

CONFIDENTIAL



Eastern Waste Management Authority Special Board Meeting

Agenda

Friday 14 November 2025

As adjourned 7 November 2025

Notice is hereby given that a special meeting of the Board of the Eastern Waste Management Authority
will be held via MS Teams
on Friday 14 November 2025 commencing at 4:00pm.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'L. Leyland'.

Leonard Leyland
General Manager

Acknowledgement of Country

We would like to acknowledge this land that we meet on today is the traditional lands for the Kaurna people and that we respect their spiritual relationship with their country.

We also acknowledge the Kaurna people as the custodians of the Adelaide region and that their cultural and heritage beliefs are as important to the living Kaurna people today.



Agenda

Eastern Waste Management Authority Special Meeting of the Board of Management

Meeting to be held on Friday 14 November 2025 commencing at 4:00pm.
via MS Teams:

- 1. Present**
- 2. Acknowledgement of Country**
- 3. Apologies**
- 4. Conflicts of Interest**
- 5. Adjourned Business from 7 November 2025**

5.1 Organics Processing Tender

Page 4

6. Next Meeting of the Board

The next Ordinary Board Meeting is proposed to be held on:
Thursday 20 November 2025, at the Mayor's Parlour, City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters,
175 The Parade, Norwood

7. Closure of Meeting

5.1 Organics Processing Tender

Report Author General Manager

Attachments A: (Revised) Tender Evaluation Report
B: Probity and Tender Evaluation Plan

Pursuant to Section 83(5) of the *Local Government Act 1999*, the Report attached to this Agenda and the accompanying documentation is provided to the Board Members upon the basis that the Board will consider the Report and the documents in confidence under Part 3 of the Act, specifically on the basis that the Board will receive, discuss or consider:

- Section 90(2) & (3)(d)(i)(ii) commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret) the disclosure of which would, on balance, be contrary to the public interest.

As Adjourned on 7 November 2025

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to present to the East Waste Board the outcomes of the Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) assessment for RFT 2025/06 –Organics Processing Services, and to seek endorsement of the proposed recommendations.

This report should be read in conjunction with the attached Tender Evaluation Report (**refer Attachment A**), and the Probity and Tender Evaluation Plan as presented in Attachment B (**refer Attachment B**).

Recommendation 1

Pursuant to Section 90(2) and (3)(d) of the Local Government Act, 1999 the East Waste Board orders that the public, with the exception of the following East Waste employees: General Manager, Leonard Leyland, Manager Business Services, David Maywald, Manager Operational Services, Brian Krombholz, Manager Human Resources and Financial Services, Kelly Vandermoer, and Executive Administration Officer, Vanessa Davidson, be excluded from the meeting on the basis that the Board will receive, discuss and consider:

- (d) commercial information of a confidential nature (not being a trade secret) the disclosure of which –***
 - (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 as premature release of the details could impact future tender negotiations with the companies that have submitted a tender which in turn could lead to increased costs for the Constituent Councils.***

and the East Waste Board is satisfied that, the principle that the meeting should be conducted in a place open to the public, has been outweighed by the need to keep the receipt/discussion/consideration of the information confidential.

Recommendation 2

- 1. That the East Waste Board adopts the recommendation of the Tender Evaluation Panel, being to appoint Peats Soils & Garden Supplies as the preferred contractor for the Organics Processing Services Contract (RFT 2025/26).*
- 2. Authorises the General Manager to write to participating Member Councils advising of the Tender outcome and seek their formal commitment to participate in the contract.*
- 3. Subject to Member Councils Participation, Authorise the General Manager to enter into a contract with Peats Soils & Garden Supplies for an initial term of five (5) years; and authorises the General Manager to undertake all necessary negotiations, finalise contractual documentation, and execute the contract on behalf of East Waste, subject to confirmation of Member Council participation.*

Recommendation 3

- 1. That pursuant to section 91(7) of the Local Government Act 1999 the East Waste Board orders that the report 'Organics Processing Tender, Attachment A – Tender Evaluation Report and Attachment B - Probity and Tender Evaluation Plan be kept in confidence until further order.*
- 2. Pursuant to section 91(9)(c) of the Local Government Act 1999, the power to revoke the order under section 91(7) prior to any review or prior to a review is delegated to the General Manager, or any person acting in that position*
- 3. This order is subject to section 91(8)(b) of the Act which provides that details of the identity of the successful tenderer must be released once the GMPR Committee has made a selection.*
- 4. The East Waste Board notes any discussions of the East Waste Board on the matter are confidential in accordance with sections 62(4a) and 110A of the Local Government Act 1999.*

Strategic Link

Objective 1. Deliver cost effective and efficient services and facilities.

Objective 4. Help develop a local circular economy.

Background

East Waste, on behalf of participating Member Councils, released a Request for Tender (RFT) seeking a suitably qualified provider(s) to undertake the processing of kerbside collected organics material.

Five Member Councils elected to participate in the tender process:

- Adelaide Hills Council
- City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
- City of Mitcham
- City of Prospect
- City of Unley

Three Member Councils opted not participate due to existing contractual arrangements; however, there may be opportunities to include their tonnages in future contract arrangements if desired.

The participating Councils collectively generate approximately 33,000 tonnes of organics material per annum. This material has been processed by Jeffries under a non-contracted rate agreement following the expiration of the previous contract expiry in October 2025.

The contract term is five years, with two extension terms of five years each, providing for a potential maximum arrangement of 15 years (5 + 5 + 5 years).

Governance & Probity

Prior to the Tender being released, a Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) was established which comprised of six voting members, including representatives from East Waste and participating Member Councils, and was supported by specialist advisors including a probity advisor.

All members and advisors completed confidentiality and conflict-of-interest declarations prior to the Tender being released.

The tables below outlined who the members were of the tender Evaluation Panel and the people engaged to assist with provided technical advice (non-Voting members).

Name	Role	Organisation	Role
Leonard Leyland	General Manager	East Waste	Voting member
David Maywald	Manager Business Services (Chair)	East Waste	Voting member
Linley Golat	Waste Management Coordinator	Adelaide Hills Council	Voting member
Paul Hill	Principal Procurement Analyst	City of Mitcham	Voting member
Sam Wellington	Manager, Assets and Maintenance	City of Prospect	Voting member
Eddie Christopoulos	Operations Contracts & Projects Officer	City of Unley	Voting member

Support to the TEP was provided by specialist advisers which included.

Name	Project Role	Organisation	Evaluation panel role
Brian Krombholz	East Waste operations advice	East Waste	Non-voting
Shane Drury	East Waste operations advice	East Waste	Non-voting
Paul Gasiorowski	Probity	O'Connor Marsden & Associates (OCM)	Non-voting
Kristian Le Gallou	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Jarvis Webb	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Kat Heinrich	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Mark Rawson (joined part way through)	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting

Tender Process Overview

The Tender was publicly advertised via Tenders SA website (Refence - EWMA057643) on 1 October 2025 and closed on the 16 October 2025 at 5pm (AEST).

Interested parties were able to submit queries via a secure electronic mailbox, with one query being received and responded to whilst the Tender was open.

At the completion of the Tender period two (2) conforming tender responses were received via Tenders SA website prior to the closing date, from:

- Peats Soil & Garden Supplies (Peats); and
- Integrated Waste Services (IWS)

Just prior to the closing date/time of the Tender the incumbent Jeffries sent a letter to East Waste to advise of their decision not to participate and the reasons for the decision.

Evaluation Method

The Tender Evaluation was undertaken in accordance with the Tender & Probity Evaluation Plan as provided at Attachment A (**Attachment A**).

Scoring Methodology

A three-step weighted scoring approach was used:

- Non-financial criteria – 60%
- Financial (price) – 40%

A 0–5 scale was applied to all criteria, with consensus scoring completed following individual assessments and TEP discussion.

Clarification questions were issued to both respondents. All clarifications were reviewed and considered by the TEP prior to agreeing on the scoring

Tender Evaluation Panel Meetings

The Panel met on multiple occasions to:

- Discuss the Tender Evaluation plan
- Conduct a review of the Tender submissions
- Determine consensus scoring
- Consider clarifying information
- Assess pricing
- Determine value for money and risk
- Formulate the preferred recommendation

Probity was maintained throughout.

Evaluation Outcomes

Summary

The TEP noted that both respondents submitted high quality submissions and demonstrated that they are capable providers who could successfully deliver organics processing services to East Waste's member Council's

Each respondent demonstrated particular strengths such as:

- Peats Soils & Garden Supplies showed strong market presence and demonstrated well-established end markets for their finished products, competitive pricing, and long-term operational experience.
- Integrated Waste Services (IWS) submitted a polished proposal demonstrating a solid operational history, strong governance and social initiatives, and robust reporting capabilities.

While both parties were assessed as capable providers, Peats demonstrated a stronger end market performance, more competitive pricing, and provided the greatest overall value for money when considered against all evaluation criteria.

Both tenderers proposed multiple sites for the delivery of material. Peats nominated two facilities North Plympton and Brinkley each with differing processing costs. IWS nominated two facilities Wingfield and Seaford Heights with consistent pricing across both locations.

Given the price variations between the Peats facilities, each Peats site was assessed individually. In contrast, the IWS sites were assessed collectively, noting that both offered the same pricing structure, with logistical considerations taken into account.

Pricing summary

A summary of the processing rates provided by each respondent and the estimated first year cost if all ~33,000 tonnes of material was processed at each facility.

	Peats - Brinkley	Peats - North Plympton	IWS – Wingfield & SRC
Processing rate (0% - 3% contamination) - \$ per tonne	\$43.40	\$45.00	\$49.00
First year estimated cost	\$1,432,808	\$1,485,630	\$1,617,686

Additional pricing for managing contamination was provided by each tenderer. These values were not considered in the pricing weighted score as all Member Councils are currently below the 3% contamination threshold. The impacts of these fees were considered by the TEP.

	Peats	IWS
Contamination Penalty Fee (3% - 5%)	\$12.00	\$191.00*
Contamination Penalty Fee (>5%)	\$15.00	\$191.00*
Contamination Management Rate (\$ per tonne excl. SA Waste Levy)	\$140.00	\$20.00

A key area of financial risk identified through the tender evaluation relates to the significantly higher processing fees proposed by Integrated Waste Services (IWS) for material with contamination rates above 3%.

While all participating Member Councils currently operate below the 3% contamination threshold, there remains an inherent risk that contamination levels could increase over the contract period due to changes in community behaviour, seasonal variations, population growth, or program changes such as expanded garden waste collection.

Under the IWS pricing structure, contamination above 3% would attract substantially higher processing fees, creating material financial exposure for Member Councils. In comparison, Peats proposed a considerably lower contamination related fee structure, reducing the overall financial risk profile.

The TEP noted that although IWS demonstrated reasonable capability regarding education and contamination management, the cost impact of elevated contamination levels should they occur could significantly influence long-term cost predictability for Member Councils.

Given the variable nature of contamination trends over the life of a long-term contract (up to 15 years), this risk was considered material. The higher-risk pricing structure contributed to Peats offering the stronger overall value-for-money position, supported by more favourable contamination cost provisions.

In summary, the contamination-related pricing proposed by IWS represents a higher financial and operational risk compared to Peats, particularly over an extended contract term. This was a contributing factor in the TEP recommendation.

The table below outlines the TEP's agreed scoring results for each evaluation criterion, noting that a higher score indicates stronger performance.

Criteria	Peats Brinkley	Peats North Plympton	IWS Wingfield & SRC
Compliance and legal	Complete and compliant	Complete and compliant	Complete and compliant
Service methodology	29.3	29.3	32.0
Capability and circularity of end markets	22.5	22.5	17.5
Environment, Social and Governance (ESG)	15.8	15.8	20.0
Value add/continuous improvement	7.0	7.0	7.0
Commercial/Risk	Non- weighted	Non- weighted	Non- weighted
Commercial terms (Price)	40	38.6	35.4
Total weighted score	84.8 out of 100	83.4 out of 100	81.3 out of 100

Based on the TEP's agreed ratings after having assessed all criteria Peats (Brinkley scored the highest rating, followed by peats (North Plympton) and IWS.

Split-contract Consideration

Taking into account the strong performance of both participants and recognising the importance of cost and operational efficiencies associated with logistics, the TEP explored the possibility of a split contract arrangement whereby material could be processed by both Peats and IWS.

This approach was considered as it had the potential to provide logistical benefits and ultimately reduce costs for Member Councils through shorter haulage distances to nominated processing sites.

However, during clarification discussions, IWS advised that it would not accept material under a shared provider arrangement. As a result, the TEP determined that a split-contract model was not feasible.

Accordingly, a split contract approach is not considered to be a viable option.

Conclusion

The TEP recommends that the East Waste Board:

1. Adopt Peats Soils & Garden Supplies as the preferred tenderer for the Organics Processing Contract (RFT 2025/06), subject to final negotiations and participating Council approvals; and
2. Support execution of a contract with Peats consistent with the intent and scope outlined in the Tender Evaluation Report.

Additional Information – 14 November 2025

Following the Special Board Meeting held on Monday, 10 November, where the Board requested that the Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) reconvene to discuss the email received from IWS on the 10 November 2025 in which IWS advised of a change in position and indicated a willingness to enter into a split contract for specified Councils material, the TEP met on Wednesday, 12 November at 4:00pm via Microsoft Teams to consider this new information.

For clarity, the Tender Evaluation Plan required a quorum of four (4) TEP members. While five (5) members were available to attend, one member expressed concerns regarding the process at the commencement of the meeting and elected to resign from the TEP. As a result, four (4) members remained and met to discuss and consider the additional information provided by IWS. During the meeting, the remaining TEP members discussed IWS's revised position and considered the following key points:

1. Split Contract Arrangement:

The TEP acknowledged IWS's change in position and their willingness to enter into a split contract. However, the TEP noted that this arrangement would only be offered by IWS if East Waste specified that the material would be sourced from nominated Councils, including an indicative tonnage allocation for those Councils. The TEP further noted that committing specific Councils and tonnages within the contract would limit East Waste's ability to move tonnes between Councils and processors, thereby reducing operational flexibility and constraining East Waste's ability to effectively manage both operational and contractual risks.

2. Cost and Risk Considerations:

The TEP acknowledged that there may be logistical efficiencies and potential cost benefits in having a couple of Member Councils' material processed by IWS. However, the Panel determined that the risks associated with IWS's proposed contamination fee structure outweighed the potential financial benefits. This was particularly relevant in the context of ongoing FOGO trials and the reported increase in contaminated materials received by both processors. The Panel also noted that Councils have limited capacity to directly control contamination levels, further compounding this risk.

Having discussed and considered the information provided by IWS in their email on the 10 November 2025 the Tender Evaluation Panel was in agreement that the original recommendation of the TEP should remain unchanged (refer below).

Following a comprehensive evaluation of all tender submissions, clarifications and a negotiation meeting to further clarify details, the Tender Evaluation Panel recommends:

- 1. Peats Soils and Garden Supplies be selected as the sole preferred supplier for 100% of the participating Member Council's organics recycling materials.*
- 2. East Waste to enter contract negotiations with Peats. This includes further exploring logistics and drop-off locations, especially the opportunity to accelerate a drop-off location in the vicinity of the East Waste depot.*

In addition to the above recommendation, separate to the TEP recommendation, East Waste Administration will be incorporating into the contractual discussions consideration to ensure each extension period, each five years, provides an opportunity for individual Councils to reaffirm and continue or remove themselves from the contract, without any impact on the East Waste contract itself. Supporting this objective is the confirmation that no minimum tonnage, nor specific allocation of Council, is required from the preferred tenderer.



Tender Evaluation Report

RFT 2025/06 | Organics Processing Services

November 2025

Contents

Organics Processing Tender Evaluation Report.....	3
Background.....	3
Governance	4
Evaluation Plan	4
Evaluation Panel	4
Probity	5
Tender Process.....	6
Evaluation stages	6
Submission summary Peats Soils & Garden Supplies	7
Submission summary Integrated Waste Services	7
Scoring summary	8
Pricing summary.....	8
Logistics considerations	9
Risk Assessment & Negotiations Meetings.....	11
Peats Soils & Garden Supplies	11
Integrated Waste Services	12
Development of the TEP Recommendation	13
Recommendation.....	14
Tender Evaluation Panel endorsement	14

Organics Processing Tender Evaluation Report

This report has been prepared to present the findings and recommendations of the Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) for the open Request for Tender (RFT) RFT 2025/06 | Organics Processing Services to East Waste.

The objective of the tender process was to secure a suitably qualified supplier(s) to provide processing of organics materials collected from Member Councils and support East Waste's operational requirements in alignment with its Strategic Plan objectives, particularly delivering cost-effective services and providing leadership in operational management.

Background

East Waste invited all member Councils to participate in the tender process. Five Member Councils opted to participate in the tender for organics processing services with three member councils opting not to participate on the basis that they had other contractual arrangements. The participating Councils included:

- Adelaide Hills Council
- City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters
- City of Mitcham
- City of Prospect
- City of Unley

These councils generate approximately 33,000 tonnes of organics materials a year. This is currently processed by Jeffries (previous contract ended in October 2025 and currently processed under a non-contracted rate).

The tender process was initiated to establish a new long-term contract for organics processing services. The contract term provides for two extension options, allowing for a maximum duration of up to 15 years (5 + 5 + 5 years).

The remaining three Member Councils currently have existing organics processing contracts; however, East Waste may have the opportunity to include their tonnages in a processing contract in future.



Governance

An Evaluation Plan was developed prior to the release of the tender and outlined the evaluation process, expectations of the Tender Evaluation Panel (TEP) and the criteria and weightings.

Evaluation Plan

The evaluation plan was based on weighted scoring across a three-step process:

- **Non-Financial** – Worth 60%
- **Financial** – Worth 40%
- **Overall score**

The table below outlines the Evaluation Criteria and weightings that informed the evaluation of tender responses.

Scoring was conducted using a 0–5 scale, where 0 indicated an unacceptable response and 5 indicated an excellent response. A weighted average was then applied to derive the final scores.

Criteria	Non-financial weighting	Financial weighting
Compliance and legal	Mandatory	NA
Service methodology	40%	NA
Capability and circularity of end markets	25%	NA
Environment, Social and Governance (ESG)	25%	NA
Value add/continuous improvement	10%	NA
Commercial/Risk	Non-weighted	NA
Commercial terms	NA	100%

Evaluation Panel

The TEP consisted of six voting members.

Name	Role	Organisation	Role
Leonard Leyland	General Manager	East Waste	Voting member
David Maywald	Manager Business Services	East Waste	Voting member & TEP Chair
Linley Golat	Waste Management Coordinator	Adelaide Hills Council	Voting member
Paul Hill	Principal Procurement Analyst	City of Mitcham	Voting member
Sam Wellington	Manager, Assets and Maintenance	City of Prospect	Voting member
Eddie Christopoulos	Operations Contracts & Projects Officer	City of Unley	Voting member

Norwood Payneham & St Peters were invited to include a member for the TEP but declined based on staff availability and capacity.

Support to the TEP was provided by specialist advisers which included.

Name	Project Role	Organisation	Evaluation panel role
Brian Krombholz	East Waste operations advice	East Waste	Non-voting
Shane Drury	East Waste operations advice	East Waste	Non-voting
Paul Gasiorowski	Probity	O'Connor Marsden & Associates (OCM)	Non-voting
Kristian Le Gallou	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Jarvis Webb	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Kat Heinrich	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Mark Rawson	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting

Probity

Probity was proactively managed throughout the tender process:

- TEP members and specialist advisers signed confidentiality and conflict of interest declarations prior receiving tender responses.
- A probity advisor was present at all TEP meetings and opened each session with a reminder of expectations, requirements and seeking if any TEP member needed to make any disclosures.
- The probity adviser participated in each meeting and was available for clarifications throughout.

Tender Process

On the 01 October 2025 the Tender was advertised through the Tenders SA website providing interested parties until 16 October 2025 to respond.

Whilst the tender was open, interested parties were invited to contact the chair of the evaluation Committee to ask questions or seek clarification via a specified electronic mailbox. During this period one query was received and responded to from Gaia Envirotech regarding the proposed contract start date.

Two conforming responses were received via Tenders SA website prior to the Tender closing from:

- Peats Soil & Garden Supplies (Peats)
- Integrated Waste Services (IWS)

Evaluation stages

Evaluation took place in multiple stages

- 1. Individual assessment of non-financial responses**
Submissions were distributed to TEP members and independently reviewed, scored and comments recorded.
- 2. Panel review and consensus scoring**
The TEP convened to discuss each submission, review individual assessments, discuss variances in scoring, and then reach a consensus on final scores. Some criteria were given provisional scores pending further information from tenderers. For these provisional scores, upper and lower bounds were agreed and then finalised following clarifying information provided by tenderers.
- 3. Pricing scoring**
Pricing tender responses were shared with the TEP and the scoring completed based on the tenderers costs against the lowest total cost.
- 4. Review and confirmation**
The TEP met to confirm consensus scoring for non-financial responses, financial and overall score.
- 5. Value for money and risk assessment**
The TEP met to consider the value for money (which includes the logistics considerations of drop off locations) and risk considerations of the tender responses.
- 6. Negotiation discussions**
Representatives of the TEP, OCM (probity) and Rawtec (technical support) met with both Tenderers to further discuss and confirm aspects of their responses.
- 7. Recommendation for the Board**
The TEP confirmed their recommendation for the East Waste Board to consider.
- 8. Final negotiations and contract execution**
Pending Board approval and member council endorsement, final negotiations and contract execution to be completed.

Submission summary | Peats Soils & Garden Supplies

Peats provided a sound response and demonstrated long-term expertise, capacity and strong end markets for their products generated. The response did lack some detail and overall polish, but the TEP is confident in the ability of Peats to deliver the processing services.

Two drop-off locations were provided for consideration:

- Adelaide Waste and Recycling Centre, North Plympton
- Peats Brinkley

Considering all evaluation criteria, the Brinkley drop-off location scored the highest of all options but has significant logistics implications for East Waste. The North Plympton drop-off location scores second highest overall.

During the evaluation process, the TEP sought clarification from Peats on several matters including:

- Access for participating councils' material to be processed at North Plympton
- Clarification on lack of ISO accreditation.
- Reporting capabilities.
- Additional information on WHS performance.
- Option for a northern drop off location.

The clarification provided by Peats was taken into consideration by the TEP when determining appropriate scores.

Submission summary | Integrated Waste Services

IWS provided a polished response. They also demonstrated a long operating history, good range of social initiatives and current processing volumes but the response was less convincing about their end markets for products generated.

Two drop-off locations were provided for consideration:

- IWS Wingfield
- Southern Recycling Centre, Seaford Heights

The two IWS drop-off options scored third overall.

During the evaluation process, the TEP sought clarification from IWS on several matters including:

- Clarification on contamination pricing.
- Additional information on not participating in the National Heavy Vehicle Accreditation Scheme
- Reporting Capabilities
- Material Flows (where the processed products end up)
- Contamination Material Audits

The clarification provided by IWS was taken into consideration by the TEP when determining appropriate scores.

Scoring summary

Criteria	Peats Brinkley	Peats North Plympton	IWS Wingfield & SRC
Compliance and legal	Complete and compliant	Complete and compliant	Complete and compliant
Service methodology	29.3	29.3	32.0
Capability and circularity of end markets	22.5	22.5	17.5
Environment, Social and Governance (ESG)	15.8	15.8	20.0
Value add/continuous improvement	7.0	7.0	7.0
Commercial/Risk	Non- weighted	Non- weighted	Non- weighted
Commercial terms (Price)	40	38.6	35.4
Total weighted score	84.8 out of 100	83.4 out of 100	81.3 out of 100

Pricing summary

A summary of the processing rates provided by each respondent and the estimated first year cost if all ~33,000 tonnes of material was processed at each facility.

	Peats - Brinkley	Peats - North Plympton	IWS – Wingfield & SRC
Processing rate (0% - 3% contamination) - \$ per tonne	\$43.40	\$45.00	\$49.00
First year estimated cost	\$1,432,808	\$1,485,630	\$1,617,686

Additional pricing for managing contamination was provided by each tenderer. These values were not considered in the pricing weighted score as all Member Councils are currently below the 3% contamination threshold. The impacts of these fees are considered in the risk assessment.

Peats provided their pricing according to the processes outlined in the specifications that shares the responsibility and risk of contamination between all parties (see table below).

	Peats	IWS
Contamination Penalty Fee (3% - 5%)	\$12.00	See commentary below
Contamination Penalty Fee (>5%)	\$15.00	
Contamination Management Rate (\$ per tonne excl. SA Waste Levy)	\$140.00	

The contamination pricing provided by IWS required further clarifications to confirm, as it appeared to differ from the processes outlined in the specifications.

In the negotiation meeting IWS confirmed that they would charge \$191 per tonne for contamination material separated from a load (identified as being above 3% contamination). This rate includes the SA waste levy and landfill disposal costs. This contamination process does diverge from the tender specifications as currently written (further detail and considerations outlined below in the risk assessment section).

Logistics considerations

The tender documentation specified in the Information for Tenderers that East Waste may consider awarding a contract to multiple Tenderers to support efficiencies in collection logistics, see text box below of the wording included in the published tender documents.

To support this and inform the TEP East Waste completed preliminary investigations into the logistics considerations of the two Tenderers and their proposed drop-off locations.

High-level analysis was based on:

- Travel from a central point in each Member Council area.
- Travel time from this centre point, the number of kilometres and the number of loads completed in 2024/2025 (it excluded the travel component of bin collections).
- Member Councils 24/25 organics volumes.
- All organics volumes going to the one location

EXTRACT FROM TENDER DOCUMENTS | SECTION A: INFORMATION FOR TENDERERS

Continuous improvement

East Waste provides collection of Organics Recycling kerbside bins across a large geographic area and is continuously looking for opportunities to improve efficiency and manage costs for Member Councils.

If there are operational benefits that can be achieved, East Waste may consider entering a Contract with multiple Tenderers to create efficiencies in collection and delivery of Organics Recycling Material to Nominated Facilities. This could mean:

- *All Organics Recycling Materials from a Member Council are directed to a single facility*
- *A portion of Organics Recycling Materials from a Member Council are directed to multiple facilities.*

If a contract with multiple Tenderers is the preferred pathway, East Waste will confirm an estimated distribution of tonnes of Organics Recycling Material prior to the execution of a Contract.

Example Scenario

The East Waste collection vehicle completes its first collection run of kerbside Organics Recycling bins for Member Council 1 and delivers the Material to Nominated Facility A. Upon completion of the second collection run the Material is delivered to Nominated Facility B.

The tables below summarise the estimated annual costs for each council considering the combined travel and processing costs.

Note, East Waste will complete detailed analysis and modelling for each Member Council prior to entering any contractual arrangements.

Council	IWS - Wingfield	IWS - SRC	Peats - North Plympton	Peats - Brinkley	Impact – All to IWS	Impact – All to Peats	% Impact if all to Peats
Prospect	\$204,745	\$350,707	\$237,983	\$344,363	Lowest	+\$33,238	+16%
Norwood Payneham & St Peters	\$345,244	\$504,092	\$374,636	\$538,713	Lowest	+\$29,392	+9%
Unley	\$450,247	\$548,620	\$407,043	\$592,410	+ \$43,204	Lowest	-11%
Mitcham	\$876,504	\$957,414	\$834,272	\$1,012,747	+ \$42,232	Lowest	-5%
Adelaide Hills	\$531,989	\$592,348	\$570,408	\$515,581	+ \$16,408	Lowest	-3%
TOTAL					+ \$101,844	+ \$62,630	-\$39,215 (1.7% net saving)

Risk Assessment & Negotiations Meetings

Risks and further clarifications were identified for each Tenderer and discussed with each Tender in a negotiations meeting.

Peats Soils & Garden Supplies

The following items were identified by the TEP and discussed with Peats in a meeting on Thursday 6 November 2025.

Risk/Clarification	Detail	Response/clarification
ISO 9001 Certification	Peats do not have an ISO accredited Quality Plan/Management System	Peats advised that they have an internal quality system in place; however, they have not undertaken formal certification. They indicated they would be willing to pursue certification if required by East Waste, noting that the process may take some time to complete.
Northern drop-off location	Peats do not currently have a Northern drop-off location. This creates potential for increased time/cost for delivery of materials to drop-off location.	Peats confirmed they had explored various options to date but have not secured anything yet. A northern depot is something they have wanted to develop and are committed to exploring this further to be able to provide East Waste this option.
Minimum & Maximum tonnes	Does the Tenderer have a required minimum or maximum tonnes if East Waste was to progress to a contract.	Peats indicated no minimum or maximum tonnes. They will accept any volumes and have the operational flexibility to respond accordingly (e.g. additional bulk transport loads from North Plympton).
Contract Start dates	Confirming if staged contract commencement is available pending Member Council approval processes.	Peats confirmed that staged commencement is acceptable.

Integrated Waste Services

The following items were identified by the TEP discussed with IWS in a meeting on Friday 7 November 2025.

Risk/Clarification	Detail	Response/clarification
Contamination pricing	Significant concern was raised by the TEP about the high contamination management fees (\$191/tonne) and if Member Councils were to exceed 3% contamination rates. This creates financial risk for Member Councils, especially those closer to the 3% contamination mark.	IWS confirmed that the \$191 per tonne contamination rates include the SA waste levy and landfill disposal costs. They apply to the contamination material separated from a load (identified as being above 3% contamination) and not the full load of organics materials. IWS have taken this approach in other contracts but has not currently exercised this contamination fee yet. IWS indicated a commitment to communication of contamination issues prior to applying the fee. Note that the contamination process outlined by IWS differs slightly from the tender specifications as currently written and it would be beneficial to clearly update the documents to be clear on processes and costs associated with contamination prior to the potential signing of a contract.
Material flow pathways	The TEP sought further clarification on the amount of organics material processed, products generated and sold into external markets.	IWS noted that their response in the tender response documents and Clarification #2 was sufficient and they would not provide further detail on the material flows, citing this as commercially sensitive information.
Minimum & Maximum tonnes	Does the Tenderer have a required minimum or maximum tonnes if East Waste was to progress to a contract.	IWS confirmed that they would not accept the split of tonnes between Tenderers, and they are only interested in 100% of the organics materials.
Contract Start dates	Confirming if staged contract commencement is available pending Member Council approval processes.	IWS confirmed that staged commencement is acceptable.

Development of the TEP Recommendation

Friday 7 November	• TEP met at 10:30am to finalise a recommendation for the East Waste Board. • Tender Evaluation Report sent to TEP at 3:42pm for their approval and signature. • Based on the TEP's verbal endorsement at the morning meeting, the Evaluation Plan was included in the Board Agenda. • TEP Chair sent a summary of discussion of negotiations meeting to respective Tenderers at 4:39pm. – This was intended to avoid any unintentional misinterpretation of the meeting and Tenderers were given the courtesy of providing any comments on these notes by 2:00pm Monday 10 November.
Monday 10 November	• IWS provided a response that outlined a significant change in their position and indicated a willingness to <i>'accept a part-contract arrangement for certain councils.'</i> • At 12:03pm the TEP Chair sent an email to the TEP informing them of the IWS email (including its contents in the email). The email sought confirmation from the TEP that upon considering this information the original recommendation in the Evaluation Plan remained the same. • The East Waste Board met at 5pm and requested that the TEP meet to discuss and consider the email response provided by IWS in which they indicated they would accept a split contract with another tenderer with tonnes from specified council(s).
Wednesday 11 November	• Five members of the TEP met at 4pm to discuss the Board feedback. • Eddie Christopoulos (TEP representative) raised concerns with reopening the evaluation process after the evaluation panel had already made a determination and did not wish to proceed. As such, he did not take part in any further discussion. • A quorum was still able to be maintained and remaining members (noting TEP member Paul Hill was unavailable) of the TEP confirmed their acceptance to reopen the evaluation process to discuss and consider the additional information from IWS, as requested by the Board. • These items were discussed and considered and the TEP confirmed its recommendation for the Evaluation Report and the evaluation process was closed again.
Thursday 12 November	• Evaluation Report updated and sent to TEP for review and signature.

Recommendation

Following a comprehensive evaluation of all tender submissions, clarifications and a negotiation meeting to further clarify details, the Tender Evaluation Panel recommends:

1. Peats Soils and Garden Supplies be selected as the sole preferred supplier for 100% of the participating Member Council's organics recycling materials.
2. East Waste to enter contract negotiations with Peats. This includes further exploring logistics and drop-off locations, especially the opportunity to accelerate a drop-off location in the vicinity of the East Waste depot.

Peats provided a sound response and demonstrated long-term expertise, capacity and strong end markets for their products generated. Their submission was rated highest overall when considering the non-financial and financial weighting.

Through the clarifications and negotiation meeting, they also demonstrated willingness to partner with East Waste and Member Councils to continually improve service delivery. They also expressed a commitment to investigating options for a northern drop-off location to improve logistics for Member Councils.

Tender Evaluation Panel endorsement

This Tender Evaluation Report has been reviewed and endorsed by all members of the TEP.

Name	Role	Organisation	Signature
David Maywald	Manager Business Services	East Waste	<i>DN Maywald</i>
Leonard Leyland	General Manager	East Waste	<i>LL</i>
Linley Golat	Waste Management Coordinator	Adelaide Hills Council	<i>Linley Golat</i>
Sam Wellington	Manager, Assets and Maintenance	City of Prospect	<i>Sam</i>

EastWaste



1 Temple Court
Ottoway SA 5013



PO Box 26
Mansfield Park SA 5012



08 8347 5111



east@eastwaste.com



EastWasteSA



@East_Waste



East Waste - Eastern Waste
Management Authority



eastwaste.com.au

EVALUATION PLAN | EAST WASTE ORGANICS PROCESSING TENDER

1. PURPOSE

This Evaluation Plan helps support a structured, fair, and defensible tender process that facilitates the selection of the most suitable bidder.

2. OBJECTIVE OF THE PROCUREMENT

The Request for Tender aims to deliver a range of objectives through a positive partnership with the successful Tenderer(s):

Environmental	• Support South Australia's circular economy and climate change mitigation and adaptation. • Source separate material to extract the most resources at their best and highest use. • Reduce waste generation and material to landfill.
Quality	• Achieve and maintain a high standard of performance. • Produce high quality products from Organics Recycling Material that support the SA circular economy market. • Deliver best practice Services and continual improvement. • Provide regular and transparent reporting on the Services.
Community	• Deliver Services the community can rely on. • Support building relationships with the community to responsibly manage waste and recycling.
Financial	• Provide value for money to East Waste and Member Councils and the community. • Develop the local economy and employment opportunities.
Legislative	• Fulfil East Waste and Member Council's obligations to provide waste and recycling services.

3. CONFIDENTIALITY

Information provided to the Evaluation Panel must be treated as confidential and always maintained. Members of the Evaluation Panel must not disclose any information to persons outside of the Evaluation panel (this includes executive leadership of their respective councils).

Once the evaluation process is complete a recommendation to the East Waste Board will be provided.

4. EVALUATION

The objective of the evaluation is to identify the best fit for purpose, value for money solution which delivers the outcome required by East Waste on behalf of its Member Councils for this procurement.

The evaluation process considers the financial (quantitative) and non-financial (qualitative) elements of a supplier's offer.

4.1. Evaluation Panel

East Waste will form an evaluation panel of members with relevant expertise to the tender. Members of the Panel with evaluation and voting rights will include:

Name	Role	Organisation	Evaluation Panel role
Leonard Leyland	General Manager	East Waste	Voting member
David Maywald (Chair)	Manager Business Services	East Waste	Voting member
Linley Golat	Waste Management Coordinator	Adelaide Hills Council	Voting member
Paul Hill	Principal Procurement Analyst	City of Mitcham	Voting member
Sam Wellington	Manager, Assets and Maintenance	City of Prospect	Voting member
Eddie Christopoulos	Operations Contracts & Projects Officer	City of Unley	Voting member

Absence of Evaluation Team Members

In the event that any member of the evaluation team is unavailable (as a result of a conflict of interest, sick leave, job reallocation or other reason for absence), an alternative staff member with an equivalent skill set or expertise may be chosen to undertake the duties of the original member. Any changes to the evaluation team will be recorded as a departure from the approved evaluation plan.

For the purposes of progressing the evaluation, a minimum of four (4) voting members will constitute a quorum. The evaluation process may proceed provided this quorum is maintained throughout meetings and assessment activities.

4.2. Specialist advisors

The following specialist advisors or support has been engaged to assist the evaluation team in making their recommendations. They are not part of the evaluation team.

Name	Project Role	Organisation	Evaluation panel role
Brian Krombholz	East Waste operations advice	East Waste	Non-voting
Shane Drury	East Waste operations advice	East Waste	Non-voting
Paul Gasiorowski	Probity	O'Connor Marsden & Associates (OCM)	Non-voting
Kristian Le Gallou	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Jarvis Webb	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting
Kat Heinrich	Technical advice	Rawtec	Non-voting

5. RISK MITIGATION

Probity and risk are a responsibility of all members of the Evaluation Panel. Additional support will be provided by OCM.

- OCM will be present and open all meetings.
- A probity briefing will be held prior to the release of the tender.
- Evaluation team members, supporting staff and consultants must sign conflict-of-interest declarations.
- Contingency plans for disputes or unforeseen delays will be established.

6. TRANSPARENCY AND DOCUMENTATION

All evaluation documents will be retained in file securely by East Waste, including scores, justifications, and decision-making records.

7. EVALUATION PROCESS

A three-stage scoring process will be conducted:

- Stage 1 - Non-Financial - Worth 60%
- Stage 2 - Financial - Worth 40%
- Stage 3 - Overall score

A consensus scoring system will be used. Following the submission of individual evaluation scores by each team member, the panel will meet to discuss the rating for each tenderer and service provided and agree on a score for each criteria. This will then be entered into the Evaluation Assessment spreadsheet. Notes justifying the consensus score shall be recorded within the spreadsheet.

7.1. Stages of evaluation

1	Preliminary screening - mandatory 'compliance and legal' components reviewed by East Waste (Dave Maywald).
2	Rawtec provided all responses for independent analysis of qualitative and quantitative responses
3	Panel members provided qualitative responses for evaluation
4	Panel members individually assess qualitative responses submitted
5	Consensus scoring of qualitative responses
6	Panel members provided quantitative responses and Rawtec financial analysis for evaluation
7	Panel members individually assess quantitative responses submitted
8	Consensus scoring of quantitative responses
9	Overall score developed for each tenderer
10	Risk Assessment
11	Value for money
12	Presentations/Clarifications Meeting (if required to confirm previous clarifications)
13	Site Visits (if required)
14	Financial Viability Assessment (if required)
15	Negotiation
16	Referee Checks
17	Confirm Value for Money
18	Recommendation for the East Waste board
19	Notification of outcome to all tenderers and opportunity for feedback
20	Execute contract

7.2. Preliminary Screening:

- East Waste (Dave Maywald).will check the responses for compliance with submission requirements (e.g., completeness, eligibility, required documentation).
 - Non-conforming responses will be identified and reviewed in a secondary process following the review of conforming submissions.

Non-conforming tenders

The decision to evaluate non-conforming tenders will be at the Evaluation Panel's discretion.

- Non-conforming tenders will only be assessed after conforming tenders have been assessed and their overall score determined.
- The same two step process will be completed for non-confirming tenders.

7.3. Detailed Evaluation:

Rawtec's role

Rawtec will receive all documents to support an independent review of submissions separate to the evaluation panel.

A list of technical and financial considerations and clarifications will be developed for the evaluation panel to consider at the appropriate step.

Evaluation panel

Following an initial review by East Waste (Dave Maywald).to confirm submissions have completed the mandatory criteria (compliance and legal), the evaluation panel will receive conforming submissions in a two-step process to complete their technical evaluation against the scoring framework.

- Step 1
 - Section E Part 1 Tender Response Schedules documents and supporting information submitted by the tenderer.
 - Each member will note clarifications, to be consolidated as a single document.
 - Each panel member to submit their technical evaluation and scoring to East Waste (Dave Maywald).
 - The panel will then meet to determine consensus scoring.
- Step 2
 - Tender Section E Part 2 Pricing Schedules and financial summary (developed by Rawtec) will be provided to the evaluation panel.
 - Each panel member to submit their financial evaluation and scoring to East Waste (Dave Maywald).
 - The panel will then meet to determine consensus scoring.

Following these two individual steps, and response to all clarification questions, an overall score will be determined for each tenderer.

8. EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING FRAMEWORK

8.1. Evaluation criteria

	Criteria	Return Schedule	Non-financial weighting	Financial weighting
Compliance and legal	• Tenderer details • Financial standing • Conflict of interest • Regulatory compliance • Declaration • Tender conformity • Insurances	1, 2 and 7	Mandatory	<i>NA</i>
Service methodology	• Service delivery proposal • Resourcing • Data and reporting	9 and 10	40%	<i>NA</i>
Capability and circularity of end markets	• Experience • Established external markets for products generated through the Processing of Organics Recycling Materials	3, 4, 10.2 and 10.3	25%	<i>NA</i>
Environment, Social and Governance (ESG)	• Sustainability of Tenderer and proposed Services • Local economic and social benefits • Governance structure	8	25%	<i>NA</i>
Value add/continuous improvement	• Service improvements • Proposed innovation	11	10%	<i>NA</i>
Commercial/Risk	• WHS • Quality Plan • Emergency Plan • Business Continuity Plan • Environmental Management Plan • Industrial Relations and Workforce Plan	5, 6	Non-weighted	<i>NA</i>
Commercial terms	• Price and commercial offer • Value for money • Direct and indirect benefits to East Waste and Member Councils • Whole of life costs	-	<i>NA</i>	100%

8.2. Scoring System

Scoring against the weighted evaluation criteria (including sub criteria) will be undertaken using the following system. Half marks are acceptable.

	Rationale	Score
Excellent Offer	Highly convincing and credible. Offer demonstrates excellent capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Documentation provides complete details. All claims adequately demonstrated and substantiated.	5
Good Offer	Offer complies, is convincing and credible. Offer demonstrates good capability, capacity and experience, relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Minor uncertainties and shortcomings in the supplier's claims or documentation.	4
Adequate Offer	Offer complies and is credible but not completely convincing. Offer demonstrates adequate capability, capacity and experience, relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria. Supplier's claims have some gaps.	3
Limited Offer	Barely convincing. Offer has shortcomings and deficiencies in demonstrating the supplier's capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.	2
Poor Offer	Offer unconvincing. Offer has significant flaws in demonstrating the supplier's capability, capacity and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.	1
Inadequate Offer	Offer is totally unconvincing, and requirement has not been met. Offer has inadequate information to demonstrate the supplier's capability, capacity, and experience relevant to, or understanding of, the requirements of the evaluation criteria.	0

9. EVALUATION TEAM SIGN-OFF

I have read and agree to abide by this Evaluation Plan

I have executed a *Conflict-of-Interest* declaration prior to commencing the evaluation.

I understand that I am required to notify the Probity Officer immediately in writing, if prior to, during or at the conclusion of the evaluation process, an actual, potential, or perceived conflict of interest arises or appears likely to arise.

Name	Role	Organisation	Signature
David Maywald	Manager Business Services	East Waste	Date:
Leonard Leyland	General Manager	East Waste	Date
Linley Golat	Waste Management Coordinator	Adelaide Hills Council	Date:
Paul Hill	Principal Procurement Analyst - Community Renewables	City of Mitcham	Date:
Sam Wellington	Manager, Assets and Maintenance	City of Prospect	Date:
Eddie Christopoulos	Operations Contracts & Projects Officer	City of Unley	Date: