

Question No: 79

Question: Engineering Consultancies

Date: 12/11/91

Member: Mr STIRLING

To: MINISTER for TRANSPORT and WORKS

1. What was the total cost of engineering consultancies in the areas of civil design and documentation, surveying and geotechnical engaged by the Department of Transport of Works and the Construction Authority between 1 October 1990 and 1 October 1991.
2. What was the total number and value of these consultancies in each of the above areas that were subject to tender processes and those that were not subject to tender processes respectively.
3. What was the number and value of these consultancies that were engaged by direct commissioning.
4. Who were these direct commission consultancies awarded to and what was the total value of consultancies awarded to each of these various consultants engaged over this period.
5. What selection criteria was followed in each case not subject to public tender.
6. Have any engineering consultants left the Northern Territory over this period due to their expressed dissatisfaction with the processes for awarding consultancies for the Department of Transport and Works and the construction agency.

ANSWER

1. \$2 246 121.

2. (a) Subject to tender processes - Nil.
(b) Not subject to tender processes -

Civil 53 \$1 711 996
Survey 34 \$ 290 576
Geotechnical 21 \$ 243 549

3. As for question 1 - \$2 246 121.

4. As per Attachment A.

5. As per Attachment B.

6. The department is not aware of any firm leaving the Territory for such reason.

ATTACHMENT A

Consultant No. Value
\$

CIVIL

Acer Vaughan (D) 12 357 350
Acer Vaughan (A/S) 4 42 795
Connell Wagner 3 86 931
Clarendon 4 23 113
Colless and O'Neill P/L 2 24 316
Gibb Australia 3 18 953
Gutteridge Haskins (D) 4 730 361
Gutteridge Haskins (A/S) 1 35 000
Pak Poy Lange 1 14 000
Sleeman Dunkley Treacy Maunsell P/L (D) 2 88 601
Sleeman Dunkley Treacy Maunsell P/L (A/S) 1 5 185
Willing and Partners P/L (D) 14 224 391
Willing and Partners P/L (A/S) 1 61 000

52 1 711 996

SURVEY

AireSearch Mapping 3 14 572
Brazier and Motti 2 46 000
Brian Blakeman 2 3 410
Colless and O'Neill 2 13 830
Earl James and Associates 8 130 499
Fisher Stewart P/L 1 9 226
John Liew 1 4 609
GPS Surveys 7 14 632
Gutteridge Haskins 1 5 000
Qasco Northern Surveys 3 27 497
Survey and Mapping Group 1 1 290
Tony Markham 3 20 011

34 290 576

GEOTECHNICAL

Acer Vaughan 2 43 595
Coffey and Partners 2 23 090
Dames and Moore 5 106 920
M Sakurai 4 22 336
Ted Warren and Associates 1 4 335
Ulman and Nolan 3 19 610
Woodburn Fitzharding 4 23 663

21 243 549

ATTACHMENT B

SELECTION OF A PROPOSED CONSULTANT

The Department/Authority requires the selected consultant to have the professional expertise and resources to meet the time, quality and cost factors for a particular

project or study and selection is always to be made within this criteria.

GENERAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SELECTION

Select 1 consultant with selection based on -

- Expertise available for the project
- Quality of previous work
- Ability to perform within our time constraints.

Then brief the consultant to define work scope and negotiate fair and reasonable fee. If selected consultant is unable to meet our requirements, or if fee cannot be agreed, then repeat the process with our second choice.

SPECIAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR SELECTION

Where the particular task is extensive or of a specialised nature, proposals should be sought from a number of consultants.

Proposals should -

- Confirm resources available
- Demonstrate experience
- Indicate methods and special considerations

Fee proposals are to be sought at the same time as technical proposals but are to be a secondary, but necessary, consideration when assessing proposals.

GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR SELECTION

- (a) Territory preference will continue to prevail.
- (b) Where 'all is equal', ensure that favouritism does not occur.
- (c) Unsuccessful consultants shall be advised formally of the outcome.
- (d) Fee competition is not part of our selection process, but value for money is required.
- (e) Fee proposals which are abundantly too high or low should normally be rejected.
- (f) Fees based on accepted tender prices are not acceptable without specific approval.
- (g) Consultancies should preferably be for 'whole tasks' to avoid split responsibility consequences.