8.33	9.00	7.00
Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project.	15	7.33	10.50	11.67	11.17	14.00	14.17	12.67	14.00	13.17	13.83	11.33
1.2 Relevant experience of key person(s)												
Credentials (i.e. formal qualifications and experience) of key person(s).	5	3.17	3.83	4.17	3.83	4.67	4.83	4.17	4.83	4.67	4.67	3.67
Role of the key person(s) in the project.	5	2.83	3.67	3.83	4.00	5.00	4.83	4.17	4.50	4.67	4.67	3.83
1.3 Methodology												
Proposed methodology for this project.	10	5.67	5.83	7.67	7.00	8.83	8.67	8.50	9.17	8.33	8.83	6.67
Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results.	5	3.17	3.50	4.00	3.83	4.50	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.67	4.50	3.50
Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature	5	3.17	3.50	4.00	3.33	4.50	4.83	3.67	4.50	4.33	4.50	3.50
1.4 Key Issues												
Demonstrate your understanding of the required service by identifying the key issues associated with delivering the project.	8	3.83	5.00	5.67	5.33	7.33	7.17	6.33	6.83	6.50	6.83	5.67
Explain how you intend to address these issues.	7	3.00	4.50	6.00	5.33	6.50	6.67	6.17	6.50	6.17	6.50	4.67
1.5 Fee Proposal												
This contract is offered on a lump sum fee basis. Include in the lump sum fee all fees, any other costs and disbursements to provide the required service and the appropriate level of the Goods and Services Tax (GST)	30	30.00	27.20	24.48	21.76	19.04	16.32	13.60	10.88	8.16	5.44	2.72
	100	67.83	74.53	79.31	72.76	83.37	80.99	71.27	74.71	68.99	68.71	52.55
Ranking		10th	5th	3rd	6th	1st	2nd	7th	4th	8th	9th	11th

Note:

Town to provide on-site accommodation for the consulting team if required.

A detailed summary of each tender and a breakdown of the time allocated to each objective is shown at the end of this report.

Indicative Timeline:

Corporate and Regional Enterprise (CARE) Consulting have submitted the following timeline. This complies with the Council tender requirement. Indicative dates have been included. This consultant has confirmed that they are available to commence on 3 February 2003.

Objective	Timeline
Strategy	3 February – 14 February 2003 (2 weeks)
Organisational Structure Review	10 February – 4 April 2003 (8 weeks)
Governance	12 February – 28 February 2003 (2.5 weeks)
Human Resources & Performance Management	10 February – 28 February 2003 (3 weeks)
Financial Performance & Accountability	24 February – 14 March 2003 (3 weeks)
Financial Accountability – Business and Services	24 February – 14 March 2003 (3 weeks)
Human Resources Survey	17 February – 14 March 2003 (4 weeks)
Process & Procedures	17 February – 14 March 2003 (4 weeks)
Financial Implications & Accountability	10 March – 28 March 2003 (3 weeks)
Human Resources – Senior Executive	10 March – 28 March 2003 (3 weeks)
Draft Final Report	31 March - 8 April 2003 (1.5 week)
Present Final Report	8 April – 14 April 2003 (1 week)

CONSULTATION/ADVERTISING:

The tender was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper on 7, 11 & 14 December 2002, the Town's website and Public Noticeboard with tenders closing on 24 December 2002.

LEGAL/POLICY:

Nil. The tender submissions are "*Laid on the Table*".

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS:

The Independent Organisational Review is not listed in the Town's Strategic Plan.

FINANCIAL/BUDGET IMPLICATIONS:

An amount of \$75,000 is included in the Town's 2002/03 Budget for this review. The recommended tender is \$4,500 over the budgeted amount (excluding GST). It should be noted that the Town will recoup the GST.

COMMENT:

The tenders submitted were of a high standard and in the main, demonstrated a good understanding of the project.

The recommended consultants demonstrated a very high knowledge of local government and have had extensive experience with various local governments.

SUMMARY OF TENDERS:

1. Equal Management Services

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p><u>Limited</u> experience with local government - Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale, City of Bunbury minor works. Experience with several private companies.</p> <p>The principal is a qualified engineer supported by a principal consultant in human resource management and certified practising accountant.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>Whilst individuals are suitably qualified in their own fields there is an overall lack of local government knowledge and experience.</p> <p>The project manager's role is limited to 74 hours, principal consultants limited to 148 hours total with the bulk of the hours (324) being carried out by a research admin assistant.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Basic methodology listed – however indicated "a more detailed Assignment Plan would be developed at the commencement of contract".</p> <p>Basic methodology listed - however indicated "a more detailed Assignment Plan would be developed at the commencement of contract".</p> <p>Basic methodology listed - however indicated "a more detailed Assignment Plan would be developed at the commencement of contract".</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Basic methodology listed - however indicated "a more detailed Assignment Plan would be developed at the commencement of contract".</p> <p>Basic methodology listed - however indicated "a more detailed Assignment Plan would be developed at the commencement of contract".</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$45,496 (Lowest) -</p> <p>NOTE: Objective 9 - Financial Implications and Accountability and Objective 11 - Timeline and Reporting - hours not specified. Stated at interview that these are included as part of the overall project. There is some question that this may be a non-conforming tender.</p>

2. Stamford's Advisers & Consultants

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Considerable experience with Private Sector reviews. Extensive experience in Public and Private Sector auditing. <u>Limited</u> local government organisation review experience.</p> <p>Considerable experience to address issues however, there is a strong focus towards financial accountability and business units.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The partners have extensive qualifications in business and finance. The use of a licensed local government investigator with considerable experience has been included into the project team.</p> <p>The partners will be used to varying degrees in this project.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$65,428</p>

3. Estill & Associates Pty Ltd

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Considerable experience. Specialises in Public Sector management and policy. Major works at Water Corporation and DOLA. <u>Limited</u> local government work - Joondalup, and Claremont.</p> <p>Considerable experience to address issues however, there is a strong focus towards financial accountability and business units.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The partners have extensive qualifications in business and finance. The use of a licensed local government investigator with considerable experience has been included into the project team.</p> <p>The partners will be used to varying degrees in this project.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$71,227</p>

4. Westmorland Consulting Group

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Considerable experience with Private Sector reviews. Extensive experience in Public and Private Sector human resource management. <u>Limited</u> local government organisation review experience.</p> <p>Considerable experience to address issues however, there is a strong focus towards human resource management.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The partners have extensive qualifications in human resource management. The use of a senior consultant with considerable business and financial experience has been included in the project..</p> <p>The partners will be used to varying degrees in this project.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$72,435</p>

5. CARE Consulting and Regional Enterprises Consultants in conjunction with Murray Jorgensen & Associates and AMD Chartered Accountants

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Extensive local government experience including Joondalup, Bunbury, Bridgetown Greenbushes, South Perth, Geraldton, Ravensthorpe, Bunbury Port Authority, Albany, Serpentine-Jarrahdale and numerous private companies.</p> <p>The principals of this company have extensive local government experience at a senior level including administration and liaison with Elected Members.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>Gary Brennan - extensive qualifications in local government, 12 years as CEO in various local governments, management, MBA, Director Bunbury Port Authority and various other organisations.</p> <p>Murray Jorgensen - OAM, JP, extensive qualifications in local government, 15 years as CEO, currently Chairman of the Forrest Products Commission.</p> <p>Robyn Morris - 15 years university lecturing in business marketing, MA, extensive academic history, 9 years consulting experience.</p> <p>AMD - is one of the largest regional accounting firms in WA with 50 employees, extensive local government experience.</p> <p>The principals of this consulting group will be <u>directly</u> carrying out this work.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$87,450</p>

6. Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p><u>Extensive</u> including Cities of Stirling, Joondalup, of Perth, Gosnells, various country local governments and numerous Public Sector organisations.</p> <p>The principals of this company have extensive experience at a senior level in a wide range of disciplines necessary to carry out this project.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The project principals have extensive qualifications and experience in the various disciplines.</p> <p>The principals of this consulting group will be carrying out this work to varying degrees.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$99,000</p>

7. Newshore Consortium Pty Ltd

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Considerable experience with private sector reviews. Limited local government local government organisational review experience.</p> <p>The principals of this company have extensive experience in a wide range of disciplines to carry out this project. However, strong emphasis on human resources/survey.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The project principals have extensive qualifications and experience in the various disciplines including accountancy, business and marketing strategy and human resources.</p> <p>The principals of this consortium will be carrying out this work to varying degrees.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$101,226</p>

8. Ernst & Young Australia

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p><u>Extensive</u> experience including Cities of Fremantle and Perth, Towns of Cambridge and Claremont, educational, government departments, sporting agencies and private sector.</p> <p>The principals of this company have extensive local government experience at a senior level, including administration and liaising with Elected Members.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The principals of this company have extensive experience at a senior level in a wide range of disciplines necessary to carry out this project. The use of an experienced local government consultant (former CEO) has been included in the project team.</p> <p>The principals of this company will be directly carrying out this project to varying degrees.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$102,465</p>

9. Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Considerable experience, including government departments and the private sector. <u>Limited local government work and experience.</u></p> <p>The principals of this company have extensive experience at a senior level in a wide range of disciplines necessary to carry out this project.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The principals of this company have extensive qualifications and experience in the various disciplines, with considerable business and financial experience included in the project.</p> <p>The principals of this company will be directly carrying out this project to varying degrees.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$108,460</p>

10. Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p><u>Extensive</u> local government experience including Cities of Belmont, Subiaco, Wanneroo, Towns of Cambridge and Victoria Park as well as public sector organisations.</p> <p>The principals of this company have extensive experience at a senior level in a wide range of disciplines necessary to carry out this project.</p> <p>This organization was the Town's external auditors from 1994 until 2001, and therefore have a good knowledge of the Town.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>The principals of this company have extensive qualifications and experience in the various disciplines</p> <p>The principals of this company will be directly carrying out this project to varying degrees.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Very detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$108,900</p>

11. Crew Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting

Criteria	Comments
<p>1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews</p> <p>Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project</p>	<p>Extensive experience in public and private sector. Limited local government organisational review experience.</p> <p>Considerable experience to address issues however, there is a strong focus towards financial and human resource management.</p>
<p>1.2 Relevant experience of key person</p> <p>Credentials of key person</p> <p>Role of the key person in the project</p>	<p>Whilst the individuals are suitably qualified in their own fields, there is a lack of local government knowledge and experience.</p> <p>The partners will be used to varying degrees in this project.</p>
<p>1.3 Methodology</p> <p>Proposed methodology for this project</p> <p>Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results</p> <p>Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.4 Key Issues</p> <p>Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated</p> <p>Explain how you intend to address these issues</p>	<p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p> <p>Detailed and satisfactorily meets criteria.</p>
<p>1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)</p>	<p>\$127,193</p>

12. Genesis Business Advisers (Alternative Tender)

Criteria	Comments
1.1 Professional expertise and relevant experience in organisational reviews Demonstrated knowledge & experience in organisational reviews Capacity to address the range of technical aspects involved in the project	Not stipulated. Not stipulated.
1.2 Relevant experience of key person Credentials of key person Role of the key person in the project	Not stipulated. Not stipulated.
1.3 Methodology Proposed methodology for this project Previous methodology in relevant projects and demonstrated evidence of successful results Demonstrated experience in relevant projects of a similar nature	Not stipulated. Not stipulated. Not stipulated.
1.4 Key Issues Key Issues satisfactorily demonstrated Explain how you intend to address these issues	Not stipulated. Not stipulated.
1.5 Fee Proposal (inc GST)	\$165,000 (Highest)

Note: This tender was submitted as an alternative tender. It is the highest fee. As there are sufficient conforming tenders, this alternative tender should not be considered.

SUMMARY OF CONSULTANT HOURS AND COSTS**INDEPENDENT ORGANISATIONAL REVIEW**

No:	Company	Hours	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	546	45,496.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	715	65,428.00
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	568	71,227.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	439	72,435.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	530	87,450.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	1,030	99,000.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	818	101,226.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	455	102,465.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	830	108,460.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	710	108,900.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	775	127,193.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	165,000.00
	Average	674	89,934.55
	Median	530	87,450.00

OBJECTIVE – STRATEGY

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	55	4,166	417	4,583.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	25	2,050	205	2,255.00
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	24	2,736	273	3,009.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	33	4,950	495	5,445.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	80	12,000	1,200	13,200.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	85	8,500	850	9,350.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	80	7,200	720	7,920.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	40	8,900	890	9,790.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	90	11,200	1,120	12,320.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	40	5,400	540	5,940.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	100	16,000	1,600	17,600.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	59			8,310.18
	Median	40			

OBJECTIVE – ORGANISATIONAL REVIEW

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	50	3,787	379	4,166.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	86	7,052	705.20	7,757.20
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	44	5,016	501	5,517.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	56	8,400	840	9,240.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	50	7,500	750	8,250.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	145	11,500	1,150	12,650.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	80	9,600	960	10,560.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	40	7,850	785	8,635.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	105	12,,200	1,220	13,420.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	50	7,200	720	7,920.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	33	4,455	445	4,900.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	67			8,455.93
	Median	50			

OBJECTIVE – GOVERNANCE

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	55	4,166	417	4,583.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	22	1,804	180.40	1,984.40
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	60	6,840	684	7,524.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	32	4,800	480	5,280.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	80	12,000	1,200	13,200.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	75	6,000	600	6,600.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	60	4,800	480	5,280.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	30	5,850	585	6,435.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	75	9,500	950	10,450.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	40	6,400	640	7,040.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	13	1,755	175	1,930.50
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	49			6,391.54
	Median	32			

OBJECTIVE – HUMAN RESOURCES & PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	65	4,924	492	5,416.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	84.5	6,929	692.90	7,621.90
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	40	4,560	456	5,016.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	41	6,150	615	6,765.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	40	6,000	600	6,600.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	90	8,500	850	9,350.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	75	9,000	900	9,900.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	40	7,900	790	8,690.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	75	8,900	890	9,790.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	35	4,700	470	5,170.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	121	19,965	1,996	21,961.50
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	64			8,752.76
	Median	41			

OBJECTIVE – FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	65	4,924	492	5,416.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	42.5	3,485	348.50	3,833.50
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	40	4,560	456	5,016.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	28	4,200	420	4,620.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	45	6,750	675	7,425.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	100	9,000	900	9,900.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	90	7,200	720	7,920.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	45	8,875	887.50	9,762.50
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	65	8,600	860	9,460.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	40	5,400	540	5,940.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	90	14,850	1,485	15,840.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	59			7,739.36
	Median	45			

OBJECTIVE – FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY -BUSINESS AND SERVICES

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	66	5,000	500	5,500.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	105	8,610	861	9,471.00
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	40	4,560	456	5,016.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	30	4,500	450	4,950.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	45	6,750	675	7,425.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	125	11,000	1,100	12,100.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	80	6,000	600	6,600.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	50	12,500	1,250	13,750.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	75	8,200	820	9,020.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	80	11,600	1,160	12,760.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	110	17,600	1,760	19,360.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	73			9,632.00
	Median	66			

OBJECTIVE – HUMAN RESOURCES SURVEY

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	80	6,060	606	6,666.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	96.5	7,913	791.30	8,704.30
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	40	4,560	456	5,016.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	38	5,700	570	6,270.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	60	9,000	900	9,900.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	55	4,000	400	4,400.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	130	15,764	1,576	17,340.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	30	5,000	500	5,500.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	65	8,900	890	9,790.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	90	12,900	1,290	14,190.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	99	9,405	940	10,345.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	71			8,920.12
	Median	60			

OBJECTIVE – PROCESS AND PROCEDURES

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	60	4,546	454	5,000.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	88	7,216	721.6	7,937.60
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	60	6,840	684	7,524.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	56	8,400	840	9,240.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	40	6,000	600	6,600.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	150	10,500	1,050	11,550.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	585	20,100	2,010	22,110.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	65	12,825	1,282.50	14,107.50
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	85	10,800	1,080	11,880.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	140	20,200	2,020	22,220.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	89	13,350	1,335	14,685.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	129			12,077.65
	Median	65			

OBJECTIVE – FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS AND ACCOUNTABILITY

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	0	0	0	0.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	91	7,462	746.20	8,202.20
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	40	4,560	456	5,016.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	52	7,800	780	8,580.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	40	6,000	600	6,600.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	90	9,000	900	9,900.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	48	5,760	576	6,336.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	35	8,750	875	9,625.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	60	5,300	530	5,830.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	55	7,700	770	8,470.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	80	12,800	1,280	14,080.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	54			7,512.65
	Median	55			

OBJECTIVE – HUMAN RESOURCES – SENIOR EXECUTIVES

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	50	3,787	379	4,166.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	14.5	1,189	118.90	1,307.90
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	40	4,560	456	5,016.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	28	4,200	420	4,620.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	20	3,000	300	3,300.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	35	3,500	350	3,850.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	30	3,600	360	3,960.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	30	5,900	590	6,490.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	75	9,800	980	10,780.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	35	4,000	400	4,400.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	20	2,700	270	2,970.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	34			4,504.73
	Median	30			

OBJECTIVE – TIMELINE AND REPORTING

No:	Company	Hours	Fee	GST	Amount
1	Equal Management Services	0	0	0	0.00
2	Stamfords Advisers and Consultants Pty Ltd	60	4,920	492	5,412.00
3	Estill and Associates Pty Ltd	60	6,840	684	7,524.00
4	Westmoreland Consulting Services	45	6,750	675	7,425.00
5	Care Consulting and Regional Enterprise Consulting	30	4,500	450	4,950.00
6	Hall Chadwick Chartered Accountants & Business Advisers	80	8,500	850	9,350.00
7	Newshore Pty Ltd	40	3,000	300	3,300.00
8	Ernst and Young Australia	40	8,800	880	9,680.00
9	Mainsheet Corporate Pty Ltd	60	5,200	520	5,720.00
10	Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu	105	13,500	1,350	14,850.00
11	Crewe Sharp Pty Ltd/Maitland Consulting	20	3,300	330	3,520.00
12	Genesis Business Advisers* Alternative tender	0	0	0	0.00
	Average	49			6,521.00
	Median	45			

8. CLOSURE

Presiding Member, Mayor Catania JP, declared the Meeting closed at 7.00pm with Councillors Chester, Cohen, Doran-Wu, Drewett JP, Franchina, Hall, Ker and Piper JP, Chief Executive Officer, John Giorgi JP, Executive Manager Corporate Services, Mike Rootsey, Executive Manager Technical Services, Rick Lotznicher, Minutes Secretary, Debbie Winfield, Voice News journalist, Mark Fletcher and Guardian Express journalist, Ryan Sturman present.

Signed:Presiding Member
Mayor Nick Catania, JP

Dated this day of 2003