

18.1 Airport Upgrade Project - Item 18.2 - 14 March 2017 Council Meeting

Council Meeting Date	08/08/2017
Author	Andrew Boardman
Title	Chief Executive Officer
Attachments	Refer to attachment
File Ref - Records	16.15.9
Hours to compile	5
Strategic Plan Ref	Reference to Council's 2014-18 Strategic Plan:
Cost Management	7.1 Advocate for affordable access to Island by both sea and air, for freight and people.
Revenue	14.1 Develop case for Airport redevelopment and expansion of services
Stimulus / Service	30.3 Continue to lobby for better consideration of Island issues within State and Strategic infrastructure plans.
Purpose	To update Council on progress with the airport and the implications on the project due to the crushing contractor placing themselves into voluntary liquidation.
Recommendation	<p>That Council approves under the provisions of Section 90 (2) of the Local Government Act 1999 an order be made that the public be excluded from attendance at the meeting, in order to consider, in confidence, a matter on the grounds of Section 90 (3) –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(d) commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret) the disclosure of which—<ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) could reasonably be expected to prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied the information, or to confer a commercial advantage on a third party; and(ii) would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest; <p>This matter relates to matters concerning contractual arrangements between Council and Contractors involved in the Kangaroo Island Airport Upgrade Project and, as such, represents matters that are commercial in confidence and should not be divulged in the public realm until the project is complete and no outstanding commercial issues remain unresolved.</p> <p>That Council approves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. That all documentation relating to the above matter be kept confidential, pursuant to Section 91 (7) (b) of the said Act.b. Further, that pursuant to Section 91 (9) (a) of the said Act, that part “a” of this resolution shall cease from 30 June 2018.

This matter relates to matters concerning contractual arrangements between Council and Contractors involved in the Kangaroo Island Airport Upgrade Project and, as such, represents matters that are commercial in confidence and should not be divulged in the public realm until the project is complete and no outstanding commercial issues remain unresolved.

Discussion

Following the resolution from 14 March 2017 Council Meeting,

- c) *Write to the Commissioner seeking assistance (and working with the Parliamentary Public Works Committee, Minister Mullighan, his Department and others in Government), in:*
 - i. *establishing the exact processes used to initiate DPTI-pre qualification for a business such as this in demonstrating financial capability and evidence and;*
 - ii. *what processes are in place to manage and monitor the pre-qualification status, including any additional processes that are to be undertaken on a contract by contract basis.*
- d) *If it is established that there are additional processes that should have been undertaken then Council seeks the assistance of the Commissioner in identifying the reasoning behind these processes not being discussed at PCB or with the Project Manager during their meetings with DPTI Contracts Officer subsequent to the PCB meeting held on 17 September 2016. Council should also seek an explanation from DPTI representatives on the PCB as to why they did not seek clarification of the process prior to accepting the recommendation and awarding the work.*

The Commissioner has provided the attached report on her investigations.

It is noted that there appears to be discrepancy between the fact that no evidence of the existence of a financial check process post-qualification has been produced yet the communication from Ms Butler on behalf of Michael Deegan clearly states that an internal procedure exists for financial assessment of contracts over \$550,000. Mr Deegan also acknowledged to the Minister at the meeting held in February that suitable process exists and yet this process has not been produced. The project was required to comply with all DPTI-documentation and process and the Project Managers were required to attend a specific briefing on these issues with a DPTI Contracts Officer. This was done and no process was produced.

During this process, DPTI Contracts officers provided copies of tender documentation for a material crushing contract as examples of what should be used – no request in this documentation for financial information.

All documentation was provided to the PCB and no issues with financial due diligence raised by the two DPTI General Manager members of the PCB.

It is noted that conversations with DPTI-pre-qualified Contractors have revealed that they have not been audited or had to produce financial information for individual contracts subsequent to the pre-qualification process.

To this end one can only draw conclusion that there is no documented process in DPTI for conducting financial due diligence on smaller contracts utilising pre-qualified contractors.

This is compounded by the simple inability to produce the documentation and demonstrate its application.

Whilst financial due diligence may have identified issues with NBS, in all likelihood it would not have done so, given that the information produced would have likely been dated and, given they are a small business, likely to be difficult to validate unless court actions by creditors were already in process. This was not the case with NBS – they chose to take themselves to Liquidation and therefore the normal warning signs that may have been able to be identified in public realm would not have been present. To this end whether done or not the outcome is likely not to have been any different.

More of a concern is that Mr Deegan / DPTI have taken the public position that there is a process and that it is Council's issue that this has not been followed and / Council should have taken their own action to ensure due diligence was carried out in addition to the insisted upon use of pure DPTI process and documentation. This has extended to quoting the funding deed which states that Council is responsible for procurement decisions, yet requiring DPTI to have two senior Officers on the PCB in a position to influence project decisions.

Given the conclusion of the Commissioner's report is that there is no evidence of a procedure then part d of the Council's resolution is largely not relevant – this assumed evidence of process was produced and sought the Commissioner's assistance in finding out why this was not communicated to Council / Project Managers.

To this end perhaps Council should seek the Commissioner's assistance in identifying why DPTI have not been able to produce the documented process and examples of its application given the CE of DPTI, Michael Deegan, gave assurance to the Minister that such a process exists; that this has also been indicated to the Public Works Committee; that this has been indicated to the Commissioner in the email response dated 13 April.

There is no doubt that NBS entering voluntary liquidation has impacted the project significantly causing delay to works – these delays creating inefficiency for the principal airside contractor, BMD, and then having ancillary cost impacts to the Professional Fees budget through the overall extension of this element of the contract. The exact repercussions of this are yet to fully manifest themselves and the Project managers and CEO are working diligently to manage these costs down as much as they can. The reality is that until airside works are completed on the ground – which should be November 2017 – the final costs of this element will not be able to be fully understood and the overall project budget will still have the landside works to complete before being able to fully understand total cost. At this time cost and risk mitigation strategies are in final process of being assessed and decisions will be made that will influence the ability to manage project costs more directly. The Landside element of the project is well within budget and there are opportunities here to reduce cost if needs be. These are being assessed.

The Project team and CEO will continue to best manage these costs and still deliver the project – there may be a discussion to be held with State Government about any budget over-run – it is suggested that this is carried out once the full ramifications of airside works is understood when this element of the project is completed in November and we have a much better understanding of the landside budget costs and likely available contingency.

The statements / intimation / published Hansard from Public Works Committee clearly suggests that Council have not performed due diligence and that DPTI played no role in this lack of process – which is clearly not the case. There is a case for the Commissioner's

findings being made public at some point in the future - Council consideration around next steps is required and needs to be mindful of potential fallout from going public.

Council may wish to consider:

- discussing this directly with the Commissioner as soon as possible to gauge her views on the best way to proceed.
- considering whether a revised request for further action should be provided to her (given point d of previous resolution is not relevant) or
- whether Council should write to the Public Work Committee with a copy of this report or
- whether the Council should seek direct discussion with the Minister or
- all / other actions as deemed appropriate

Council consideration required

Governance Considerations

(relates to consistent management, cohesive policies, guidance, processes and decision-rights for a given area of responsibility)

Nil at this time.

Risk Management Considerations

(identification, assessment, and prioritization of risks (defined as the effect of uncertainty on objectives, whether positive or negative) followed by coordinated and economical application of resources to minimize, monitor, and control the probability and/or impact of unfortunate events or to maximize the realization of opportunities)

Council reputation has been put in the spotlight by DPTI suggesting that Council “failed” in its role as project managers despite a governance structure that has two of their senior Officers involved in every major decision. This is a public issue and the outcome of this our request for

Economic Considerations

(Assessment of likely financial implications of pursuing a course of action)

There will be an impact to project costs – the exact level of these will not be fully understood until completion of the airside element of the project and then the completion of the landside element of the project in March 2018.

Social Considerations

(Assessment of likely impacts with the Community)

Issues with risk to reputation for Council.

Environmental Considerations

(Assessment of likely impacts on the environment)

Nil at this time.

Office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island

2 August 2017

Mayor Peter Clements
Kangaroo Island Council
PO Box 121
KINGSCOTE SA 5223
Via email: peter.clements@kicouncil.sa.gov.au

Dear Mayor Peter

Attached is my report addressing the issues Council referred to me through its confidential resolution regarding procurement matters related to the crushing contractor for the airport upgrade. I have marked the report confidential.

You will note that at this stage I have only addressed part (c) of the resolution with a suggestion that the parties consider the report prior to me doing any work related to part (d).

As suggested to you previously I believe that the report should also be provided, on a confidential basis, to Minister Mulligan. I also consider a copy should be provided to Mr Deegan.

Please don't hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss any matters raised within the report.

Yours Sincerely



Wendy Campana
Commissioner for Kangaroo Island

Cc: Andrew.Boardman@kicouncil.sa.gov.au

Attached: Report & Appendices

Confidential Resolution Regarding Airport Upgrade Tender Process – March 2017

2 August 2017

INTRODUCTION

On 14 March 2017, I received a confidential email from Mr Andrew Boardman, CEO of the Kangaroo Island Council, outlining a confidential resolution of the Council adopted at its March meeting and attaching the report that the resolution related to. The email confirmed the resolution proposed in Mr Boardman's report was adopted by the Council.

The item (18.2.) was proposed by the CEO to be considered on a confidential basis and included information regarding the voluntary liquidation of NBS, the crushing contractor engaged by Council.

The relevant elements of the confidential resolution to the Office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island are points (c) and (d) resolving that Council:

Point (c):

"Write to the Commissioner seeking assistance (and working with the Parliamentary Public Works Committee, Minister Mullighan, his Department and others in Government) in:

- i. establishing the exact processes used to initiate DPTI pre-qualification for a business such as this is demonstrating financial capability and evidence and;*
- ii. what processes are in place to manage and monitor the pre-qualification status, including any additional processes that are to be undertaken on a contract by contract basis."*

Point (d):

If it is established there are additional processes that should have been undertaken then Council seeks the assistance of the Commissioner in identifying the reasoning behind these processes not being discussed at PCB or with the Project Manager during their meetings with DPTI Contracts Officer subsequent to the PCB meeting held on 17 September, 2016. Council should also seek an explanation from DPTI representatives on the PCB as to why they did not seek clarification of the process prior to accepting the recommendation and awarding the work".

I confirmed in writing to Mayor Peter Clements on 21 April, that I would make enquiries in relation to the matter and report back to the Council in due course. I also advised the Mayor that the report prepared should also be provided to Minister Mullighan.

This report outlines the information I have gained in relation to part (c) of the resolution of Council:

- the requested and gained from DPTI, Council and RCP;
- the responses that have been received;
- summary.

In relation to part (d) of the resolution it is my view that this report should be reviewed by the parties affected and then I will assist in compiling a response to part (d). This review will “establish whether there should or should not have been additional processes undertaken ...”.

INFORMATION SOUGHT/GAINED

State Government

On 13 April 2017 I received an email from Ms Megan Butler on behalf of Mr Michael Deegan responding to an earlier request for a briefing paper that was agreed to be prepared regarding the DPTI processes for pre-qualified contractors. This briefing paper was to be prepared following a meeting on 22 February with Minister Mullighan, Mayor Peter Clements, Andrew Boardman and myself. Mr Deegan was present at the meeting. The email from Ms Butler advised that:

Contractors on the ‘pavement materials’ prequalification register are required to provide information about company structure, experience, insurance etc in a prequalification application. Contractors on the list have an obligation to “immediately” advise DPTI of any material change to their financial capability (amongst other things). DPTI may review the prequalification status of a company at its absolute discretion, and there is a “show cause” process for any prequalification downgrade (including rescinding).

For information, on DPTI led projects, internal procedures generally require a financial assessment of the company prior to contract award if the value was more than \$550,000.

In the particular case of NBS on Kangaroo Island, the contract exists between KI Council and the contractor, and the process of calling tenders etc was managed by RCP (Project Managers appointed by Council). The DPTI prequalification list was used for calling tenders. The Project Control Board, which includes DPTI representation, only considered tenders at a high level before the decision to appoint the contractor was made.

The Funding Deed, entered into by KI Council and the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure stipulates a dot point in Schedule 3 – Project Partnership Framework, Section 4.5. Procurement Management:

KI Council with the assistance of Building Projects if required will:

- *Minimise default bankruptcies and liquidations for contractors*

I have been provided with a copy of a letter sent by Mr Deegan to the Parliamentary Works Committee in response to a range of questions raised by the Committee on 2 March. Summarised below are the responses by Mr Deegan to questions related to the processes for procurement, due diligence, assessment processes specific to robustness of the companies tendering and documentation regarding the financial capacity and capability of the contractors.

- KI Council used DPTI prequalified contractors and evaluation was undertaken by the tender assessment panel comprising RCP, RLB and Tonkins who then made a recommendation to the Project Control Board;
- As part of the process NBS supplied testimonials and relevant experience. Testimonials came from companies such as Hanson and the Wimmera Grain Company;
- During the evaluation process, written post tender queries were issued to both tenderers that submitted and both responded accordingly;
- Conversations were carried out between the tender evaluation panel chair, RCP and the tenderers;

- During the tender process both companies confirmed their ability to deliver the proposed Work Under Contract within the requirements of the contract conditions and schedules;
- Several returnable schedules were requested in the tender documents and the information submitted indicated the preferred tenderer had the ability to carry out the work. (This response was to the question of the Public Works Committee regarding supporting documentation about the financial capacity and capability of the contractors).

On 21 April I sent a confidential letter to the Hon. Stephen Mullighan MP, Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, advising him of the Council's resolution and broadly outlining its contents. This letter was also provided to Mr Michael Deegan, Chief Executive of DPTI.

I sent an email to Mr Don Hogben and Mr Jon Wheelan on 21 April 2017, outlining a series of questions that I sought clarification on in preparation for a meeting to be held the following week. This meeting did not proceed and the matter was referred to Mr Michael Deegan.

I met with Mr Deegan on 29 May 2017, following a series of requests for information. The meeting confirmed matters raised in the email provided to me on 13 April by Ms Butler. In summary, discussions with Mr Deegan emphasised that:

- DPTI prequalification processes enabled a company to be checked for suitability for inclusion as a prequalified contractor;
- Their financial situation should be clarified at the time of request and then receipt of a tender and in relation to the NBS contract, this was the responsibility of Council;

DPTI has a procedure for this financial check to occur and it would have been provided to Council's project manager.

RCP – Project Managers

RCP are the Project Managers appointed by Council following feedback from DPTI.

I sent an email to Mr Boardman on 30 May asking him to refer a series of questions to RCP for response. The questions were as follows:

- *The briefing I understand took place with DPTI regarding their procurement process. What was covered, were there specific references to procedures/practices for undertaking a financial check?*
- *If the briefing did not address this – did RCP seek clarification on what was required or previously undertaken for pre-qualified contractors? If not, why not?*

Tom Dalrymple from RCP provided me a letter on 7 June included as Appendix 1. Following an email from me on the same day indicating that he had not responded to my questions a further letter was received on 8 June included as Appendix 2.

The response from RCP of 7 June included the following key points:

- *RCP worked directly with DPTI, RLB (quantity surveyor) and Kangaroo Island Council to develop the procurement process to meet requirements noted by PCB panel, including incorporating DPTI requirements that were provided to RCP;*

- *RCP complied with the request to tender directly to pre-qualified DPTI contractors;*
- *Members of the PCB panel received copies of the tenders and the evaluation report prepared by RCP in consultation with RLB;*
- *Following receipt of the evaluation report, the PCB determined the successful contractor for the works and we note no financial checks were requested to be carried out;*
- *RCP was not made aware by the members of the PCB panel of a requirement for financial checks on tenders during this process.*
- *Financial checks were not identified as a requirement in the information RCP received from the members of the PCB panel.*

The response from RCP of 8 June which looks at each question specifically indicates that:

- *RCP was briefed by DPTI regarding their procurement process in relation to tender, evaluation and forms of contract;*
- *No discussion took place about any procedures/practices in relation to requirements for financial checks;*
- *The information provided did not reference a procedure/practice for undertaking a financial check in relation to a direct tender to DPTI prequalified contractors;*
- *Information and briefings provided by DPTI were clear and did not necessitate RCP to seek clarification;*
- *PCB instructed RCP to request tenders from contractors that had been prequalified by DPTI;*
- *Members of the PCB were kept informed of the process and received copies of the tenders and evaluation report.*

Kangaroo Island Council

As stated previously Mr Boardman provided me with the Council report related to the confidential resolution. Relevant extracts of Mr Boardman's report are highlighted below:

- DPTI prequalified contractors were agreed to be used as they had gone through a DPTI pre-qualification process and had been signed off for use by the State Government. It is also noted that this approach was modified to only include all SA-based pre-qualified contractors in order to maximise "local" content aspirations of the project. For this reason Queensland and Victorian-based pre-qualified contractors were not approached;
- While adoption of the DPTI requirements meant that two quarry owner / crushing contract providers on the Island were not able to tender as they were not DPTI pre-qualified, it made sense to the project team to remove a layer of normal pre-tender capability assessment;
- DPTI representatives on the Project Control Board insisted that DPTI tender documents and processes be utilised as opposed to Council or RCP documents/processes;
- RCP modified their tender documents and processes to adopt the DPTI approach;
- It was noted that no financial assessment of the tenderers was included in this documentation but given they were pre-qualified by the Department this was not considered a showstopper;
- Minutes (of a Project Control Board Meeting) record that RCP would meet with DPTI Contracts Manager and make reasonable endeavours to adopt appropriate DPTI documents. It was also recorded that the evaluation process would be carried out by the Project Consultant Team (which would not include DPTI or Council Project Control Board representatives) and then presented to the Board with a recommendation on selection;
- The tender documents used were an amalgam of RCP/DPTI and the evaluation carried out used DPTI evaluation processes and documentation;

- It is clear in the documentation provided to the Project Control Board that no financial assessment was undertaken.

Mr Boardman outlined the usually procurement processes adopted by Council as follows:

For contracts of this scale, Council procurement policy requires that an approach to open market is made – this would typically be through an expression of interest (EOI) process. This process would seek interest from contractors and look for them to establish their credentials for consideration for the work. These credentials would include factors such as demonstrating established WHS, management and quality systems and providing financial information, company structure and demonstrable capability.

The EOI process would generate a “short-list” of those contractors that would then be asked to formally tender. The tender process would be looking for specific capability to deliver the task and be primarily method and cost focused.

The perceived strong recommendation by the DPTI members of the Project Control Board to approach pre-qualified contractors only for the tender process suggested to Mr Boardman that the pre-qualification process had effectively replaced the normal EOI process – in effect the approach to market was a “qualified” approach. To this end it is clear that Mr Boardman – taking DPTI-pre-qualification at face-value – agreed with the DPTI Project Control Board members view that approach to pre-qualified contractors only was appropriate and fulfilled Council Procurement Policy requirements.

Mr Boardman has given me information that was provided to RCP and himself by DPTI during the discussions regarding tender documentation. The document is entitled “Request for Tender – The Raising and Crushing 30,000 Tonnes of Pavement Material for Shoulder Sealing on RN02400 Todd Highway”. This document has a number of 15C632 on it. I am advised that this document was provided as an example of a typical DPTI approach to this sort of contractor, given one of the observations of the DPTI Officer was that “...*The documents are much more complex than what DPTI would use for a straightforward contract, which may discourage some companies from tendering. I have attached a typical DPTI crushing RfT document for comparison.*” It is noted that:

- Page 10 of the document outlines the information that must be supplied with the tender. No reference is made to a financial statement of any kind.
- Page 11 sets out the Assessment of Tenders. There is no mention of a financial capability assessment being undertaken.
- Page 1 of the Schedule of Contract Documents makes no reference to a requirement for financial information to be provided.

There are also several forms at the end of the document requiring the tenderer to sign. These forms relate to:

- General information about the company – entitled “Tender Form”;
- Declaration in relation to Unlawful Collusion – entitled “Tender Form – Continued”;
- Schedule Checklist for Tender Submission – no reference to financial information;
- Schedule 1 – Schedule of Rates
- Schedule 2 – Working Time

- Schedule 4 – SA Employment Contribution
- Schedule 7 – Workforce Participation Policy Statement

Schedules 3, 5 and 6 are not included, however, nothing in the document suggests that these schedules would have provided a financial capacity or capability statement.

Mr Boardman has also provided a State Government document entitled “General Conditions of Contract for Minor Works and Field Services” also identified as being a document provided to RCP by DPTI. It is noted that:

- Page 5 – Termination. There is reference to “insolvency administration” which can be exercised by the Principal.

SUMMARY

It would appear on the basis of the information provided to me by DPTI, the Council and RCP that:

- The information provided to Council and RCP by DPTI as a model to consider did not include financial assessment criteria or process;
- RCP in their briefing on the matter did not query this issue and assume to have determined that if DPTI has pre-qualified a contractor that there is some means upon which checking takes place, outside of the tender process they were engaged to facilitate;
- The Project Control Board comprising senior representatives of DPTI and the Council CEO did not query this matter;
- The Council CEO has also formed the view that some form of financial assessment must take place with prequalified contractors.



Reference: 4048M3L090 Response to Commissioner.docx
Contact: RCP Adelaide

7 June 2017

Office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island
Government Office in Kingscote, South Australia
43 Dauncey Street, Kingscote Town Hall
KINGSCOTE SA 5223

By Email: Wendy.Campana@sa.gov.au

Attention: Ms. Wendy Campana, Commissioner for Kangaroo Island

Dear Wendy,

KANGAROO ISLAND AIRPORT UPGRADE PROJECT

We refer to an email received from Andrew Boardman, CEO Kangaroo Island Council on 30 May 2017, requesting RCP to respond to your email of the same date, in regard to the procurement of a material crushing contract for the Kangaroo Island Airport Upgrade project. We provide the following information in response to the queries raised in your email to Andrew Boardman.

We note that the tender and evaluation process for the material crushing contract was an extensive process carried out during the period from August to December 2016. During this period, RCP presented the proposed tender and evaluation process to the members of the Project Control Board (PCB) on a number of occasions and the PCB was kept informed of the tender and evaluation process throughout. The requirement for financial checks to be undertaken on pre-qualified tenderers was not discussed or raised by the PCB during this period.

RCP worked directly with DPTI, RLB (quantity surveyor) and Kangaroo Island Council to develop the procurement process to meet the requirements noted by members of the PCB panel, including the incorporation of key DPTI requirements. RCP complied with the request to tender directly to pre-qualified DPTI contractors. It is noted that from the 8 contractors invited to tender on the project, only 2 contractors submitted a tender.

The tender evaluation process was conducted confidentially, and the members of the PCB panel received copies of the tenders and an evaluation report, prepared by RCP in consultation with RLB. Following receipt of the evaluation report, the PCB determined the successful contractor for the works and we note no financial checks were requested to be carried out.

RCP was not made aware by the members of the PCB panel of a requirement for financial checks on tenders during this process. Financial checks were not identified as a requirement in the information RCP received from the members of the PCB panel.

Yours sincerely,
RCP

TOM DALRYMPLE
ASSOCIATE

Copy: Mr. Andrew Boardman Kangaroo Island Council
Mr. Richard Little RCP (rlittle@rcp.net.au)



Reference: 4048M3L092.docx
Contact: RCP Adelaide

8 June 2017

Office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island
Government Office in Kingscote, South Australia
43 Dauncey Street, Kingscote Town Hall
KINGSCOTE SA 5223

Attention: Ms. Wendy Campana, Commissioner for Kangaroo Island (by email: Wendy.Campana@sa.gov.au)

Dear Wendy,

KANGAROO ISLAND AIRPORT UPGRADE PROJECT

We refer to our letter of 7 June 2017 and your email of the same date and advise as follows in relation to the questions you have raised.

Question 1 *The briefing I understand that took place with DPTI regarding their procurement process. What was covered, were there specific references to procedures/ practices for undertaking a financial check?*

RCP was briefed by DPTI regarding their procurement process in relation to tender, evaluation and forms of contract. During these briefing sessions there was no discussion about any procedures / practices in relation to requirements for financial checks. Information was issued by DPTI to RCP which detailed procedures that could be adopted by RCP to tender and evaluate the procurement of the crushing works. The information provided did not reference a procedure / practice for undertaking a financial check in relation to a direct tender to DPTI prequalified contractors.

Question 2 *If the briefing did not address this - did RCP seek clarification on what was required or previously undertaken for pre-qualified contractors? If not, why not?*

DPTI provided briefings and information to RCP setting out their requirements in relation to the tender and evaluation process. The information and briefings provided by DPTI were clear and did not necessitate RCP to seek clarification. The PCB instructed RCP to request tenders from contractors that had been prequalified by DPTI.

As noted in our previous correspondence, the members of the PCB panel were kept informed of the process and received copies of the tenders and the evaluation report.

We trust that the above provides the information which you are seeking. As RCP is engaged by the Kangaroo Island Council can we ask that any further requests for information be first referred to Andrew Boardman.

Yours sincerely,
RCP

TOM DALRYMPLE
ASSOCIATE

Copy: Mr. Andrew Boardman Kangaroo Island Council
Mr. Richard Little RCP (rlittle@rcp.net.au)

