



Queenstown Lakes District Council Procurement Plan for Planning and Development Supplier Panels

Includes four separable disciplines:

- Resource Consents
- Planning Policy
- Development Engineering
- Technical Administration

C-25-155

Document development control	
Prepared by:	Rachel Beer
Position / title:	Manager Planning & Development Technical Support
Business unit:	Planning & Development
Document version:	1

Contents

Acronyms.....	4
Approvals.....	4
Authority to proceed to procurement.....	4
Authority of the budget.....	4
Authority of the evaluation criteria and methodology.....	5
Background.....	6
Proposed outcomes of this procurement.....	6
Historical Expenditure.....	7
Key Aspects.....	7
General features.....	7
Market Analysis.....	8
The supply market.....	8
All of Government Contracts.....	9
Competing buyers.....	10
Desired supplier relationship.....	10
Contract Types.....	11
Requirements and costs.....	11
Our requirements.....	11
Estimated Costs.....	11
Key Stakeholders.....	11
Internal Stakeholders.....	11
Communications.....	12
Updates to the Procurement Plan.....	12
Procurement Process.....	12
Type of procurement.....	12
Communication with the market.....	12
RFP Closing.....	13
Evaluation Model.....	13
Evaluation Panel.....	13
Timeline.....	13
Evaluation Methodology.....	14
Evaluation Method.....	14
Evaluation criteria and weighting.....	14
Contract Type.....	17
Risk Management.....	17

Contract Delivery	19
Draft Secondary Procurement Process	19
Appendix 1: Specification of requirements.....	20
Appendix 2: RiskRegister.....	22

Acronyms

The following acronyms are used in this document.

Acronym	Term
RFP	Request for Proposal
P&D	Planning & Development
SP	Service Panel

Approvals

Authority to proceed to procurement

Project sponsor	
Approval to:	Issue a Request for Proposals to the market for Planning & Development (Resource Consents, Planning Policy, Development Engineering, and Technical Administration), and award contracts to successful respondents.
RFP start:	TBC
Contract start:	1 July 2026
Conflict of Interest:	In signing this Procurement Plan, I also confirm I have no actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest.
Name:	Michelle Morss
Position/title:	Acting Chief Executive Officer
Signature:	Date:

Approval of the budget

Delegated financial authority holder			
Total cost:	\$54,000,000		
Full contract term:	Financial year	Amount	Funding type
	25/26	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
	26/27	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
	27/28	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
	28/29	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
	29/30	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
	30/31	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
	31/32	\$7,700,000NZD	OPEX
Name:	Michelle Morss		
Position/title:	Acting Chief Executive Officer		
Signature:	Date:		

Approval of the evaluation criteria and methodology

Subject matter expert	
Conflict of Interest:	In signing this Procurement Plan, I also confirm I have no actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest.
Name:	David Wallace
Position/title:	General Manager, Planning & Development
Signature:	Date:

Endorser	
Conflict of Interest:	In signing this Procurement Plan, I also confirm I have no actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest.
Name:	Pamela Parker
Position/title:	Procurement Manager
Signature:	Date: 25/02/2026

Background

This procurement plan outlines the establishment of a Service Panel (SP) to support the following teams within the Planning & Development department (P&D) with specialised expertise and operational support:

- Resource Consents
- Planning Policy
- Development Engineering
- Technical Administration

The primary objective of the proposed procurement is to establish a panel of suitably qualified contractors to support P&D in delivering services related to resource consents, district planning matters, development engineering, and operational support. The plan will have the benefit of facilitating the Strategy and Policy team using the same contractors for strategy work. This will enable Council to meet its statutory obligations under various legislations.

The P&D department uses a combination of internal and external resources to deliver these services. For this procurement, a clear distinction has been made between:

- Business as usual (BAU) processing tasks; and
- Specialist input which often requires engagement of external technical experts.

The BAU workload is met by internal staff and supplemented by external resources as needed, depending on application volumes and demand. Specialist input, however, typically requires targeted, external technical expertise.

The panel will consist of multiple contractors, each specialising in disciplines relevant to a Local Authority's needs and will cover a range of roles required across Council.

A panel model has been chosen as it provides a broader range of contractor options, access to various disciplines and the flexibility to engage resource as and when required.

The panel will be formulated to meet the current and future needs of our growing workforce.

Proposed outcomes of this procurement

The proposed outcomes of this procurement are to:

- Deliver increased public value through improvements in contracted services
- Maintain a sustainable and competitive contractor environment.
- Consider the economic benefits of Respondent proposals.
- Ensure efficient and effective operations while enabling P&D to meet its regulatory and statutory obligations.
- Manage costs effectively. For resource consents and engineering related work, a majority of the contractor costs are recovered through charges to P&D customers.
- Continue the historical practice of using a contractor panel to backfill workloads that cannot be delivered by internal resources, or where QLDC does not have that expert inhouse.
- Move to a single contract from P&D per supplier, covering all teams and disciplines (example of team – engineering, resource consents, policy, technical administration) instead of separate contracts per team for the same supplier.
- Establish a secondary-procurement process for selecting suppliers from the Panel.

Historical Expenditure

The historical expenditure under the current contracts is set out below (based on five years):

	20/21	21/22	22/23	23/24	24/25	Total consultant spend 2020/2025 RFP (based on 5 year term)
Resource Consent + Appeals	\$ 2,177,526.20	\$ 3,048,748.66	\$ 3,004,519.10	\$ 2,430,886.73	\$ 2,564,514.80	\$ 13,226,195.49
District Plan + Hearings + Appeals	\$ 3,264,757.63	\$ 2,237,957.36	\$ 2,588,770.13	\$ 3,612,527.43	\$ 1,443,335.86	\$ 13,147,348.41
Development Engineering	\$ 499,540.04	\$ 651,422.72	\$ 840,687.68	\$ 747,233.29	\$ 591,952.41	\$ 3,330,836.14
Technical Support	\$ 8,416.61	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 54,741.50	\$ 9,446.25	\$ 72,604.36
	\$ 5,950,240.48	\$ 5,938,128.74	\$ 6,433,976.91	\$ 6,845,388.95	\$ 4,609,249.32	\$ 29,776,984.40

Key Aspects

This procurement is essential to achieving the following strategic and operational outcomes:

- 1. Access to Specialised Disciplines** - A panel enables targeted engagement of experts aligned to specific Council needs.
- 2. Cost Management** – Supports flexible resourcing during peak demand, reducing the need for permanent overstaffing.
- 3. Consistency and Quality Assurance** – Contractors on the panel are vetted for their capabilities, ensuring a consistent standard of candidate quality.
- 4. Scalability and Flexibility** – Allows Council to scale contractor support up or down as required.
- 5. Access to multiple suppliers** – Minimises risk of bottlenecks if a contractor is unavailable or underperforming.
- 6. Compliance and Risk Management** – Panel members are required to meet Council’s standards for compliance with legislation, policies and procedures.
- 7. Enhanced Relationships and Collaboration** – Long-term panel relationships foster improved understanding of QLDC’s culture, expectations and ways of working.
- 8. Engagement of local suppliers where possible** – Ensure local suppliers have the opportunity to respond to the RFP.

General features

The Panel is intended to be established for an initial term of three years, with the option for two further extensions of two years each at Council’s sole discretion.

Council reserves the right to engage an “off-panel” supplier at any time at its sole discretion.

Disbursements are excluded from panel rates. Council will retain the ability to request quotations in terms of time and disbursements from multiple Suppliers and will also retain the ability to request fixed disbursements when allocating work packages.

Disbursements will only be applicable where the Council has agreed to these in writing and on a case by case basis.

P&D will issue one contract per supplier, rather than separate contracts for each team. For clarity, suppliers previously received individual contracts for services such as Resource Consents, Policy, and

Engineering. Moving to a single contract for all P&D-related services will streamline administration. Individual parcels of work will be captured in Service Orders and appended to the Contracts by way of written variation.

Being awarded a term contract does not guarantee appointment, and engagement will be on an as required basis. The Council does not guarantee any minimum quantities.

For clarity, RMA Commissioners are excluded from the RFP process, due to their contracts being previously executed.

Suppliers awarded a contract for P&D related services may also be engaged by other departments within QLDC. This is to leverage the negotiated terms. This will be of benefit to the Strategy and Policy team at QLDC who regularly require the same services, albeit to a lesser overall extent, as the P&D Planning Policy team.

Where the value of a project warrants it, a secondary process may be run to select a supplier from the panel.

Market Analysis

The supply market

Competition is primarily based on service offering / fit for purpose / price / quality / service type/ delivery time.

There are a wide range of businesses offering the services that P&D require including other Local Government organisations.

Current Panel suppliers to QLDC are listed in the table below

Resource Consents	Planning Policy	Development Engineering
Acoustic Engineering Services Ltd	Bridget Gilbert Landscape Architecture Ltd	Atcon NZ Ltd
AECOM NZ Ltd	Helen Mellisop	Stantec NZ
Altissimo Consulting Ltd	Ian Munro	Utility 2017 Ltd
Antony Yates Planning Ltd	Market Economics Ltd	WSP Opus
archifact	Natural Solutions for Nature Ltd	
Barker & Associates	Stantec New Zealand	
Beca	Vision Planning LTD	
Boffa	Isthmus Group Ltd	
Bridget Gilbert Landscape		
Delta Planning Ltd		
Denney Landscape Architecture		
E3 Scientific		
EnvirCo Ltd		
Enviroscope		
Harrison Grierson		
Hewland Projects Ltd		
Ian Munro		
Isle Land Ltd		

Isthmus		
Jasmax		
Kate Wasley Ltd		
Kensington Planning & Landscape Consultants Ltd		
Maven South Ltd		
Morphum Environmental		
Nathan O'Connell Planning Ltd		
Natural Solutions for Nature		
Novo Group Ltd		
NZ Heritage		
Origin Consultants		
Property Economics		
Resource Development Hub Ltd		
Scott Wilkinson Planning		
SITE Landscape Architects		
Southern Skies Environmental Ltd		
Strateg Ease Ltd		
The Property Group Ltd		
Urban Planning and Design		
Vision Planning		
Vivian & Espie Ltd		
Wendy Baker Planning Consultant Ltd		
Williams & Co		
WSP Opus		

All of Government Contracts

The MBIE All of Government Consultancy Services Panel was reviewed using the disciplines as search terms. This does not provide detail however it does show that there is potential for QLDC to join the Consultancy Services Panel.

The AoG Panel provides three tiers of supplier based on company size, capacity, liability cap per Service Order (parcel of work) and level of professional indemnity insurance held.

AoG Panel Members will be welcome to respond to the RFP; however, QLDC will be seeking to use QLDC contract terms in the first instance.

AoG Tiers:

Providers are appointed across 3 tiers within each sub-category. Tiers are based on capacity, capability and value of agency spend. Each tier has been appointed in relation to providers' current Government spend and ability to provide services in one or more sub-categories.

	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
Company size	Medium-large sized companies	Medium sized companies	Small-medium sized companies
Capacity	High capacity	Medium capacity	Medium-low capacity
Liability cap per CSO	Not exceed: 10 x charges per CSO \$5m; and any greater amount agreed in CSO	Not exceed: 10 x charges per CSO \$2m; and any greater amount agreed in CSO	Not exceed: 10 x charges per CSO \$1m; and any greater amount agreed in CSO
Professional Indemnity Insurance	Minimum of \$500,000	Minimum of \$500,000	No minimum required
Admin fee	1%	1%	Not chargeable

	Resource Consents	Planning Policy	Development Engineering	Technical Administration
Search term used	Resource Consent	Planning Policy	Development Engineering	Technical Administration
Tier 1	Nil	8 suppliers including 2 with an Otago presence	7 suppliers including 2 with an Otago presence	Nil
Tier 2	1 supplier	11 suppliers including 4 with an Otago presence	1 supplier	Nil
Tier 3	5 suppliers including 2 with an Otago presence	60 suppliers including 7 with an Otago presence	16 suppliers including 1 with an Otago presence	2 suppliers including 1 with an Otago presence

The open-RFP will provide an opportunity for the whole market to respond, including new entrants, and particularly, smaller local suppliers based in the QLDC area.

Competing buyers

Other organisations seeking the same services include but are not limited to:

- Local Government Organisations
- Property developers
- Central government.

Desired supplier relationship

With the likely respondents being a mix of large corporates and smaller local suppliers, Council will be viewed in different ways (for some we will be a critical client while for others we will be a smaller and more remote client). Considering this and the proposed length of the panel contracts, the level of desired trust and communication with the suppliers and the approach to managing risk, QLDC will seek strategic collaborative relationships.

This means working together with robust contract management and progress reports to ensure the

supplier and buyer are working together towards the same goal. The Procurement Team will sit as an escalation resource where required.

The nature of supplier panels means that there will still be an element of competition between the suppliers. QLDC will need to manage the selection of suppliers from the panel in a way that is fair to the market while maintaining an appropriate level of tension between the suppliers and obtaining the best value for QLDC and thereby, for ratepayers.

Contract Types

The contract that will be included in the RFP will be the QLDC Panel Contract as drafted by QLDC’s Legal Services.

Requirements and costs

Our requirements

A detailed statement of our business requirements is contained in Appendix 1.

Estimated Costs

An estimate of the total cost over the whole-of-life of the panel of contracts, exclusive of GST is \$54,000,000NZD. This includes:

- Estimated expenditure based on previous 5 years data;
- 30% to incorporate increased workload, use of panel by the Strategy and Policy Department and possible additional use of the contracts by other QLDC Business Units.

Key Stakeholders

Internal Stakeholders

The key internal stakeholders are:

Role	Characteristics	Stakeholders
Responsible	The person or people responsible for undertaking the procurement.	Resource Consents Manager Planning Policy Manager Development Engineering Manager Planning & Development Technical Support Manager
Accountable	The person or people that have authority to make decisions and are accountable for the outcomes.	Resource Consents Manager Planning Policy Manager Development Engineering Manager Planning & Development Technical Support Manager
Supportive	Provides all administrative support.	Various
All Council Business Units	End users of the service	Various

Communications

The agency will communicate with internal stakeholders through regular meetings, email and conversations.

Updates to the Procurement Plan

Minor updates to the procurement process will be completed without adjustments to the Plan. Major updates to the procurement process will be notified to the General Manager, Planning & Development and the Chief Executive Officer.

Procurement Process

This procurement will be facilitated by the Procurement Team with subject matter expertise provided by Planning & Development.

Type of procurement

The approach to market will be a one-step open Request for Proposals (RFP). This will enable QLDC to establish who in the market can provide these services at a competitive cost.

This approach to market fits with QLDC's Procurement Policy, the *Government Procurement Rules* and the New Zealand Government's Procurement Principles.

Consideration was given to running individual procurements vs. running one procurement with each discipline listed as a separable portion:

- There are commonalities in contracting for the four disciplines. Each panel contract will contain the same or similar terms, some of the evaluation questions will be repeated across all four disciplines, some potential respondents will be providing proposals for multiple disciplines.
- Four individual procurements:
 - Requires duplication of information provision by respondents replying to multiple disciplines
 - Requires duplication of evaluation by QLDC
 - Smaller respondents may find this less intimidating
- One procurement with four disciplines in separable parts:
 - Evaluation criteria across all disciplines only needs to be evaluated once
 - Easier for respondents to multiple disciplines to demonstrate synergies in their service offerings
 - Smaller respondents may be put off by the apparent size of the RFP - this can be countered by issuing a cover letter setting out that there are four disciplines and that respondents are welcome to respond to one or multiple, and by structuring the RFP document in a way that allows respondents to easily provide proposals to either.

Communication with the market

The RFP will be advertised via the GETS portal. All incumbent suppliers and other identified potential respondents will receive a courtesy email call informing them of the RFP availability on GETS.

All further communications with the market will be via GETS and managed by the Procurement

Specialist Manager in consultation with subject matter experts (SMEs).

RFP Closing

Proposals will be received through the GETS portal.

Following the opening of the electronic copies a list of Respondents will be compiled and fresh Conflict of Interest forms including the list of Respondent names will be issued to the Evaluation Panel and Evaluation Panel Advisors for completion prior to the responses being distributed.

The COI Forms will be reviewed and any indicated conflicts or perceived conflicts will be managed appropriately. Where any person refuses to complete the form, they will not be able to be involved in the evaluation.

Proposals will only be distributed following receipt of the completed Conflict of Interest form from each evaluator.

Evaluation Model

There are five (5) commonly used evaluation models:

- Lowest price – for a simple process where price is the most important factor
- Simple score – where all criteria (including price) have the same degree of importance
- Weighted attribute – where the criteria have different levels of importance
- Target price – where the scope of works is hard to define or the budget is the main constraint
- Brook’s Law – where quality is the most important factor and price is not a key driver

The evaluation model used for this process will be “weighted attribute” due to allow full consideration of price and non-price attributes.

Evaluation Panel

The composition of the evaluation team reflects the size, complexity of this particular procurement and the potential indirect project costs. A cross-functional team will be involved in the evaluation of responses and the recommendation of the preferred respondent.

All evaluation team members will have signed a declaration of conflict of interest form and possess the ability to make a balanced judgement to avoid any suggestion of bias.

Timeline

Key dates for the proposed work to be completed for the procurement within the next three months are as follows.

Pre-Procurement	Indicative date
Procurement Plan approved	TBC
Procurement documents finalised	TBC
Procurement Process	

RFP advertised on GETS	TBC
RFP Closing Date	TBC
Evaluation	Evaluation
Evaluation panel briefing	TBC
Panel confidentiality and conflict of interest declarations signed	TBC
Evaluation	TBC
Procurement Summary incorporating Evaluation Panel recommendation	TBC
Approvals	
Approval by General Manager, Planning & Development	TBC
Approval by Acting Chief Executive Officer	TBC
Post-Evaluation	
Contract negotiations	TBC
Advise respondents of outcome	TBC
Debrief unsuccessful respondents	TBC
Contract start date	1 July 2026

Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation Method

QLDC will evaluate the proposals using a Weighted Attribute model, in accordance with the criteria (and relative ranking or weightings) referred to in the table below. However, in general terms, QLDC will be looking to deliver the work for a reasonable price relative to quality and performance and assess Respondents by reference to their understanding of and ability to deliver the Scope of Works, their willingness to meet the terms and conditions of the Proposed Contract, as well as the value for money offered by their Proposal.

Evaluation criteria and weighting

High level criterion and their weightings are shown in the table below. The total of the weighted attributes will be 70% with the balance of the 30% being apportioned to the price evaluation. This sends a message to the market that service levels are the core component of the contract.

These high-level criteria and their weightings will be notified to the market in the RFP document.

Prior to the release of the RFP, evaluation instructions will be provided to the Evaluation Panel and an Evaluation Briefing Meeting will be held to ensure panel members are fully aware of their responsibilities.

CRITERIA	IMPORTANCE OF EACH CRITERION	NOTES
Pass/Fail Criteria (pre-conditions)	Pass/Fail	Used to remove respondents unable to meet critical items
Health and Safety	Pass/Fail	Compliance with QLDC's

CRITERIA	IMPORTANCE OF EACH CRITERION	NOTES
		H&S Policy. SiteWise Green standard held where appropriate.
Capability	35%	Considers the qualifications and experience of the staff and the collective experience of the business.
Capacity	25%	Considers the depth of resource and ability to cover peak periods
Solution	10%	Their internal processes for work completion, QA etc.
Value for Money: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rate card • Ability to negotiate price per significant work package • Economic Benefit (to Queenstown Lakes District) 	30%	Balance between non-price criteria and financial impact on QLDC and Queenstown Lakes District area.
TOTAL	100%	

Pass/Fail Criteria

These will be evaluated by a sub-set of the Evaluation Panel to establish the respondents that will be taken through to the second part of the evaluation.

These will be created from the wider requirements.

Requirement (Pass/Fail)	

Non-price Attributes Scoring

The high-level technical evaluation criteria and weightings are displayed in the table below.

Score	Definition
9-10 (Excellent)	Exceeds the requirement. Exceptional demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.

Score	Definition
7-8 (Good)	Satisfies the requirement with minor additional benefits. Above average demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resources and quality measures required to provide the goods / services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.
5-6 (Acceptable)	Satisfies the requirement. Demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource, and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with supporting evidence.
3-4 (Some deficiencies)	Satisfies the requirement with minor reservations. Some minor reservations of the supplier’s relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods / services, with little or no supporting evidence.
1-2 (Significant deficiencies)	Easily identifiable deficiencies in response. Considerable reservations of the supplier’s relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods/services, with little or no supporting evidence.
0 (Unacceptable)	Does not comply and/or insufficient information provided to demonstrate that the supplier has the ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods/services, with little or no supporting evidence.

Where any respondent receives a score of two (2) or below in any sub-attributes listed as a “must”, their response may be deemed to be non-complying and may not be evaluated any further.

Responses will be initially evaluated by Evaluation Panel members on an individual basis. Evaluation Panel members will provide their individual evaluations to the Procurement Specialist no less than two business days prior to the evaluation meeting. The Project Manager will aggregate the scoring in preparation for the evaluation meeting.

At the evaluation meeting a consensus score will be agreed by the evaluation panel and a supporting comment will be added to the worksheet. This worksheet will be the definitive scoring of the non-price attributes.

Where clarification of any aspect of proposals is required to enable a consensus score to be awarded, the Project Manager will make an approach to the relevant respondent for the information.

If a further evaluation session is required to allow the evaluation of clarification information, this will be scheduled by the Project Manager.

At the completion of the combined evaluation the pricing evaluation will be disclosed.

Price Evaluation Methodology

Price will be awarded a score based on a “price as a score” formula. The price of each response will be calculated by the Procurement Specialist with support QLDC departments as required

Rate cards will be requested for pricing information. While hourly rates will be the primary price evaluation factor, the Council will include a clause in the panel contracts that allows the negotiation of specific pricing for projects.

The price calculation will be disclosed following completion of the initial non-priced attributes evaluation and included in the evaluation matrix This will form part of the overall scoring.

At this point, short-listing of the respondents will occur and will be based on the combined non-price attributes and price scores.

Due Diligence

The following verification matrix will be used as part of the evaluation and due diligence process. The table shows how elements of the criteria will be verified by the panel.

Due Diligence Options	Fit for Purpose	Ability to Deliver	Value for Money
Reference checks	✓	✓	✓
New Zealand Companies Register check	✓	✓	✓
Audited accounts (where required)		✓	

Contract Type

The proposed contract term is for an initial period of three years with the option for two further extensions of two years each at Council’s sole discretion.

The form of contract to be entered into is the QLDC Panel Services Contract.

Risk Management

Overall this procurement is deemed to be medium value with low risk

Key risks have been assessed against the risk framework detailed at Appendix 2. They have been assessed on the basis of likelihood (L) and consequence (C).

They key for the following risk tables is:

1. Likelihood (L): R = rare U = unlikely P = possible outcome L = likely A almost certain
2. Consequence (C): I = insignificant Mi = minor Mo = moderate H = high S = significant E = extreme

Key risks in the procurement process

Risk	L	C	Rating	Mitigation action	Responsible
Caliber of suppliers insufficient	U	Mi	Low	Requirements clearly articulated with Pass/Fail criteria used where appropriate to ensure only capable suppliers Respond.	Planning & Development Managers
Low response rate	U	Mi	Low	Advertise on GETS as per Procurement Policy. Notification to incumbent suppliers and other potential respondents of RFP release.	Planning & Development Technical Support
No complying proposals received	U	S	Medium	Ensure current suppliers and other identified suppliers are aware of the impending RFP and how to find it on GETS.	Procurement Specialist
Respondents do not have the requisite level of insurance cover	U	Mi	Medium	This risk has been mitigated by QLDC's insurers AON.	Planning & Development Managers
Excessive number of responses received resulting in longer time to evaluate	L	Mo	High	Utilise Pass/Fail criteria to remove respondents unable to meet critical thresholds. Ensure sufficient time allowed for evaluators to score higher numbers of responses.	Procurement Specialist
Charge out rates are too high to reasonably consider based on our current hourly rates	P	S	High	Negotiate to reduce rates to benchmarked levels.	Planning & Development Managers

Key risks in delivering the contract

Risk	L	C	Rating	Mitigation action	Responsible
Service does not meet expectations	P	S	High	Set expectations early – regular meetings, progress reports and measuring of impact	Planning & Development Managers
Panel members do not meet reasonable timeframes due to other commitments.	P	S	High	Include contractual requirement that any work accepted from QLDC will be prioritised over other work/clients. Actively manage contracts where slippage is identified. Ensure the ability to include other suppliers where workload is too high for panels.	Planning & Development Managers

It is essential that the contractor demonstrates ethics and integrity in its procurements. This means:

- acting fairly, impartially, and with integrity
- being accountable and transparent
- being trustworthy and acting lawfully
- managing conflicts of interest protecting the supplier's commercially sensitive and

confidential information.

Probity in this procurement will be managed by:

- ensuring everyone involved in the process signs a Conflict of Interest form
- identifying and effectively managing all conflicts of interest
- treating all suppliers equally and fairly
- providing each supplier with a comprehensive debrief at the end of the procurement process where requested by the respondent.

Contract Delivery

The responsibility for managing delivery under the contract and supplier relationships management will pass to P&D's Leadership staff on the signing of the contract/s. These persons will develop a contract and relationship management plan in consultation with the successful supplier.

The supplier's performance will be reviewed as required and annually as a minimum.

Draft Secondary Procurement Process

When selecting suppliers from the panels, in some instances there will only be one supplier in the area of speciality; however, in others there will be multiple suppliers capable of performing the work.

Methodology for selecting the supplier should maintain competitive tension between them but also not place an arduous requirement for duplication of information that has been provided in the original RFP.

A structure will be established that provides a summary of supplier information for each of the panels. This will enable staff to identify where there is only one supplier capable of undertaking the work. Where the work could be provided to more than one supplier, the selection of the supplier to undertake the work will be determined using a simple mini evaluation process that considers: experience required; capacity to undertake the work within the timeframes required; the price (hourly rate/estimated price for the task); economic value for QLDC (i.e. local versus national and cost to Council of disbursements), consideration of how much recent work they have received from QLDC.

At the end of the first two years of the contracts, suppliers will be required to update the information provided in their responses to the RFP to enable QLDC to update the summary of supplier information. This update process and supplier summary will be undertaken by Planning & Development.

Appendix 1: Specification of requirements

The below breakdown of our business requirements provides clarity on the scope of services expected on our panel.

Description of Services	Priority (MoSCoW)
<p>Resource Consents</p> <p>Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The resource consents team process approximately 1000 resource consents per year. Currently QLDC Resource Consent staff process approximately 70-80% of those consents with contractors processing the remainder. Contractors on the panel will be allocated consents to process when the number of consents is at a level that QLDC staff cannot process those consents within statutory timeframes. There are no minimum number of consents allocated or guaranteed hours work for contractors. Engagement is on a 'as required basis'. <p>Requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors must have current competency to process the allocated consents and be able to process consents within the timeframe guidelines provided. Appropriate qualifications and/or experience to meet Environment Court Code of Conduct requirements. Competencies must be maintained throughout the life of the contract. <p>Fast Track Approvals Act Applications</p> <p>Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning & Development lead the QLDC involvement in Central Government's FTAA Process This process requires Council to provide expert peer reviews from outside of Council on applications. This panel would provide the expert peer reviewers for Council to use as required <p>Requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate qualifications and/or experience to meet Environment Court Code of Conduct requirements. Competencies must be maintained throughout the life of the contract. 	<p>Must</p>
<p>Development Engineering</p> <p>Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development Engineering assesses, approves, and oversees engineering design, infrastructure construction, subdivision completion, development contributions, and road corridor activities to enable safe, compliant, and sustainable growth across the district. Contractors on the panel will be allocated work to process when the volume of work is at a level that QLDC staff cannot process within statutory or provided timeframes. There are no minimum number of applications allocated or guaranteed hours work for contractors. Engagement is on a 'as required basis'. <p>Requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractors must have current competency to undertake allocated tasks within the timeframe guidelines provided. Appropriate qualifications and/or experience to meet Environment Court Code of Conduct requirements. 	<p>Must</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competencies must be maintained throughout the life of the contract. • Appropriate qualifications and/or experience to meet the Council Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice (NZS4404:2010) • Appropriate systems in place to meet the requirements of the ISO 9000 family of quality standards • Contractors must comply with the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015. • Contractors must have and maintain PI and PL insurance to the minimum stated level for each allocated task. • Contractors must communicate and manage conflicts of interest for each allocated task • Contractors must apply best practice customer experience to both internal and external customers. • Ability to undertake own site visits for consent engineering reporting. • 	
<p>Planning Policy (P&D) and Strategic Growth (Strategy and Policy)</p> <p>Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Planning Policy team undertakes work to keep the District Plan update to date, this include processing variations, resolving appeals and undertaking Section 35 monitoring. • The Strategic Growth team undertakes strategy and analysis work to facilitate future growth in the District including structure planning, spatial planning, affordable housing work, projections etc. • Contractors will be used when we do not have capacity to undertake work within the internal team or when specialist expertise is required. Engagement is on a 'as required basis'. <p>Requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For Planning Policy work consultants must have experience preparing policy work including drafting Section 32, Section 42a and appearing as a witness at hearings and the Environment Court. • For Strategic Growth work consultants must have experience in preparing strategic analysis on services they offer • Appropriate qualifications and/or experience to meet Environment Court Code of Conduct requirements. • Competencies must be maintained throughout the life of the contract. 	Must
<p>Technical Administration</p> <p>Context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The P&D Technical Support team provide administrative support to the Resource Management Engineers, Resource Consent Planners and Policy Planners. The team are also specialised in process improvements for increased efficiencies across the department. • Engagement is on a 'as required basis'. <p>Requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Competencies must be maintained throughout the life of the contract. 	Must
<p>Health and Safety</p> <p>Requirement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractors must maintain compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015 and the QLDC's Health and Safety Policy at all times. • Contractors must hold SiteWise Green Certification where appropriate. 	Must

Appendix 2: Risk Register

RISK MATRIX (CONSEQUENCE)

Score	Scale	Insignificant	Minor	Moderate	Significant	Extreme
5	Almost Certain	M	M	H	VH	VH
4	Likely	L	M	H	H	VH
3	Possible	L	M	M	H	VH
2	Unlikely	i	L	M	M	H
1	Rare	i	i	L	L	M

RISK LIKELIHOOD TABLE

Score	Likelihood	Description
5	Very Likely	The risk has a >85% probability of occurring
4	Likely	The risk has a 50%-85% probability of occurring
3	Possible	The risk has a 25%-50% probability of occurring
2	Unlikely	The risk has a 2-25% probability of occurring
1	Rare	The risk has a <2% probability of occurring

RISK CONSEQUENCE TABLE

Rating Scale	Performance				Reputation		
	Delivery	Cost	Health & Safety	Environmental	Stakeholders / Community	Strategic/Political	Legal/Compliance
5 - Extreme	Expected delivery date exceeds 120% of schedule contingency allowance or slippage resulting in late delivery by more than 6 months.	Negative financial impact of more than \$500k.	Loss of life or widespread critical health impact on workers or community.	Permanent or extreme non-localised environmental degradation/damage; and/or Effects are long term and not able to be fully mitigated.	Extreme dissatisfaction and loss of <u>long term</u> support from majority of community and key stakeholders; and/or Prolonged outage to core community infrastructure (>3 days) or non-delivery of critical project milestone that significantly impacts community.	Prolonged adverse media coverage (months); and/or Long term reduction in stakeholder confidence and reputation. Potential statutory management intervention.	Multiple breaches in statutory duty; Serious compliance findings uncovered through audit/ inspection; and/or Serious / high profile court enforcement, prosecution or judicial review with potential for custodial sentence.
4 - Significant	Expected delivery date exceeds 100% of schedule contingency allowance.	Negative financial impact of \$100K to \$500K.	A notifiable injury/illness ¹ Significant injuries or serious health impact on worker or section of the community including permanent injury, impairment or multiple serious injuries.	Significant localised environmental degradation/damage; and/or Effects are significant with options to fully mitigate damage within 5 years.	Significant dissatisfaction and loss of <u>medium term</u> support from significant section of the community and/or key stakeholders; and/or Outage to core community infrastructure (2-3 days) or delay in project milestone that significantly impacts the community.	Sustained adverse national media or prolonged local media coverage (weeks/months); and/or Medium term reduction in stakeholder confidence and reputation.	Isolated breach of statutory duty; Significant compliance findings uncovered through audit/inspection; and/or Serious court enforcement, prosecution or judicial review.
3 - Moderate	Schedule delay uses planned contingency.	Negative financial impact of \$50K to \$100k.	A notifiable incident ² . Moderate injury or <u>long term</u> health impact on worker or member of community.	Localised environmental degradation/damage; and/or Effects are moderate with options to fully mitigate damage within 1 year.	Moderate dissatisfaction and loss of <u>short term</u> support from small section of the community or key stakeholders; and/or Outage to core community infrastructure (1-2 days) or delay in critical project milestone that moderately impacts the community.	Short term local media coverage or national media coverage (weeks); and/or Short term loss of stakeholder confidence and reputation.	Moderate compliance findings uncovered through audit/ inspection; and/or Major court enforcement, prosecution or legal decision loss.
2 - Minor	Delay causes non-critical path tasks to become critical path but does not use planned schedule contingency.	Negative financial impact of \$10k to \$50k.	Minor injury or short-term health impact on worker or individual member of community requiring short term medical treatment or first aid.	Minimum environmental degradation/damage; and/or Effects are minor with options to mitigate damage within 3 months.	Dissatisfaction from small section of the community; and/or Minor short-term outage (hours) to community infrastructure or delay in project milestone that has a minor impact on the community.	Short term local media coverage (days); and/or No significant loss in stakeholder confidence or reputation.	Minor compliance findings through audit/inspection; and/or Minor court enforcement, prosecution or legal decision challenge.
1 - Insignificant	Delay but does not affect critical path or planned schedule contingency.	Negative financial impact of less than \$10k.	Injury requiring no/basic first-aid care and no absence from the workplace.	Small scale locally contained environmental degradation/damage.	Minor dissatisfaction from small section of the community; and/or Short-term outage to community infrastructure, or delay in project milestone that has no discernible impact on the community.	Local interest/rumours; and/or No loss in stakeholder confidence or reputation.	Minor findings through audit/inspection; and/or Minor legal challenge.

¹ Notifiable injury or illness: injuries or illnesses that require a person to have immediate treatment (other than first aid), an injury or illness that requires, or would usually require, the person to be admitted to a hospital for immediate treatment, an injury or illness that requires, or would usually require, the person to have medical treatment within 48 hours of exposure to a substance.; any serious infection (including occupational zoonoses) to which the carrying out of work is a significant contributing factor, including any infection that is attributable to carrying out work.

² Notifiable incident: an unplanned or uncontrolled incident that exposes a worker or any other person to a serious risk to that person's health or safety.