Queenstown Lakes District Council Procurement Plan

Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station (RTS)

Main Contractor – Construction

Document development control	
Prepared by:	Matt Cowen
Position / title:	External Project Manager
Business unit:	Property & Infrastructure – Solid Waste
Document version:	0.6
Date of last revision:	12 October 2026
Status:	Issued for Approval

Drafting Note:

This Procurement Plan is subject to a report to Council at the 17 November 2026 meeting.

Sections #2 to 5 of this Procurement Plan have been drafted to align with the Recommendations included in that report.

Acronyms

The following acronyms are used in this document.

Acronym	Term
Capex	Capital Expenditure
COI	Conflict of Interest
CSMP	Contaminated Site Management Plan
DFA	Delegated Financial Authority
DSI	Detailed Site Investigation
ESCP	Erosion and Sediment Control Plan
FY	Financial Year
GETS	Government Electronic Tenders Service
GST	Goods and Services Tax
Opex	Operational Expenditure
ORC	Otago Regional Council
PCG	Project Control Group
QLDC	Queenstown Lakes District Council
RFx / RFT	Request for Tender
RTS	Refuse Transfer Station
SME	Subject Matter Expert
T&T	Tonkin & Taylor
TBIG	The Building Intelligence Group
WGW	Wānaka Green Waste
WMNZ	Waste Management New Zealand

1. Purpose of the Procurement Plan

The purpose of this Procurement Plan is to consider the procurement options and outline the recommended procurement approach for a Main Contractor for the Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) Project.

2. Recommendation

That the procurement for the contracting of the construction works utilises:

1. An approach to the Open Market
2. Through a traditional design-bid-build delivery model
3. Utilising the GETS platform.

3. Approvals

Role	Name	Signature	Dated
Prepared by the Project Manager	**Matt Cowen**		12/10/2026
Recommended by the Infrastructure Operations Manager	**Simon Mason**		
Endorsed by the Commercial & Procurement Manager	**Geoff Mayman**		13/10/2026
Endorsed by the General Manager Property & Infrastructure	**Tony Avery**		
Approved under Delegated Authority by the Chief Executive	**James Stevenson-Wallace**		

4. Delegated Authority

Following approval at the full Council meeting 17 November 2026, Council has delegated authority to the Chief Executive to approve the Procurement Plan for the open-market procurement of a contractor to construct the new Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station and, following completion of the procurement process, execute and manage the resulting contracts within the approved project budget.

5. Sub-Delegation

For the purpose of implementing this Procurement Plan and executing and managing the resulting contracts, the Chief Executive Officer sub-delegates to the General Manager Property & Infrastructure the powers, functions and duties held by the Chief Executive Officer to enter into, vary and exit from transactions up to the value of $12.90m, or such amount as varied by a Council approved reforecasting process. Every exercise of this sub-delegation must comply with Schedule 1 of the Delegations Register "General Rules Applying to all Delegations – Queenstown Lakes District Council".

6. Approved Budget

Approved Budget		
Construction Cost Estimate:	Estimated cost / spend for the construction of the Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station (RTS) project (including contingency) is $12.90*m. See section 1.8 for further detail.	
Total Budget:	**Financial year**	**Amount**
	Spend to date	*4.92m*
	FY26	6.43m
	FY27	7.98m
	FY28	0.06m
Total Project Budget	**$19.39m**	

*All dollar values referenced in this plan are exclusive of GST

7. INTRODUCTION

7.1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

QLDC is planning to construct a new Refuse Transfer Station for the Wānaka/Upper Clutha area, on a land parcel adjoining the existing facility, replacing infrastructure that is ageing, operationally constrained and carrying environmental and compliance liabilities.

Detailed design is being completed by Tonkin & Taylor, whose engagement is detailed through the Procurement Plan (C-22-010) approved by the GM of Property and Infrastructure on 18 July 2023, and Addendum 1 approved by the Chief Executive on 28 October 2025.

This Procurement Plan covers the appointment of the Main Contractor to deliver the construction works. The estimated contract value is $11,250,000 (reflective of 75% Detailed Design), with an additional $1,650,000 held as construction contingency, resulting in a total estimated cost of $12,900,000.

After considering the options, a traditional design-bid-build delivery model is recommended. The design will be complete and issued for tender before the market is approached, which allows the works to be tendered on a fixed scope, produces directly comparable pricing, and keeps the field open to both civil-led and building-led contractors rather than restricting it to those with in-house design and build capability.

The recommended approach to market is a single-stage open competitive Request for Tender (RFT) advertised on and managed through GETS, evaluated using a weighted attribute methodology with a two-envelope process and a 60% price weighting. This is a compliant sourcing method under the QLDC Procurement Policy.

A key risk within this procurement and construction activity is management of environmental risk and contractor controls. The works are located on and adjacent to a closed landfill. A Detailed Site Investigation completed in January 2026 identified an area with arsenic concentrations above threshold for contaminated materials acceptable at local tipping stations, being Victoria Flats. The project therefore has planned to minimise works to this zone to limit the amount of contaminated soil being sent further afield (if not able to be kept on site, pending ORC Consent). The evaluation for non-price criteria is weighted heavily toward construction methodology, contaminated material handling, environmental controls and the reporting regime that sits behind them.

7.2. BACKGROUND

The Wānaka Waste Facility project involves the development of a new Refuse Transfer Station on a land parcel adjacent to the existing facility, purchased by QLDC in February 2024. The new facility will provide a more operationally efficient layout, increase capacity and deliver improved infrastructure to create a fit for purpose waste facility that can meet the needs of the growing region.

The project is required because of significant environmental and compliance issues on the current site, ageing infrastructure, health and safety risks, and capacity constraints driven by population growth.

Project history and current status:

- Full Council provided endorsement to proceed on 4 September 2025, with Councillor endorsement of the preferred option received in September 2025.
- The Business Case and Concept Design were approved by the Project Control Group on 16 December 2025.
- Detailed design commenced in November 2025. The 50% Detailed Design was issued for QLDC review on 16 April 2026.
- A Detailed Site Investigation was completed in January 2026 under a resource consent for test pits granted by Otago Regional Council on 19 December 2025.
- The 100% Detailed Design package was issued on 25 September 2026, and is being used for updated cost estimates by the project Quantity Surveyor.
- The latest construction cost estimate was undertaken at 75% Detailed Design, with a forecast construction cost of $12.90M including construction contingency. This results in an overall project forecast of $19.6M against an approved budget of $19.39M. Value engineering opportunities have been explored through the remaining design process and are under review within the forthcoming 100% Detailed Design estimate.
- This project will be presented at a full Council meeting, scheduled for 17 November 2026. This report will seek endorsement the delegation to the CE to endorse this Procurement Plan.

The project is supported by Tonkin & Taylor (design, planning and Business Case), WT Partnership (cost management), WSP (engineering review) and The Building Intelligence Group (project management). Waste Management New Zealand operates the existing facility and has been engaged through design workshops on operational processes.

7.3. DELIVERY MODEL

A procurement strategy assessment was undertaken by the project Quantity Surveyor, WT Partnership, in January 2026 comparing traditional design-bid-build against design and build. Design-bid-build was recommended and has been agreed in principle. The reasoning, which this Plan adopts, is:

- Project composition. Vertical elements represent approximately 25% of total construction cost, making the works civil-intensive. In-ground risk is the dominant commercial risk and is best managed through a completed design supported by site investigation, rather than transferred to a contractor who would price it as a risk premium or tag it out.
- Competitive pricing and market reach. A completed design allows both civil and building contractors to bid without requiring in-house design and build capability, widening the pool of capable respondents.
- Fit for purpose. A completed design allows the operational requirements developed with key stakeholder Waste Management New Zealand and QLDC operations teams to be locked in before pricing, reducing the risk of rework.
- Timeframe and costs to develop Principals Requirements. The design was nearing the 50% detailed design milestone when the strategy was confirmed. This was a planned point in the design progression to assess and confirm procurement methodology. Following the 50% Detailed Design deliverable, if D&B was considered the best approach Tonkin + Taylor would have needed to prepare Pricnipals Requirements documentation and prepare the design for a design and build procurement process. This would have, in itself, been a process which would have incurred costs and taken a notable period of time to consolidate documents.

The WT memo also raised the option of splitting the works into separate vertical and civil packages under different contract types. That option has been considered but not progressed. While package splitting may produce some reduction in tendered cost (avoiding overheads being applied from head contractor to large subcontractor), it would substantially increase delivery risk by placing the interface between the two contractors with QLDC, exposing Council to coordination and delay claims. A single main contract is therefore recommended.

7.4. PURPOSE

This Procurement Plan sets out the approach for appointment of a Main Contractor to deliver the Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station project and the procurement process to be followed. It outlines how QLDC intends to select and engage a supplier.

This Procurement Plan is based on:

- The Business Case, approved 16 December 2025
- QLDC requirements, issues and constraints
- Lessons identified from other similar projects
- The requirements of the QLDC Procurement Policy 2022

7.5. KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholders	Role	Form of Communication
Councillors	Approval of the project and for the proposed Delegation of Authority for Main Contractor procurement (as per this plan). Council Briefing scheduled 17 November 2026.	Council Briefing, reports and presentations.
Kāi Tahu / mana whenua	Mana whenua interests in the project area, including environmental, cultural and land/water-related matters. Engagement as appropriate through project planning, consenting and delivery	Engagement through QLDC's mana whenua engagement contact and relevant project/consenting communications.
Chief Executive	Approval of this Plan and authority to commit expenditure.	Decision papers and project updates.
General Manager – Property & Infrastructure	Strategic oversight and support for governance decisions where required. Execution of the Construction Contract (following sub-delegation within this Procurement Plan).	Governance reports and briefings.
Project Control Group	Oversight of project delivery, scope, programme, budget, risk and commercial performance.	Monthly meetings, dashboards and reports.
Infrastructure Delivery & Engineering Manager / Infrastructure Programme Manager	Oversight of this Plan, programme oversight and governance.	Governance reports and regular updates.
Infrastructure Operations Manager	Recommendation of this Plan, programme oversight and governance.	Governance reports and regular updates.
Project Manager (TBIG)	Day-to-day management of the procurement process, evaluation coordination and contract administration.	Weekly meetings, workshops and project reporting.
Commercial & Procurement Team	Procurement governance, probity oversight and procurement facilitation.	Procurement reviews and evaluation workshops.
Design Consultant (Tonkin & Taylor)	Issue of tender documentation, technical clarifications during tender and technical evaluation support.	Design reviews and technical workshops.
Cost Consultant (WT Partnership)	Pre-tender estimate and price evaluation support.	Estimate reviews and evaluation input.
Health and Safety	Contractor prequalification requirements and health and safety expectations.	Reviews and advisory input.
Finance	Funding, budget confirmation and invoicing requirements. Consulted.	Direct and email.
Waste Management New Zealand	Facility operator. Operational requirements and interface with construction staging.	Workshops and coordination meetings.
Wānaka Green Waste	Existing tenant requiring relocation prior to commencement of civil works.	Via QLDC Property Team.
Wastebusters and other site users	Site users affected by construction activity and access arrangements.	Communications and engagement activities.

Otago Regional Council	Consent authority for stormwater discharge and resource consents.	Formal correspondence and reporting.
Respondents and preferred supplier	Participation in the RFT process and delivery of the works.	Formal procurement process via GETS.
Community and neighbouring landowners	Interests potentially affected by construction activity.	Community engagement and notifications.

7.6. SCOPE

The scope of this procurement is to source and appoint a Main Contractor to construct the Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station in accordance with the issued for tender design.

The construction scope includes the new waste transfer building, associated concrete slab, pavement works, installation of services, swales, landscaping, and other related works, together with all site establishment, earthworks, environmental controls and management of contaminated material required to deliver them.

In scope	**Out of scope**
Construction of the new waste transfer building and associated structures.	Design development. The design is completed by Tonkin & Taylor and issued for tender.
Concrete slab, tip floor, push walls and associated structural elements.	Detailed design amendment, other than contractor-initiated proposals accepted by QLDC through the contract.
Bulk earthworks, pavement and hardstand works.	Consenting and statutory approvals, other than construction-phase compliance obligations and contractor-obtained permits.
Installation of site services and utility connections.	Relocation of Wānaka Green Waste, which is managed separately by the QLDC Property Team.
Stormwater management works including swales.	Provision of the pre-tender estimate and independent cost review, undertaken by QLDC's cost consultant.
Landscaping and site reinstatement.	Ownership of design outcomes, which remains with QLDC and the Design Consultant.
Excavation, handling, treatment, on-site management and/or off-site disposal of contaminated material in accordance with the Contaminated Site Management Plan and consent conditions.	Land acquisition and property agreements.
Environmental controls, erosion and sediment control, dust management and associated monitoring and reporting.	Approval of project funding, budget allocations or changes to project scope.
Construction staging and management of the interface with the operating existing facility.	

In scope	Out of scope
Site establishment, temporary works, traffic management and public safety controls.	
Procurement, delivery, installation, and commissioning of specified weighbridges and Portacoms	
Commissioning, handover documentation, as-builts and defects liability obligations.	

7.6.1. Detailed Technical Requirements

The detailed technical requirements have been developed by Tonkin & Taylor through the detailed design process in consultation with QLDC operational stakeholders and Waste Management New Zealand, and are informed by the Detailed Site Investigation completed in January 2026. A summary is documented in **Appendix B – Part A**.

The full technical requirements will be the issued for tender design documentation and specification, which will be complete and approved prior to the RFT being released to the market.

7.6.2. Programme Requirements

The requirements of the supplier for timely delivery are listed in **Appendix B – Part C**. QLDC will state a target construction period of 8-months in the RFT and require respondents to confirm whether that period is achievable and, if not, to submit their achievable programme with supporting justification. Programme is a weighted evaluation criterion.

7.7. CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS AND STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

A successful procurement will result in QLDC engaging a contractor who will:

- Demonstrate a robust, practical and evidence-based approach to environmental management, contaminated material handling and construction controls on a closed landfill site, supported by a reporting regime that gives QLDC and Otago Regional Council confidence in consent compliance.
- Hold the capability, capacity, systems and financial standing appropriate to a construction contract of approximately $11.25M.
- Deliver the works within a construction period that supports facility commissioning ahead of the Otago Regional Council stormwater discharge consent lapse of 23 April 2028.
- Provide competitive, transparent pricing on a fixed and complete scope, with pricing assumptions and exclusions clearly stated.

- Commit named key personnel with relevant experience and confirmed availability across the construction window.
- Manage the interface with the operating existing facility, site users and neighbouring activities without unplanned disruption to waste services.
- Maintain a proactive health and safety culture appropriate to a site carrying contaminated ground, heavy vehicle movements and public interface risk.

The strategic objectives for this procurement are:

- Deliver a fit for purpose waste transfer facility that resolves the environmental and compliance issues associated with the existing site.
- Achieve value over the whole of life of the asset, balancing tendered price against environmental management, risk management, programme certainty and delivery capability.
- Attract competitive tension from suitably capable contractors across both the civil and building sectors.
- Run a fair, transparent and defensible open market process consistent with the QLDC Procurement Policy.
- Manage the construction and in-ground risk exposure to QLDC by clearly providing all available testing and history, supported by a completed design and other site investigation data.
- Support a viable and competitive local and regional supply market, consistent with the Local outcome in the QLDC Procurement Policy.

7.8. CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

Estimated expenditure of this contract will be established from the RFT responses. At this point an estimated figure of $11.25m (GST exclusive) has been calculated, taken from the cost estimate prepared for the project by WT Partnership and refined through the detailed design and value engineering process. In addition to this, a client-held 15% contingency is maintained at $1.65m (GST exclusive).

Description	FY 2026/27	FY 2027/28	WOLC
Construction contract – Main Contractor (NZS 3910:2013)	$3.15m	$9.75m	$12.90m
Estimated Total (including construction contingency)			**$12.90m**

Amounts are GST exclusive.

Estimate notes:

- The cashflow above reflects the forecast construction phase expenditure across FY2026/27 and FY2027/28, including the full expenditure of construction contingency between these years.

8. KEY PROCUREMENT CONSIDERATIONS

8.1. QLDC PROCUREMENT

QLDC's Procurement Policy is based on the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment (MBIE) and the Government Procurement Rules ("the Rules"). The Procurement Policy will be adhered to for this project and by implication, the Rules will also be followed. However; QLDC is not a mandated agency for the Rules (the Rules were written for central government agencies based in main centres), and as such there may be some deviation from the Rules where appropriate.

The Rules refer to Economic Benefit; however, this relates to the MBIE definition of 'local' being Australia and New Zealand suppliers. QLDC is applying a Queenstown Lakes District lens to this rule and questions around the 'Economic Benefit' will relate to this district.

The QLDC Procurement Policy sets financial thresholds for procurement planning and available sourcing methods. For estimated whole of life spend of $100,000 and greater, a Full procurement plan is required and the available sourcing methods are open market or a Procurement Departure Request. The estimated whole of life value of this procurement is approximately $12.55m and the proposed method is open market. This procurement is compliant with the Policy and no Procurement Policy Departure Request is required.

Because the process is open, the respondent field is managed through mandatory pass/fail preconditions and the evaluation criteria. No shortlisting, panel selection or invitation-only step is proposed, and no step in this process restricts who may submit a response.

8.2. HEALTH AND SAFETY

Health and safety will be in accordance with the Health and Safety in Work Act 2015 and QLDC Policies.

Safety in Design workshops have been held with QLDC and external stakeholders, with a further session to be scheduled through the Detailed Design phase. Outputs from those workshops will be provided to respondents as part of the RFT documentation.

The principal health and safety risks associated with the works are:

- Exposure to contaminated material during excavation and handling, including arsenic identified above threshold in the old landfill area, and management of dust, soil and groundwater pathways.
- Construction on and adjacent to a closed landfill, including potential for landfill gas, unstable or inconsistent ground conditions and buried obstructions.
- Interface with the operating existing facility, including public and commercial vehicle movements with adjacent businesses, heavy plant and site user access.
- Heavy civil earthworks, deep excavation and temporary works.

- Structural work for the transfer building and other works at height.

SiteWise Green certification is a mandatory pass/fail precondition. It has not been removed or varied and no approval from the Health and Safety Team is sought in respect of it.

Respondents will be required to demonstrate their health and safety capability, systems, performance and relevant project experience, and health and safety is a weighted evaluation criterion. The successful contractor will be required to provide a project-specific Health and Safety Plan prior to site establishment.

8.3. SITE SECURITY REQUIREMENTS

Due to the nature of the site there are security requirements for access. This will be set out within the RFT documents and where possible QLDC will assist the successful Respondent with gaining the necessary security clearances, but it will be the responsibility of the potential Respondents personnel to ensure they provide sufficient and timely information for the passes to be obtained. Where a security pass is not provided, there will be no responsibility on or liability by QLDC.

8.4. RESILIENCE AND CLIMATE ACTION

In relation to the QLDC Climate Action Plan, it is considered that the facility itself delivers a resilience and environmental outcome by resolving the environmental and compliance issues associated with the existing site.

8.5. ECONOMIC BENEFIT

The concept of economic benefit to New Zealand refers to the positive impact that an activity, policy, initiative or investment has on the nation's overall economic well-being. Within the context of procurement, QLDC must determine the economic benefit outcomes to be achieved when procuring goods, services or works.

Economic benefit is not included as a weighted evaluation criterion for this procurement. The reasoning is that the works are civil-intensive construction on a constrained and contaminated site, where the risks to public value are under-delivery of environmental management, a lack of delivery capability and an extended programme. Introducing a weighted criterion would dilute the weighting available to other key criteria, noting that the market realistically capable of winning the tender is already regional.

Economic benefit outcomes are expected to come from this procurement and will be pursued through:

- A single main contract of this scale, tendered openly on a completed design, is expected to attract primarily local Central Otago based contractors and to support local subcontractor and supplier engagement.
- The preconditions have been set at a threshold that capable regional contractors can meet, rather than at a level that would restrict the field to national Tier 1 contractors.
- Respondents will be asked to identify their proposed subcontractor and supplier approach, which will be assessed within the capability and capacity criterion.

9. MARKET ANALYSIS

9.1. PREVIOUS/INCUMBENT SUPPLIER/S

There is no incumbent construction contractor for these works. This is a new requirement and the construction of the new Wānaka Refuse Transfer Station has not previously been procured.

It is noted that QLDC operates a Contract Works panel for infrastructure projects. The panel suppliers are HEB Construction, Downer, McConnell Dowell and Fulton Hogan. This panel was established for projects that are primarily 3-waters focused with an extension approved by NZTA for transport related activity, whereas The Wānaka RTS project includes a broader mix of civil works, building works, contaminated land management and interface management with an operating waste facility. As the project does not fully align with the typical scope or intended use of the panel, restricting responses to panel suppliers is not considered appropriate. It is therefore proposed to approach the wider market to receive responses from suppliers that may be better suited to delivering this project.

The Contact Works panel suppliers were engaged with by the Infrastructure Programme Manager, and this procurement approach was tested with them, with no objections noted.

9.2. NEW ZEALAND MARKET

The works are expected to attract a mix of civil-led and building contractor-led responses. Vertical elements represent approximately 25% of the total construction cost, making the project civil-intensive, but the transfer building is a substantial structure in its own right and the works are capable of being led from either direction.

The Central Otago market has several established regional contractors operate both civil and building arms within the same company. Those contractors are well placed to deliver both components of the works under a single main contract and are expected to provide competitive responses due to potentially lower overheads. Others are expected to respond as a civil-led or building-led main contractor with the balance of the works subcontracted.

Domestic suppliers identified as likely respondents, with a local Queenstown Lakes District or wider Otago presence noted, are shown below.

Supplier Name	Synopsis
Breen Construction	Tier 2 Central Otago based contractor operating both civil and building arms within the same company. Established regional presence. Considered capable of self-delivering both the vertical and civil components of the works under a single main contract and likely to provide a competitive response, along with a sophisticated management structure.
Stewart Construction	Tier 2 Christchurch based contractor also operating a Queenstown base in both civil and building arms within the same company. Has a regional presence, though on a smaller scale to competitors. Considered capable of self-delivering both the vertical and civil components of the works under a single main contract and likely to provide a competitive response. Will need to carefully review methodology and contractor sophistication.
Fulton Hogan	Tier 1 civil contractor with extensive experience delivering major infrastructure projects throughout the Otago Region, supported by proven capability across horizontal civil works and vertical build delivery for complex industrial, commercial, and public-sector facilities. Demonstrates a strong track record in collaborative delivery models, including ECI, alliance, and partnership-based frameworks that emphasise transparency, shared risk, and high-performance outcomes. FH is currently delivering several mixed horizontal and vertical infrastructure projects for QLDC Property & Infrastructure team.
Downer	Tier 1 civil contractor with proven experience delivering large and complex infrastructure projects across Otago, supported by established capability in infrastructure construction including delivery in constrained and environmentally sensitive construction environments, including brownfield interfaces, live-asset corridors, and ecologically protected areas. In addition to core civil delivery, Downer maintains integrated vertical build capability – typically utilizing other companies within their corporate structure (Hawkins), enabling the construction of associated buildings, treatment facilities, operational structures, and other above-ground assets required for modern infrastructure programmes.
Naylor Love	Naylor Love is a Tier 1 main contractor with a well-established Central Otago operation, recognised for delivering complex vertical construction projects across commercial, civic, industrial, and institutional sectors. Their core strength lies in main-contractor management, including programme leadership, integrated design coordination, quality assurance, and end-to-end vertical build delivery.

The market assessment shows that sufficient competition exists for an open competitive process. The primary market risk isn't a lack of capable contractors but the volume of construction in Central Otago competing for the same resources. The possibility of responses from parties without the scale or environmental capability to carry a contract of this size also exists. Both risks are mitigated through the preconditions and the evaluation criteria.

9.3. INTERNATIONAL MARKET

Participation from international suppliers will not be targeted.

9.4. KEY BUYERS WITHIN THE MARKET

The primary buyers competing for the same contractor market are territorial and regional authorities delivering three waters, transport, solid waste and community infrastructure programmes, along with private development in the Queenstown Lakes and Central Otago districts, which competes directly for building and civil resource.

Contractor resourcing decisions in this market are influenced by the volume of concurrent work, subcontractor and labour availability, and supply chain capacity. QLDC has a significant infrastructure pipeline that competes for the same contractors. The procurement approach and the tender programme have been developed with this in mind, allowing contractors outside of the QLDC 3-Waters Construction Works panel to submit.

9.5. PRICING METHODOLOGIES

Pricing methodologies used within the New Zealand construction market include lump sum, measure and value, target cost and cost reimbursable, and hybrid arrangements incorporating elements of these.

Key factors affecting pricing for these works are:

- The extent and treatment of contaminated material, which is the single largest variable in the tendered price and the item most likely to attract a risk premium or be tagged out if not adequately defined.
- Ground conditions on a closed landfill, including the potential for inconsistent conditions and buried obstructions.
- Earthworks and pavement quantities, which dominate the civil component.
- Structural steel and building material availability and lead times.
- Construction cost and fuel escalation, including indirect effects of international events on the cost of construction goods.
- Contractor availability and the level of competing workload at the time of tender.

The preferred pricing methodology is a Lump Sum for the above-ground building works, supported by Measure & Value through a Schedule of Prices for all below ground and site civil works. The Schedule of Prices will provide a defined competitively priced arrangement for all Civil works, but

importantly will maintain cost claims for any excavation, handling and disposal of additional contaminated material.

The split between Fixed Price Lump Sum, and Measure & Value is deliberate. The design is complete, which allows the above-ground works to be priced as a fixed lump sum on comparable terms across all respondents. Contaminated material quantities remain the least certain element of the scope even after the Detailed Site Investigation, and requiring respondents to price that risk as a fixed lump sum would predictably produce either inflated risk premiums or tagged-out qualifications, both of which reduce comparability and value for money. Measuring and valuing that component against tendered rates transfers the productivity and methodology risk to the Contractor while QLDC carries the quantity risk it is better placed to hold.

The proposed payment approach will be progress payments based on work completed, claimed and certified in accordance with NZS 3910:2013 Construction Contract. All payment claims will be verified by the Engineer to the Contract, with review from the cost consultant, before certification.

9.6. SUPPLY MATRICES

This procurement sits in the High Value Non-Strategic category of the supply positioning matrix. It is high value and medium risk to QLDC, with a limited number of contractors capable of managing the environmental complexity.

QLDC's dependency on the supplier market is high, reflecting the specialist environmental management requirement, the programme constraint imposed by the Otago Regional Council stormwater discharge consent lapse of 23 April 2028, and the criticality of the facility to district waste services. Supplier dependency on QLDC is moderate, as the identified contractors operate across a broad regional workload and are not reliant on this contract.

Supply positioning matrix



10. RISKS AND MITIGATIONS

Overall, this procurement is deemed to be high value with medium risk.

Key risks have been assessed against the risk framework detailed in Appendix A on the basis of likelihood and consequence. The risks recorded below are procurement risks. Project risks are recorded and managed in the project risk register and reported through the monthly project status report.

Risk	Initial Rating	Mitigation	Residual Rating	Escalation	Authority to carry risk
Insufficient or no responses received from the market, due to competing workload and contractor capacity in the region.	Medium	Complete and approved design issued with the RFT so bid effort is proportionate. Realistic tender period. Direct notification to identified potential respondents once the RFT is live. Target construction period tested with the market rather than imposed.	Low	Only one conforming response received.	Infrastructure Delivery & Engineering Manager
A high volume of responses from contractors lacking the scale, systems or environmental capability required, creating an unmanageable and low-value evaluation.	High	Mandatory pass/fail preconditions including SiteWise Green, insurance, two comparable projects above $5M in the last five years, acceptance of NZS 3910:2013 with QLDC Special Conditions and confirmed key personnel availability. Indicative contract value and contract form stated in the RFT so the market self-selects. Sub-attribute scoring floor under which a score of four or below may render a response non-conforming. Page limits and a prescribed Schedule of Prices.	Low	Preconditions fail to filter the field, with responses received that do not provide full confidence.	Infrastructure Delivery & Engineering Manager
Respondents demonstrate insufficient capability to manage contaminated material and environmental controls, or price the risk without understanding it.	Medium	Detailed Site Investigation data, Contaminated Site Management Plan and consent conditions issued with the RFT. Methodology and environmental management weighted at 20%, the highest single non-price weighting. Site visit offered to all respondents. Specific RFT questions on contaminated material handling, environmental	Low	No respondent scores above 50% on the methodology criterion.	Infrastructure Delivery & Engineering Manager

		controls, monitoring and reporting. Reference checking of comparable contaminated or brownfield works at due diligence.			
Tender closure at 20 working days would close on the final working days of 2026. Evaluation would span the Christmas and New Year shutdown, delaying evaluation and award.	Very High	RFT issued mid-November 2026 with an extended day tender period, allowing tender close at the end of January. Evaluation panel briefed and conflict of interest declarations completed before the RFT closes. Individual scoring commenced prior to shutdown. Evaluation meeting scheduled in the second /third week of February 2027. Panel availability confirmed in advance.	High	Evaluation and contract award not completed by the date recorded in the indicative timeline.	Project Manager
Tendered prices materially exceed the approved budget.	High	Pre-tender estimate prepared by the cost consultant. Value engineering continuing through the remaining Detailed Design process. Schedule of Prices structured to allow line-by-line comparison and identification of outliers. Respondents invited to identify value engineering opportunities. Price weighted at 60%.	High	Lowest conforming tendered price exceeds the approved budget.	General Manager Property & Infrastructure
Estimated construction value exceeds financial delegation of the Chief Executive or GM P&I, and requires Council approval for the Procurement Plan and construction contract.	Medium	Approval of the Delegated Authority to the CE to approve this Procurement Plan sought on the basis of the current approved scope and budget. Procurement Plan seeks sub delegation to the GM of Property & Infrastructure.	Low	Council does not approve delegation, which requires another Council meeting to execute construction contract.	General Manager Property & Infrastructure
Site not available at the contracted commencement date because the relocation of Wānaka Green Waste is not complete.	High	Relocation required by end March 2027 to avoid affecting the project, which precedes the proposed site commencement date. QLDC Property Team engaged on lease and key terms, with project team support to Wānaka Green Waste on consenting. Site availability position disclosed in the RFT and reflected in the possession of site provisions of the contract. Staging that allows works to commence in unaffected areas to be sought through the RFT.	Medium	Relocation not achieved by end March 2027, or lease not signed.	Project Manager, QLDC Property Team

Non-conforming or heavily qualified responses, or alternative tenders, complicating evaluation and comparison.	Medium	Acceptance of NZS 3910:2013 with QLDC Special Conditions, with only minor resolvable departures, is a pass/fail precondition. Prescribed Schedule of Prices with only that schedule used for price evaluation. Alternative tenders accepted only where a fully conforming tender is also submitted. Clarification process managed through the Procurement Facilitator.	Low	Material departures that cannot be resolved through clarification.	Project Manager, QLDC Legal
Conflict of interest arising through project advisors, QLDC staff or evaluation panel members.	Medium	Conflict of interest declarations completed by all panel members and advisors, refreshed after the respondent list is known and before responses are distributed.	Low	Any declared conflict that cannot be managed.	Procurement Manager
Construction cost and fuel escalation between tender close and contract award, or during the contract.	Medium	Short and defined period between tender close and award. Tender validity period specified in the RFT. Respondents required to state pricing assumptions and the basis of any escalation allowance. Cost fluctuation provisions considered and confirmed in the contract documentation.	Medium	Preferred respondent seeks to reprice within the validity period.	Project Manager
Long-lead equipment — particularly weighbridges/building components — affecting practical completion.	Medium	Long-lead items to be identified by respondents in their tender programme, including required procurement dates and lead times. Programme evaluation specifically assesses long-lead item management. Following award, the Contractor will be required to confirm procurement schedules and place orders for critical items early, with progress monitored through regular programme reporting. Alternative suppliers/products and early QLDC approvals to be progressed where lead times threaten the critical path.	Low	Respondents identify mitigation/approach in RFP	Project Manager
Unknown contamination/ground conditions causing significant M&V growth,	High	Detailed Site Investigation, CSMP and all available site information issued with the RFT to support informed pricing. Below-ground/civil works priced through the Schedule of Prices with competitively tendered rates, avoiding inappropriate lump-sum	Medium	Preferred respondent must demonstrate approach and mitigations through	Project Manager

		risk premiums while retaining quantity risk with QLDC. Actual quantities to be measured and verified during construction, with contaminated material classification, tracking and disposal records maintained. Cost consultant to monitor measured quantities, forecast final cost and emerging trends against contingency, with early escalation where forecast quantities or costs materially exceed tender assumptions.		supplied RFT methodology	
Procurement challenge or supplier complaint.	Low	Open competitive process is proposed with no restriction on who may respond. Evaluation criteria and weightings published in the RFT. Structured debrief offered to all respondents. QLDC 3-Waters construction panel provides are have already been engaged with, and advised this is being released to the open market. No issues were raised by these suppliers.	Low	Formal complaint, challenge or audit review initiated.	Procurement Manager

11. FORM OF CONTRACT

The intended form of contract is NZS 3910:2013 Conditions of Contract for Building and Civil Engineering Construction, together with QLDC Special Conditions, as attached in Appendix C. A template contract will be attached to the RFT.

NZS 3910 has been selected because the works are major construction works without a design component. The design is being completed by Tonkin & Taylor and will be issued for tender, so design responsibility remains with QLDC and its consultant and is not transferred to the Contractor. NZS 3916 and NZS 3917 are not appropriate, as there is no design and construct element and the contract is defined by scope rather than by a fixed term.

The 2013 edition is specified rather than the 2023 edition, consistent with typical QLDC practice.

Minor amendments to the standard QLDC contract terms and conditions are proposed to provide specificity to this particular contract. These have been reviewed in conjunction with QLDC legal. Where further amendments are proposed during RFT preparation or through tender evaluation and confirmation, Legal endorsement will be obtained.

The proposed total contract term is:

- Construction period: a target maximum of eight months from site commencement, to be tested with the market through the RFT. On the indicative timeline this provides site commencement in April 2027 and practical completion in or around December 2027.
- Defect Liability Period: 12 months following Practical Completion.

12. INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Pre-existing Intellectual Property will remain the property of each of the parties.

New Intellectual Property arising as a result of the contract will be the property of QLDC or will be the property of the supplier however the supplier will grant QLDC a perpetual, irrevocable, unlimited licence to use the new intellectual property for whatever it sees fit.

13. OWNERSHIP OF DATA

Data provided by QLDC or resulting from the performance of the contract will remain the property of QLDC.

The specification will include a requirement for provision of all data to QLDC at the end of the contract. This includes environmental monitoring records, contaminated material tracking and disposal records, testing and validation results, quality assurance records, as-built drawings and asset data required for handover into QLDC's asset management systems.

14. INSURANCE REQUIREMENTS/LIMITATION OF LIABILITY

Insurance requirements and limitation of liability are as per the proposed QLDC amended NZS 3910:2013 contract, with minor project-specific adjustments agreed with QLDC legal.

The insurances required from the supplier are Public Liability, Contract Works, Motor Vehicle, and Statutory Liability. Minimum levels of cover and the limitation of liability figure are as specified in the in the contract documentation issued with the RFT.

Minimum of $20 million Public Liability insurance

Minimum of $1 million Motor Vehicle insurance.

Minimum of $2 million Statutory Liability insurance.

The minimum limitation of liability requirement is: 100% of the Contract Price (including any adjustments to Contract Value via variations or other cost adjustment mechanisms)

Respondents will be required to provide evidence of insurance cover, including certificates of currency, as part of the procurement and contract award process.

15. SOURCING PROCESS

15.1. APPROACH TO MARKET

The recommended approach to market is a single-stage open competitive Request for Tender, advertised on and managed through GETS. This approach will:

- Meet the QLDC Procurement Policy requirements, being an open market sourcing method for expenditure of $100,000 and greater
- Provide a fair opportunity for suppliers to participate in the process based on capability and capacity to fulfil QLDC requirements
- Be a fair and transparent process

Alternative procurement strategies were considered in the preparation of this Procurement Plan:

- **Two-stage open prequalification or expression of interest followed by a shortlisted RFT.** This would allow the field to be reduced before pricing is sought. It has not been progressed due to;
    - Time required for a two-stage process. The project does not have enough available programme time for a two-stage process, given the interval between design approval and the required site commencement date.
    - Shortlisting restricts the number of respondents invited to tender, which is a trigger for the Procurement Policy Departure Request. This procurement is intended to proceed as a compliant open market process without a departure.
- **Closed or invited tender**. This restricts the number of respondents and would require a Procurement Departure Request. There is no basis for one here: the market is competitive, the scope is well defined, and there is no urgency or sole capability argument that would support limiting participation.

Because the process is single stage and open, the quality and manageability of the field is controlled through the mandatory preconditions, the way the opportunity is described to the market, and the scoring floor applied during evaluation. These are set out in the Evaluation Criteria and Methodology section.

15.2. NOTIFICATION TO MARKET

The RFT will be advertised on, and managed through, GETS.

All possible and probable respondents identified through the market analysis will additionally be made aware of the opportunity once the RFT is live on GETS.

15.3. SITE VISITS

Site visits are planned and will be offered to all potential respondents. A site visit is considered important for this procurement rather than optional, and as such attendance at a site visit will be a mandatory pre-condition for Tender acceptance. The works are on a closed landfill with an operating waste facility alongside them, and the constraints on access, staging and environmental control are difficult to appreciate from documentation alone. Attendance supports better-informed pricing and reduces the risk of qualified tenders.

Any potential respondent attendance at site visits will require:

- Notification of attendance and the full names of those attending by a deadline set by QLDC.
- Temporary security passes if necessary.
- Attendance at the meeting location, date and time regardless of any external factors including any travel restrictions.

- All costs to be borne by the potential Respondents.

Where any of the above bullet-pointed items are not met, QLDC will incur no responsibility or liability for costs or further performance of site visits.

15.4. COMMUNICATIONS WITH MARKET

All communications with the market will be via GETS and managed by the Procurement Facilitator in consultation with subject matter experts (SMEs).

15.5. RFT CLOSING

Supplier responses will be received through the GETS portal.

Following the opening of the electronic copies a list of Respondents, updated 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.

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

15.6. 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.

Prior to the RFT Closing Date, 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.

Name of Evaluator	Evaluator Job Title	Organisation	Role	Criteria
Paul Rogers	Independent Procurement Specialist	Spire Consulting	Chair (non-voting)	None
Matt Cowen	Project Manager	TBIG	Voting	All
Myles Manihera	Solid Waste Operations Manager	QLDC	Voting	All
Chris Purchas	Design Engineer	Tonkin + Taylor	Voting	All
Simon Mason	Infrastructure Operations Manager	QLDC	Non-voting, attendance and review at moderation meeting	All

15.7. INDICATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA AND METHODOLOGY

15.7.1. Evaluation Criteria & Model subject to Final Review

Prior to the release of the RFT, the evaluation criterial and model will be subject to final review and sense testing.

15.7.2. 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**, because the criteria have different levels of importance to the successful delivery of these works. Weighted attribute is the most commonly used model at QLDC.

Price will be a weighted criterion.

A two-envelope process will be used, and suppliers' pricing will only be opened once the non-price criterion scoring is completed and consensus scores have been agreed by the panel.

15.7.3. Preconditions

As the process is open, the number and quality of respondents needs to be managed through mandatory pass/fail preconditions rather than through any restriction on who may tender. The preconditions require SiteWise Green certification, insurance, demonstrated delivery of at least two comparable projects above $5,000,000 in the last five years, acceptance of NZS 3910:2013 with QLDC Special Conditions, and named key personnel with confirmed availability. This is intended to attract contractors of the required scale and deter responses from parties who cannot carry a contract of this size, while keeping the process open to the regional market.

This plan outlines procurement risks, some of which can be generally mitigated by incorporating a set of fact-based pre-condition questions. Key requirements relating to insurance, safety, experience, contractual acceptance and resourcing are outlined below.

Each supplier must meet all of the following pre-conditions. Where pass/fail criteria are not met, responses may be excluded from further evaluation. The RFT will clearly state these criteria as being pass/fail.

The preconditions carry weight in this procurement. Because the process is open and single stage, they are the only mechanism by which a response can be excluded before scoring, and they are therefore the principal means of ensuring the field consists of contractors with the scale and capability appropriate to a ~$12.90M contract on a contaminated site. They are drafted to be objective and evidenced, so that a decision to exclude is defensible.

Requirement (Pass/Fail)	Detail
Health and Safety	Respondent must hold SiteWise Green certification, or a health and safety prequalification of equal or higher standard approved by QLDC.
Insurance	Respondent must hold, or demonstrate to QLDC's satisfaction the ability to obtain on appointment, Public Liability, Contract Works, Statutory Liability, Professional Indemnity and Motor Vehicle insurance at the levels specified in the QLDC standard NZS 3910:2013 provisions.
Relevant experience	Respondent must demonstrate successful delivery of at least two comparable construction projects, each with a contract value in excess of $5,000,000, completed within the last five years.
RFT Conditions acceptance	Respondent must confirm acceptance of the RFT conditions.
Site Visit Attendance	Confirmed attendance at a Site Visit hosted by QLDC as part of the RFT process.

Financial capacity is not a pass/fail precondition. QLDC maintains the right to undertake credit checks, Companies Office checks and a review of audited accounts as part of due diligence on the preferred respondent.

15.7.4. Indicative Evaluation criteria

Having met all of the preconditions qualifying bids will be evaluated on their merits using the following high-level technical evaluation criteria and weightings displayed in the table below.

The detailed evaluation criteria and questions are available in **Appendix D**.

Criterion	Weighting
Methodology and construction approach	**20%**
Respondents shall provide construction methodology and staging, management of contaminated material, environmental controls, monitoring and reporting, management of the interface with the operating facilities and neighbouring businesses, and risk identification and mitigation Respondents shall provide information and evidence regarding health and safety culture, systems, performance and management of the specific risks associated with this site	
Programme	**10%**
Respondents shall provide a detailed construction programme showing alignment of the proposed 8-month construction period. Ensure clear detailing of tasks, triggers, dependencies, staging, critical path, client deadlines and management of long-lead items.	
Capability and Capacity	**10%**
Respondents shall provide the experience of named personnel, their committed time, organisational capacity, current workload and subcontractor approach Respondents shall provide comparable projects delivered, performance on those projects and client references.	
Price	**60%**
Respondents shall provide a completed pricing schedule, made up of the Schedule of Prices, and Lump Sum pricing schedule. This will be assessed on the overall value submitted, transparency or pricing, reasonableness of pricing assumptions, and adjustments required for any exclusions.	
Total weightings	**100%**

The rationale for this weighting split is as follows.

- Methodology carries the largest single non-price weighting because the dominant risk to this project is the management of contaminated material and environmental controls on a closed landfill. A Detailed Site Investigation has identified an area with arsenic above threshold. The difference between a contractor who has understood that risk and one who has not is the difference between a compliant, on-programme delivery and a contract exposed to variations, consent breaches and delay. The reporting regime is assessed within this criterion because consent compliance is evidenced through records, not intentions.
- Programme is weighted separately due to its importance in this project. QLDC is stating an 8-month target as a starting position and asking the market whether it is achievable. Weighting programme allows the panel to reward a credible, resourced and justified programme rather than the shortest number offered.
- Capability and Capacity is weighted at 10% because a threshold has already been set through the pass/fail precondition requiring two comparable projects above $5,000,000. The weighted criterion assesses quality and relevance above that threshold rather than re-testing whether the respondent has any relevant experience at all.
- Price is weighted at 60%. The design is complete and the scope is fixed, so responses will be directly comparable and price is properly a significant factor. It is set below half so that the evaluation is not effectively a lowest price process, which on a contaminated site would risk selecting the respondent who has priced the environmental risk least rather than understood it best. Tendered prices will be assessed against the pre-tender estimate prepared by WT Partnership. Where tendered prices exceed the approved budget, the outcome will be escalated to the Project Control Group for consideration and recommended actions.

15.7.5. Price / Non-Price Weighting Sensitivity Testing

The recommended approach to market is a single-stage open competitive Request for Tender advertised on and managed through GETS, evaluated using a weighted attribute methodology with a two-envelope process and a 60% price / 40% non-price weighting.

This position is informed by approved sensitivity testing of 60/40, 50/50 and 40/60 non-price/price scenarios against a baseline tender price of $12.90M. The testing showed that a 40% price weighting could allow an exceptional non-price tenderer to price up to 42.9% ($5.49M) above the baseline and still win, while the recommended 60% price weighting limits that potential quality premium to 15.4% ($1.97M). Under the recommended weighting, a near-threshold tenderer would need to undercut the baseline by 13.3% ($1.71M) to win.

This delivery risk is considered manageable because mandatory preconditions establish a minimum capability threshold before weighted evaluation, including a minimum conforming score of 4/10 for each non-price attribute, and programme requirements and construction-phase oversight provide further safeguards. The weighting therefore balances value for money and delivery capability while limiting exposure to a tender outcome materially above the available project budget. This is a compliant sourcing method under the QLDC Procurement Policy.

15.7.6. Innovation

Suppliers may have new and innovative ways to deliver against the requirements. QLDC may accept alternative proposals on this basis.

15.7.7. Non-price Attributes Evaluation

The non-price attributes will be evaluated using the following scale.

Score	Definition
90-100 (Excellent)	Exceeds the requirement. Exceptional demonstration by the supplier of the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the services. Response identifies factors that will offer potential added value, with supporting evidence.
70-80 (Good)	Above average 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.
50-60 (Acceptable)	Some minor reservations of the above average 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.
30-40 (Some deficiencies)	Significant reservations around the relevant ability, understanding, experience, skills, resource and quality measures required to provide the goods/services. Little or no supporting evidence.
10-20 (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.
0-10 (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 forty (40) or below in any single sub-attributes or an overall score of less than 50% in the non-priced categories, 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 Facilitator no less than two business days prior to the evaluation meeting. The Procurement Facilitator 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 Procurement Facilitator 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 Procurement Facilitator.

15.7.8. Price Evaluation Methodology

Price will be requested in NZD. Where respondents do not provide this, they will be asked to resubmit their pricing in NZD. Where this does not occur the foreign exchange rates at the closing date will be used to calculate the NZD amounts.

Price will be awarded a score based on a “price as a score” formula. The price of each response will be calculated by the Project Manager.

A price matrix will be included in the RFT documentation, which will outline the key trade elements or elements of the construction package. Respondents will be required to complete the provided matrix but may provide their own formatting pricing providing it outlines the required information proposed within the price matrix.

Respondents will also be provided with a schedule of quantities for the civil works, as proposed by WT Partnership (Quantity Surveyor) and will need to return this in full, in the provided format.

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

15.7.9. 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, on an 'as required' basis.

Evaluation and due diligence options	Criteria		
	Fit for purpose	Ability to deliver	Value for money
Form of response (proposal)	✓	✓	✓
Buyer clarifications of offer	✓	✓	✓
Reference checks	✓	✓	✓
Interview/Q&A Session	✓	✓	
Accepts proposed contact conditions		✓	

16. PROCUREMENT PLAN REVIEW

This Procurement Plan will be reviewed:

- Where there is new information that may materially affect any part of the sourcing process;
- At the end of the RFT process; and
- At the completion of the contractor implementation (final review for knowledge transfer into the future).

Minor changes will be updated to the Plan with major changes requiring approval by delegated authorities.

17. PROBITY

17.1. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

It is essential that QLDC 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.

17.2. PROBITY IN THIS PROCUREMENT

Probity in this procurement will be managed by:

- Ensuring everyone involved in the process signs a confidentiality agreement and declares any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest. Where any staff member refuses to sign a conflict of interest form, they will not be able to be part of the procurement process
- Communication guidelines set with suppliers and QLDC staff once in due process
- Identifying and effectively managing all conflicts of interest
- Ensuring that all responses are opened at the same time and witnessed
- Recording the date & time of receipt of submissions and returning them to the Procurement Specialist once the process ends
- Treating all suppliers equally and fairly
- Documenting key discussions & decisions
- Providing each respondent with a comprehensive debrief at the end of the procurement process

- Retaining all documentation in line with the Public Records Act
- Ensure the QLDC Audit and Assurance function is aware of the project and has full access to review the process at any point but particularly at:
  a) Review of the Procurement Plan
  b) Review of the Conflict of Interest forms
  c) Review of the evaluation documents and recommendation to management

18. APPROVALS PROCESS

The DFA holder's approval will be required to progress this procurement through to contract execution. Approval of contract award and contract execution will be sought via a Procurement Summary and Recommendation report summarising the procurement process followed, the evaluation outcome, the due diligence undertaken and the preferred provider.

This Procurement Plan will be included within the Wānaka RTS report for the 17 November 2026 full Council meeting. Council is not being asked to approve this Procurement Plan; their approval is sought for delegation to the Chief Executive who will approve this Procurement Plan, and the forthcoming construction contract.

This Procurement Plan then approves that the General Manager Property and Infrastructure is provided sub-delegation by the Chief Executive to execute and manage the forthcoming construction contract.

19. CONTRACT HANDOVER AND IMPLEMENTATION

Responsibility for managing implementation and delivery under the contract and supplier relationship management will pass to the Project Manager on the signing of the contract, supported by the Engineer to the Contract, the cost consultant and the design consultants.

20. RESPONDENT DEBRIEF

All proposal submitters must be advised of the outcome of the evaluation of their proposal and given reasons for their appointment or non-appointment.

This will be facilitated by the Project Manager and will be over the phone or in person.

21. INDICATIVE TIMELINE

QLDC is obligated to provide adequate/fair time for respondents to prepare their submissions. The RFT will remain open for an extended duration, due to its adjacency to the Christmas holiday period. The indicative timeline is below.

	Sept				Oct				Nov				Dec				Jan				Feb				March				April			
Pre-procurement																																
Procurement Plan approved internally																																
RFT documents compiled and approved																																
Council Briefing for endorsement																																
RFT documents compiled and approved																																
Evaluation panel confirmed, briefed and COI declarations completed																																
Approach to market																																
RFT issued on GETS																																
Site visit																																
RFT last date for questions																																
Question responses completed																																
RFT closing date 29 January 2027 (extended >20 business days due to holiday period)																																
Evaluation																																

Tender administration compliance review against preconditions																															
Individual panel scoring																															
Evaluation panel meets, consensus scoring, price envelopes opened																															
RFT evaluation completed																															
Due diligence completed																															
Approvals																															
Procurement Recommendation completed																															
Contract Negotiation																															
Negotiation																															
Execution																															
Process Completion																															
Advise respondents of outcome and publish contract award on GETS																															
Debrief unsuccessful respondents																															

APPENDIX A – RISK PROFILE

The risk matrix includes a number of items that will also have been identified at the project level however it is appropriate that they are raised as procurement risks also.

Below is the QLDC Risk Evaluation Framework and overleaf is the risk matrix including all relevant details.

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 schedule contingency allowance and exceeds the existing stormwater lapse date of April 2028.	Construction contingency expenditure is exceeded by 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 long term 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 of schedule contingency allowance but delivery remains within the existing stormwater lapse date of April 2028.	Construction contingency expenditure is exceeded by up to $500K.	A notifiable injury/illness1 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 medium term 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 breech 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.	Construction contingency is fully expended.	A notifiable incident2. Moderate injury or long term 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 short term 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.	Expenditure of construction contingency exceeds 50% of budgeted value.	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.	Expenditure of construction contingency remains within 50% of budgeted value.	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.

APPENDIX B – REQUIREMENTS/SPECIFICATIONS

The full technical requirements are the issued for tender design documentation and specification prepared by Tonkin & Taylor, which will be complete and approved prior to RFT issue and attached to the RFT. The summary below sets out the requirements as currently understood.

PART A –TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

The Contractor will be required to undertake the following outline works – noting that full details of the project scope will be encompassed by the Tender design documentation:

- Construct the new waste transfer building, tip floor, push walls and associated structures in accordance with the issued for tender design.
- Undertake bulk earthworks, pavement and hardstand works on and adjacent to a closed landfill, managing inconsistent ground conditions and the potential for buried obstructions.
- Excavate, handle, treat, manage on site and/or dispose of contaminated material in accordance with the Contaminated Site Management Plan, the Detailed Site Investigation findings and all consent conditions, including management of the area identified as containing arsenic above threshold.
- Implement environmental controls including erosion and sediment control, dust management, stormwater management and controls on soil and groundwater pathways, and undertake associated monitoring.
- Maintain records and reporting sufficient to evidence consent compliance, including contaminated material tracking, disposal records, testing and validation results.
- Install site services and utility connections, and construct stormwater management works including swales.
- Undertake landscaping and site reinstatement.
- Develop and implement a construction staging and delivery approach that manages the interface with the operating existing facility and its users, including separation of construction traffic from public and commercial vehicle movements.
- Provide temporary works, traffic management, site establishment and public safety controls.
- Commission the works and provide handover documentation, as-builts and asset data in a format acceptable to QLDC, and meet defects liability obligations.
- Procurement, delivery, installation, and commissioning of weighbridges and small buildings within the main contract scope.

PART B – NON-TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS

The Contractor will be required to:

- Hold and maintain SiteWise Green certification or an equivalent prequalification approved by QLDC, and hold the insurances required under the QLDC standard NZS 3910:2013 provisions.
- Commit named key personnel for the duration of the contract, with QLDC approval required for any substitution.
- Maintain a mature health and safety culture, with a project-specific Health and Safety Plan provided prior to site establishment.
- Provide regular reporting on programme, cost, risk, environmental compliance and health and safety.
- Comply with the QLDC Supplier Code of Conduct.
- Engage constructively with QLDC, the Engineer to the Contract, the design consultant, the facility operator and affected site users throughout delivery.

PART C – PROGRAMME REQUIREMENTS

Milestone / Deliverable	**Expected date**
Contract execution	Mid March 2027
Site possession and commencement	April 2027
Project-specific Health and Safety Plan, Contaminated Site Management Plan compliance approach and environmental management plans submitted and accepted	Prior to site establishment in accordance with the contract.
As-builts, asset data and handover documentation	Prior to award of Practical Completion
Practical Completion	December 2027, based on an 8 month target programme
Defects liability period expiry	December 2028, based on an 12 month DLP

A target 8-month construction period is a proposed in the RFT due to the projects' strict deadline on completion (and occupation) of this facility. This will baseline programme duration across all responses, with each respondent advising on how they could meet this, or the closest achievable timeframe.

APPENDIX C – FORM OF CONTRACT

Form of contract: NZS 3910:2013 Conditions of Contract for Building and Civil Engineering Construction, with QLDC Special Conditions.

APPENDIX D – Indicative Evaluation Criteria

These questions are subject to change in the time between procurement plan approval and RFT document finalisation. If questions do change, they will still be relevant to the evaluation criteria and proportionate to the assigned weightings.

Sub-weightings for questions within each criterion will not be applied, as this disperses the overall weighting and scoring of each section.

	QUESTION
1	**METHODOLOGY AND CONSTRUCTION APPROACH – 20%**
1.1	Describe your proposed construction methodology and staging, including how you will sequence the works and manage work fronts on a constrained site. Describe how you will manage the interface with the operating existing RTS facility, Wastebusters, and Wānaka Greenwaste. Ensure separation of construction traffic between public and commercial vehicle movements, and how you will maintain full public and commercial access to these facilities through the course of construction. Your programme, methodology, and staging must all be aligned.
1.2	Describe your approach to the excavation, handling, treatment, on-site management and disposal of contaminated material, in relation to the Detailed Site Investigation report and the Contaminated Site Management Plan.
1.3	Describe your environmental controls, including erosion and sediment control, dust management, stormwater management and controls on soil and groundwater pathways, and the monitoring you will undertake.
1.4	Describe the reporting regime you will operate to evidence environmental and consent compliance, including contaminated material tracking, disposal records, testing and validation results.
1.5	Identify the main risks you foresee in delivering these works and how each will be managed. Provide a risk register.
1.6	Outline your subcontractor approach, including which packages you propose to subcontract and how subcontractors will be selected and managed.
1.7	Describe your companies health and safety systems and processes and provide evidence of your health and safety performance record.

	QUESTION
1.8	Describe how you will manage the specific health and safety risks associated with this site, including exposure to contaminated material, work on a closed landfill, and the interface with public and commercial vehicle movements.
2	**PROGRAMME – 10%**
2.1	Provide a detailed construction programme (Gannt format) showing achievement of the proposed 8-month construction period. Ensure clear detailing of tasks, triggers, dependencies, staging, critical path, client deadlines and management of long-lead items. Programme must be clearly aligned to project scope, site specific requirements, and the contractors proposed methodology and staging.
3	**CAPABILITY AND CAPACITY – 10%**
3.1	Name the key personnel proposed for this contract, provide their CVs, and confirm their committed time allocation across the construction period.
3.2	Provide a summary of your other commitments during the delivery timeframe and confirm your capacity to deliver these works.
3.3	Provide an organisational chart for the project and describe how continuity will be maintained if key personnel become unavailable.
3.4	Provide details of at least two comparable projects above $5,000,000 delivered in the last five years, describing what went well and what was learned. Provide client references for the projects cited.
4	**PRICE – 60%**
4.1	Submit your pricing using the prescribed Schedule of Prices for Measure & Value elements, and the proposed pricing schedule for Fixed Price Lump Sum elements. Ensure you state all pricing assumptions, qualifications and exclusions.
4.2	Identify any value engineering or cost-saving opportunities you consider available, including proposed cost savings that would be available from these.