

Selection Process

A two staged select tender process was adopted to identify the most suitable firm to be recommended to Council as the principal design consultant for the SEC project.

Stage one was an open Expression of Interest (EOI) which elicited thirty submissions. These were assessed against a published criteria by a panel. Ten firms were shortlisted and interviewed.

Oversight of Probity Advisor

The appointed Probity Advisor for this project (Checks, Balances and Integrity Pty Ltd) has oversighted the entire EOI process.

EOI Evaluation Panel

The Evaluation Panel for this tender comprised of suitably qualified and experienced staff. The Evaluation Panel was responsible for the development of service specifications, evaluation criteria and evaluation of tender submissions. Council and external staff were on the Evaluation Panel.

Evaluation Process

Thirty (30) companies submitted a response to the EOI. To ensure a thorough evaluation of all EOI responses was undertaken and that risks associated with each tender response were effectively identified and considered, the Evaluation Panel considered the following evaluation methods:

- short-listing organisations that demonstrated relevant experience in similar performing arts spaces and evaluating them together as a panel against the selection criteria
- evaluating each submission individually against the selection criteria.

The Evaluation Panel determined that short-listing organisations that demonstrated relevant experience in similar performing arts spaces and evaluating them together as a panel against the selection criteria was the most suitable method.

EOI responses were evaluated and rated independently by each panel member based on each organisations experience in similar performing arts spaces. The Evaluation Panel reviewed each individual evaluation and determined a short-list of organisations.

Short Listing for Interviews

The Evaluation Plan allows the Evaluation Panel to shortlist Responding Organisations if they believe it to be beneficial to the EOI process. The Evaluation Panel determined that it would be beneficial to conduct interviews with short listed organisations to test their understanding of the projects vision (both Council's and their own) and key objectives.

In accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Evaluation Panel short listed the following submissions:

- Angelo Candalepas & Associates Pty Ltd
- Brewster Hjorth Architects
- Clarke Hopkins and Clarke Architects
- Conrad Gargett Ancher Mortlock Woolley
- Cox Architecture Pty Ltd
- dwp Australia Pty Ltd
- Francis-Jones Morehen Thorp Architects

- NBR Architecture
- Peter Hunt Architect
- TKD Architects

The Evaluation Panel determined that submissions from these Tenderers demonstrated their experience in similar performing arts spaces, particularly when compared to the other twenty (20) organisations.

Interviews

The Evaluation Panel conducted interviews with the ten (10) organisations. The Project Probitry Advisor was present at these interviews. The Evaluation Panel used the interview process to determine a level of assurance as to each organisations overall appreciation for the project including their own vision, objectives and definitions of a successful outcome in terms of design. On completion of the interviews, the Evaluation Panel, with assistance from the Probitry Advisor, reviewed each of the responses to determine which tenders would be recommended for further short-listing. Each panel member applied a Yes or No vote to each of the interviewed organisations and those organisations that achieved a unilateral Yes vote were further short-listed.

Conclusion

In accordance with the Evaluation Plan, the Evaluation Panel further short listed the following organisations to be invited to submit a proposal to Council via Request for Proposal / Selective Tender process:

- Cox Architecture Pty Ltd
- Francis-Jones Morehen Thorp Architects
- NBR Architecture

Stage 2

As part of Stage two Request for Proposal (RFP), the shortlisted were invited to submit tenders.

The three firms were required to submit the RFP tender in two (2) parts:

- Part A - Design Concept (creativity, client responsiveness, sustainability, context understanding)
- Part B – Value for Money (methodology, expertise, fees)

Two separate panels were established who undertook the following assessments:

- Part A – Design Concept evaluated by the independent Design Review Panel (DRP)
- Part B – Value for Money evaluated by the Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP)
- Part C – Combined assessment of Parts A and B, including community feedback by the Evaluation Panel

Design Review Panel

The DRP was responsible for the evaluation of tender submissions relating to Part A in accordance with sub-criteria detailed in the project brief. The DRP comprised suitably qualified and experienced members, being:

- Darlene van der Breggen – Strategic Design Advisor to the Government Architect NSW

- Colin Sargent – Senior Development Manager, Transport NSW
- Craig Gamble – Theatre Consultant, Setting Line Theatre Consulting

Tender Evaluation Panel

The TEP developed the service specifications and evaluation criteria and undertook the evaluation of tender submissions relating to Part B.

In addition to assessing Part B, the TEP also undertook the overall evaluation, incorporating the outcomes from the DRP's assessment of Part A and the community consultation feedback.

Evaluation

The extensive evaluation process included the following elements:

- cost reviews at 50% and 100% of concept design
- tenderer presentations to Councillors
- review of concept designs by the independent DRP
- community consultation
- elemental cost reviews and value management workshops
- review of fees and services

Criteria and weightings

The TEP determined the criteria and weighting for each part by which tenderers were assessed. A 0 to 10 scoring system with 10 being the highest score, was used to evaluate the effectiveness of tender responses against each selection criteria.

Part A Design Concept - Selection Criteria

- Creative
- User-Responsive
- Contextual
- Sustainable
- Value for Money

Part B Value for Money - Selection Criteria

- Project Methodology
- Design Team
- Services and Deliverables
- BIM Services
- Fess and Hourly Rates

Part C Combined assessment of Parts A and B, with community feedback - Selection Criteria

- Design Concept Part A
- Value for Money Part B
- Community Consultation
- Financial Capability
- WHS

- Environmental Practices

DRP evaluation of Part A (Concept Design)

The DRP evaluated each tender submission against the criteria using the agreed scoring method. The DRP also provided the TEP with a detailed DRP report to support their evaluation.

TEP evaluation of Part B (Value for Money)

The TEP analysed and evaluated the:

- fees associated with the required consultant and sub-consultant disciplines,
- resource allocation of each architectural firm and their nominated sub-consultants key staff and estimated number of hours allocated to the project, including hourly rates,
- tender submissions individually against the all selection criteria (except price) using the agreed scoring method, and
- scores for price were determined on the lump sum submitted by each tenderers.

This process ensured a thorough evaluation of tender responses and consideration of risk and merit associated with each tender response.

The TEP also undertook cost review and value management workshops to test each tenderer's understanding of functionality and satisfy themselves as to each tender's willingness and flexibility to respond to client needs.

Part C Combined assessment

In order to consider how best to reach an overall combined assessment, the TEP:

- conducted a detailed review of all scores and comments for Part A and Part B
- reviewed data of the Community Consultation process and agreed to convert into a score out of 10
- collated scores from Part A, Part B and Community Consultation to determine a total overall score for each Tenderer
- determined that the two highest scoring tenderers be invited for an interview to address possible risks identified during the evaluation process

Interviews

The TEP conducted interviews with the two tenderers in the presence of the Probity Advisor. The interviews were aimed at determining a level of assurance as to each tenderer's willingness to work effectively with Council and deliver design services that will achieve the functional design requirements and overall budget provisions of the project.

Community Engagement

Council actively sought community feedback on the design concepts, consistent with the objective to engage with community and stakeholder groups, and provide appropriate opportunities for collaboration and involvement through all stages of the project.

The consultation period between 20 March to 3 April and was widely promoted through Council’s website, social media and weekly newspaper advertisements. Videos and drawings could be viewed on Council’s website and in a dedicated consultation exhibit at the Sutherland Entertainment Centre. Feedback could be submitted online and on hard copy forms at the Entertainment Centre and Libraries. The digital reach during the consultation period was strong, with over 3,000 clicks to the dedicated consultation page on the website, and over 20,500 people reached on social media.

Community members were asked to indicate which of the four design elements appealed to them, being

- External Appearance
- Entrance and Foyer
- Theatre Experience
- Connection with the Park

A total of 423 submissions were received (noting that respondents could vote for more than one scheme). The most important element receiving the most responses was the external appearance, followed by the theatre experience. The entrance and foyer and connection to the park were valued equally and received fewer responses compared to the other two elements.

The table below details the responses received.

Tenderer	External appearance	Entrance and foyer	Theatre experience	Connection with the park
COX	185	153	138	122
FJMT	82	94	179	104
NBRS & CHROFI	278	275	220	295
Total responses	545	522	537	521

Probity

The independent probity advisor Checks, Balances and Integrity Pty Ltd has provided a fully compliant probity report for the tender process undertaken.