



# Contractor Performance Report Scoring Guide

Main Roads Western Australia

# **Table of Contents**

| CON | CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT SCORING GUIDE |   |  |  |  |
|-----|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1.  | APPLICATION                                 | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2.  | REPORTING                                   | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2.1 | Objectives                                  |   |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | Frequency                                   | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2.3 | Responsibility<br>Review and Assessment     | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2.4 | Review and Assessment                       | 3 |  |  |  |
| 2.5 | Contractor's Response                       | 4 |  |  |  |
| 3.  | PERFORMANCE RATINGS                         | 4 |  |  |  |
| 4.  | FINAL PERFORMANCE REPORT                    | 5 |  |  |  |

# **CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE REPORT SCORING GUIDE**

# 1. Application

This scoring guide provides minimum requirements for a common contractor performance reporting regime under the National Prequalification System and is applicable from 1 January 2011.

## 2. Reporting

#### 2.1 Objectives

- Promote the process of continuous improvement in the delivery of road and bridge projects.
- Recognise good and superior performance and manage poor performance.
- Encourage cooperative relationships between prequalified contractors and Participating Authorities.
- Obtain a measure of the contractor's performance under the contract, to allow Participating Authorities to make informed decisions related to tender assessment and prequalification.
- Enable the meaningful exchange of contractor performance reporting information under the National Prequalification System.

#### 2.2 Frequency

Contractor Performance Reports are required to be completed as a minimum:

- 1 every six months during the contract
- 2 immediately after practical completion of a contract
- 3 at the Participating Authority's discretion e.g. when there is a continuing period of unsuitable performance on a contract by the contractor, or when a contract is terminated.

Note: The performance criteria and a preliminary assessment should be discussed with the contractor prior to allocating final scores.

#### 2.3 Responsibility

Responsibility for completion of Contractor Performance Reports should be assigned to the person best able to make accurate and factual assessments in accordance with the evaluation criteria. For most contracts, this will be the person who has day-to-day liaison with the contractor and would generally be the road authority's site representative.

It is important to have all relevant facts and documentation to justify the assessment made, particularly if the assessment is negative.

#### 2.4 Review and Assessment

When specified by the Participating Authority, a review of the reporting officer's appraisal may be made by a reviewing officer experienced in contract management at a more senior level. The reviewing officer's task is to ensure that the report is objective and accurate to the extent that it can be relied upon by the Participating Authority to make accountable decisions related to prequalification and tender assessment.

Any disagreements with the reporting officer's report must be capable of substantiation and supported by facts.

#### 2.5 Contractor's Response

The contractor must be given a copy of each Contractor Performance Report. The report is to be discussed with the contractor, who must be given the opportunity to comment on the assessment within 10 working days or other period as may be determined by the Participating Authority<sup>1</sup>.

In all cases, the reporting and/or reviewing officer must address any issues raised by the contractor and respond in writing. The contractor's comments and the written response by the reporting and/or reviewing officer form part of the report.

### 3. **Performance Ratings**

The contractor's performance is to be assessed against the performance criteria and scored in line with the descriptions outlined in Table 1 and Table 2 to promote consistency across Participating Authorities.

There should be no unsatisfactory performance rating unless evidence exists to demonstrate lack of achievement of the required standard of performance. Each criterion has an overall score that is made up of the average of the subcriteria (total score = average of subcriteria scores).

| Table 1: | National Prequalification System contractor performance scoring generic rating descriptions |
|----------|---|
|----------|---|

| Score | Rating       | Descriptor (the extent to which the contractor meets performance requirements)   |
|-------|--------------|--|
| 10    | Superior     | Exceptional. Always well above the required standard of performance. Demonstrated strengths and use of innovation where appropriate. No errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions.                              |
| 9     | Cood         | Often exceeds the required standard of performance. Demonstrated strengths and use of innovation where appropriate. Negligible minor errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which are acceptable as offered. |
| 8     | Good         | Sound achievement of the required standard of performance. Minimal minor errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which are acceptable as offered.   |
| 7     |              | Reasonable achievement of the required standard of performance. Some minor errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which may be acceptable as offered.  |
| 6     | Acceptable   | Reasonable achievement of the required standard of performance standard of performance. Some errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which can be corrected/overcome with minimum effort.                     |
| 5     |              | Minimal achievement of the required standard of performance. Some errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which are possible to correct/overcome and make acceptable.   |
| 4     |              | Moderate weaknesses. Does not always meet the required standard of performance.  |
| 3     |              | Significant weaknesses. Performance is often below the required standard of performance.   |
| 2     | Unacceptable | Major weaknesses. Rarely meets the required standard of performance.   |
| 1     |              | General non-compliance. Has not met the required standard of performance.  |
| 0     |              | Severe non-compliance. Does not meet the required standard of performance and is not recommended to carry out this type of work.   |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> In WA this period is 15 business days

#### GUIDE NOTE:

It is possible that not all subcriteria will be assessed for every contract. Where a subcriterion is not assessed, the remaining subcriteria will be averaged to provide a score at the criterion level. For example, for Criteria 5, Quality of Work, subcriteria (a) Design will not be assessed if the contract does not include design works. The overall score for Criteria 5 will be the average of the remaining subcriteria (b) to (d).

# 4. Final Performance Report

The final Contractor Performance Report on each completed contract will be the main source of data for evaluation of the performance of a contractor. For this reason, the final report should reflect the performance of the contractor during the whole of the contract. When performance is unsatisfactory, the report must be accompanied by backup evidence and all relevant details of the unsatisfactory performance.

Documentary evidence supporting reports, including minutes of meetings with the contractor, should be referenced in the report. Care should be taken not to destroy the evidence whilst it is still relevant to a performance report.

#### Table 2: National Prequalification System contractor performance criteria and detailed rating descriptions

|    |                                    |  |   | Sc   | ore  |   | Examples of  |
|----|------------------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--|
|    | Criteria                           | Subcriteria                                | 0-4   | 5-7  | 8-9  | 10  | documentation to<br>support  |
|    |                                    |  | Unacceptable  | Acceptable   | Good   | Superior  | assessment   |
| 1. | Time<br>management<br>and progress | (a) Program                                | <ul> <li>An initial construction<br/>program that did not meet<br/>the minimum requirements.</li> <li>Initial construction program<br/>finalised and accepted later<br/>than required or after some<br/>delays and later than the<br/>time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Inadequate planning,<br/>coordination and execution<br/>of activities, work processes<br/>and critical operations.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>A satisfactory initial construction program.</li> <li>Initial construction program finalised and accepted on time or in the time required by the contract.</li> <li>Satisfactory planning, coordination and execution of activities, work processes and critical operations.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>A good initial construction program.</li> <li>Initial construction program finalised and accepted earlier than required or earlier than the time required by the contract.</li> <li>Good planning, coordination and execution of activities, work processes and critical operations. Good effort made to keep on schedule.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>An excellent initial construction program.</li> <li>Initial construction program finalised and accepted much earlier than required or much earlier than the time required by the contract.</li> <li>Excellent planning, coordination and execution of activities and work processes. Very proactive in keeping ahead of schedule.</li> </ul> | Program.   |
|    |                                    | (b) Progress of<br>work against<br>program | <ul> <li>Contractual obligations not<br/>met within the prescribed<br/>time limits on many<br/>occasions and having a<br/>moderate-to-significant<br/>impact on the contract.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Contractual obligations generally<br/>within the prescribed time limit.</li> <li>Some notices/claims etc. lodged<br/>late but minimal impact on<br/>contract.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Contractual obligations met by<br/>the prescribed time limit.</li> <li>Issuing of notices etc. by the<br/>prescribed time.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Contractual obligations met<br/>ahead of the prescribed<br/>timeframe.</li> <li>Issuing of notices etc ahead of<br/>the prescribed time.</li> <li>Early warning of potential<br/>design errors or omissions.</li> <li>Early warning of possible<br/>variations.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Copies of dated<br/>correspondence<br/>confirming time<br/>obligations met<br/>or not met.</li> <li>Site meeting<br/>minutes. Letters<br/>advising missed<br/>time limits.</li> <li>Certificate of<br/>Practical<br/>Completion.</li> </ul> |

|    |                           |   |  | Sc   | core   |  | Examples of  |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|    | Criteria                  | Subcriteria   | 0-4  | 5-7  | 8-9  | 10   | documentation to<br>support  |
|    |                           |   | Unacceptable   | Acceptable   | Good   | Superior   | assessment   |
| 2. | 2. Contract<br>management | (a) Management of<br>subcontractors                   | <ul> <li>The contractor exercised some contractual responsibility for all of its consultants, subcontractors and suppliers.</li> <li>Inadequate management and coordination of all of consultants, subcontractors and suppliers.</li> <li>The contractor exercised inadequate control of the performance and work processes of each consultant, subcontractor and supplier.</li> <li>Poor performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealing with subcontractors.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>The contractor exercised a satisfactory level of contractual responsibility for all of its consultants, subcontractors and suppliers.</li> <li>Satisfactory management and coordination of all consultants, subcontractors and suppliers.</li> <li>The contractor exercised satisfactory control of the performance and work processes of each consultant, subcontractor and supplier.</li> <li>Adequate performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealing with subcontractors.</li> </ul> | control of the performance and<br>work processes of each<br>consultant, subcontractor and<br>supplier.   | <ul> <li>The contractor exercised an exceptional level of contractual responsibility for all of its consultants, subcontractors and suppliers.</li> <li>Excellent management and coordination of all of consultants, subcontractors and suppliers.</li> <li>The contractor exercised excellent control of the performance and work processes of each consultant, subcontractor and supplier.</li> <li>Excellent performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealing with subcontractors.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Audit reports,<br/>internal and 2nd<br/>party.</li> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> </ul>  |
|    |                           | (b) Contract<br>resources<br>(plant and<br>personnel) | <ul> <li>Plant</li> <li>Inadequate condition and availability of plant.</li> <li>Inadequate selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract.</li> <li>Plant use was below the acceptable standard and moderately effective.</li> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Contractor's representative has limited knowledge and</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Plant</li> <li>Satisfactory condition and availability of plant.</li> <li>Satisfactory selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract.</li> <li>Plant use met the acceptable standard and was effective.</li> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Contractor's representative has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>of plant.</li> <li>Good selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract.</li> <li>Plant use was above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Contractor's representative</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Plant</li> <li>Excellent condition and availability of plant.</li> <li>Excellent selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract.</li> <li>Plant use was well above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Contractor's representative has excellent knowledge and experience. Performance was</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Monthly progress<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> <li>Prestart checklist<br/>or Plant<br/>Condition<br/>Reports.</li> </ul> |

Contractor Performance Report

Page 7 of 22

|          |             |  | Sc  | ore  |  | Examples of                 |
|----------|-------------|--|---|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Criteria | Subcriteria | 0-4  | 5-7   | 8-9  | 10   | documentation to<br>support |
|          |             | Unacceptable   | Acceptable  | Good   | Superior   | assessment                  |
|          |             | <ul> <li>experience. Performance<br/>was below the acceptable<br/>standard. Qualifications did<br/>not meet requirements.</li> <li>Contractor's representative<br/>sometimes off-site for<br/>critical operations.</li> <li>Construction manager<br/>(roads/bridges) has limited<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was below the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications did not meet<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Construction manager<br/>(roads/bridges) sometimes<br/>off-site for critical<br/>operations.</li> <li>Design manager has limited<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was below the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications did not meet<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Design manager has limited<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was below the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications did not meet<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Key operational personnel<br/>have limited knowledge,<br/>experience and<br/>performance. Qualifications<br/>did not meet requirements.</li> <li>Inadequate number of key<br/>operational personnel.<br/>Some difficulty in delivering</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Qualifications met requirements.</li> <li>Contractor's representative on site at most times but always on-site for critical operations.</li> <li>Construction manager (roads/bridges) has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard. Qualifications met requirements.</li> <li>Construction manager (roads/bridges) on site at most times but always on-site for critical operations.</li> <li>Design manager has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard. Qualifications met requirements.</li> <li>Design manager has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard. Qualifications met requirements.</li> <li>Sufficient key operational personnel. Little difficulty in delivering the contract. Insignificant adverse effect on processes and outcomes.</li> <li>Insignificant adverse effect on progress and quality caused by turnover in key operational personnel.</li> <li>Key operational personnel on-site at most times but always for critical operations.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>standard. Qualifications<br/>exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Contractor's representative<br/>almost always on-site but<br/>always on site for critical<br/>operations.</li> <li>Construction manager<br/>(roads/bridges) has good<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was above the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Construction manager<br/>(roads/bridges) almost always<br/>on -site but always on-site for<br/>critical operations.</li> <li>Design manager has good<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was above the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Design manager has good<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was above the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements</li> <li>Key operational personnel<br/>have good knowledge,<br/>experience and performance.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>More than sufficient key<br/>operational personnel. No<br/>difficulty in delivering the<br/>contract. No adverse effect on</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>well above the acceptable standard. Qualifications exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Contractor's representative always on-site and present at all critical operations</li> <li>Construction manager (roads/bridges) has excellent knowledge and experience. Performance was well above the acceptable standard. Qualifications exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Construction manager (roads/bridges) always on-site and present at all critical operations.</li> <li>Design manager has excellent knowledge and experience. Performance was well above the acceptable standard. Qualifications exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Design manager has excellent knowledge and experience. Performance was well above the acceptable standard. Qualifications exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Key operational personnel have excellent knowledge, experience and performance. Qualifications exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Key operational personnel have excellent knowledge, experience and performance. Qualifications exceeded requirements.</li> <li>Exceptional number of key operational personnel. No difficulty in delivering an excellent contract. A</li> </ul> |                             |

Contractor Performance Report

Scoring Guide December 2010 Page 8 of 22

| Criteria | Subcriteria                    | Score  |   |   |  |  |
|----------|--------------------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
|          |                                | Subcriteria 0-4  | 5-7   | 8-9   | 10   | documentation to<br>support  |
|          |                                | Unacceptable   | Acceptable  | Good  | Superior   | assessment   |
|          |                                | <ul> <li>the contract. Some<br/>adverse effects on<br/>processes and outcomes.</li> <li>Some adverse effect on<br/>progress and quality<br/>caused by turnover in key<br/>operational personnel.</li> <li>Key operational personnel<br/>sometimes off-site during<br/>critical operations.</li> <li>Note: Key operational personnel<br/>includes:</li> <li>Project manager</li> <li>Site engineers</li> <li>Senior supervisors</li> <li>Foremen</li> <li>Specialists.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Note: Key operational personnel<br/>includes:</li> <li>Project manager</li> <li>Site engineers</li> <li>Senior supervisors</li> <li>Foremen</li> <li>Specialists.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>outcomes and processes.</li> <li>No adverse effect on progress<br/>and quality caused by turnover<br/>in key operational personnel<br/>almost always on-site but<br/>always for critical operations.</li> <li>Note: Key operational personnel<br/>includes:</li> <li>Project manager</li> <li>Site engineers</li> <li>Senior supervisors</li> <li>Foremen</li> <li>Specialists.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>significant positive effect on processes and outcomes.</li> <li>A positive effect on progress and quality due to turnover in key operational personnel.</li> <li>Key operational personnel always on-site and present at all critical operations.</li> <li>Note: Key operational personnel includes:</li> <li>Project manager</li> <li>Site engineers</li> <li>Senior supervisors</li> <li>Foremen</li> <li>Specialists.</li> </ul> |  |
|          | (c) Contract<br>administration | <ul> <li>Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract was below the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Contract records system was inadequately maintained.</li> <li>Some difficulty in ensuring that up-to-date drawings and specifications are used on-site.</li> <li>Some as-built records were</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract met the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Contract records system was satisfactorily maintained.</li> <li>Usually ensured that up-to-date drawings and specifications are used on-site.</li> <li>As-built records were submitted in time and mostly complete.</li> <li>Satisfactory follow-up action on minutes of site meetings.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract was above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Contract records system was maintained well.</li> <li>Almost always ensured that up-to-date drawings and specifications are used on-site.</li> <li>As-built records were submitted ahead of time, and</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract well above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Maintenance of the contract records system was excellent.</li> <li>Always ensured that up-to-date drawings and specifications are used on-site.</li> <li>As-built records submitted complete and well ahead of</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Monthly progra<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Statutory<br/>declarations.</li> <li>Minutes of<br/>meetings.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Report.</li> </ul> |

Contractor Performance Report

Page 9 of 22

|          |             | Score  |            |   |   |                             |
|----------|-------------|--|------------|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Criteria | Subcriteria | 0-4  | 5-7        | 8-9   | 10  | documentation to<br>support |
|          |             | Unacceptable   | Acceptable | Good  | Superior  | assessment                  |
|          |             | submitted on time, with<br>some incomplete.<br>Inadequate follow-up action<br>on minutes of site meetings. |            | <ul> <li>complete.</li> <li>Good follow-up action on minutes of site meetings.</li> </ul> | <ul><li>time.</li><li>Excellent follow-up action on minutes of site meetings.</li></ul> |                             |

|  |   |  | Sc   | ore   |   | Examples of  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Criteria   | Subcriteria                                     | 0-4  | 5-7  | 8-9   | 10  | documentation to<br>support  |
|  |   | Unacceptable   | Acceptable   | Good  | Superior  | assessment   |
|  | (d) Management of<br>construction<br>works/site | <ul> <li>Inadequate management<br/>structure and reporting<br/>procedures.</li> <li>Inadequate supervision of<br/>contractor's own site<br/>personnel.</li> <li>Inadequate support of<br/>inexperienced construction<br/>personnel by experienced<br/>senior on-site personnel.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Satisfactory management<br/>structure and reporting<br/>procedures.</li> <li>Satisfactory supervision of<br/>contractor's own site personnel.</li> <li>Satisfactory support of<br/>inexperienced construction<br/>personnel by experienced senior<br/>on-site personnel.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Good management structure<br/>and reporting procedures.</li> <li>Good supervision of<br/>contractor's own site<br/>personnel.</li> <li>Good support of inexperienced<br/>construction personnel by<br/>experienced senior on-site<br/>personnel.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Excellent management<br/>structure and reporting<br/>procedures.</li> <li>Excellent supervision of<br/>contractor's own site<br/>personnel.</li> <li>Excellent support of<br/>inexperienced construction<br/>personnel by experienced<br/>senior onsite personnel.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Monthly progress<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> </ul>   |
| 3. Utilisation of<br>management<br>systems<br>(Note:<br>Assessment<br>will focus on<br>both quality<br>of system<br>and whether<br>it was utilised<br>successfully<br>on the<br>subject<br>contract) | (a) OH&S<br>management                          | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative has<br/>limited knowledge and<br/>experience. Performance<br/>was below the acceptable<br/>standard.</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative<br/>sometimes off-site for<br/>critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation         <ul> <li>An initial Safety Plan that<br/>did not meet the minimum<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Initial Safety Plan finalised<br/>and accepted later than<br/>required or after some<br/>delays and later than the<br/>time required by the<br/>contract.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative has<br/>satisfactory knowledge and<br/>experience. Performance met<br/>the acceptable standard.</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative on-site at<br/>most times but always on-site for<br/>critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>A satisfactory initial Safety Plan.</li> <li>Initial Safety Plan finalised and<br/>accepted on time or in the time<br/>required by the contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Satisfactory safety induction<br/>program.</li> <li>Holds toolbox meetings in<br/>accordance with the Safety Plan.</li> <li>Adequate safety performance.</li> <li>Standard of monthly OH&amp;S</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative has good knowledge and experience. Performance was above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative almost always on-site but always on-site but always on-site for critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>A good initial Safety Plan.</li> <li>Initial Safety Plan finalised and accepted earlier than required or earlier than the time required by the contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Good safety induction program.</li> <li>Holds toolbox meetings in accordance with the Safety</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative has<br/>excellent knowledge and<br/>experience. Performance was<br/>well above the acceptable<br/>standard.</li> <li>OH&amp;S representative always<br/>on-site and present at all<br/>critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation         <ul> <li>An excellent initial Safety Plan.</li> <li>Initial Safety Plan finalised and<br/>accepted much earlier than<br/>required or much earlier than<br/>the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation         <ul> <li>Excellent safety induction<br/>program.</li> <li>Holds toolbox meetings in</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Copies of safety<br/>audit reports.<br/>Internal and 2nd<br/>party.</li> <li>Non-compliance<br/>with contract<br/>requirements<br/>and contract<br/>Safety Plan.</li> <li>Monthly progress<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Incident/accident<br/>reports.</li> <li>Worksafe<br/>improvement<br/>notices.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance</li> </ul> |

Contractor Performance Report

Page 11 of 22

|          |                           |   | Sc  | ore  |  | Examples of  |
|----------|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Criteria | Subcriteria               | 0-4   | 5-7   | 5-7 8-9  |  | documentation to<br>support  |
|          |                           | Unacceptable  | Acceptable  | Good   | Superior   | assessment   |
|          |                           | <ul> <li>Limited safety induction program.</li> <li>Holds toolbox meetings but not in accordance with the Safety Plan.</li> <li>Inadequate safety performance.</li> <li>Standard of monthly OH&amp;S reports inadequate.</li> <li>Monthly OH&amp;S reports submitted after some delays and later than required by the contract.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections not usually carried out as per the Safety Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents often poorly reported and poorly actioned.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-conformance type with moderate consequences.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified an inadequate level of compliance.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>reports adequate.</li> <li>Monthly OH&amp;S reports submitted<br/>on time, as required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections<br/>mostly carried out as per the<br/>Safety Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and<br/>accidents nearly always reported<br/>and nearly always actioned<br/>promptly and effectively.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-<br/>conformance type with minor<br/>consequences.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a<br/>satisfactory level of compliance.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Plan, sometimes more frequently.</li> <li>Good safety performance.</li> <li>Good standard of monthly OH&amp;S reports.</li> <li>Monthly OHS reports always submitted earlier than required by the contract.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections almost always carried out as per the Safety Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents almost always reported and almost always reported and almost always actioned promptly and effectively.</li> <li>Low number of repetitions of the same non-conformance type.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a good level of compliance.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>accordance with the Safety<br/>Plan, usually more frequently.</li> <li>Excellent safety performance.</li> <li>Standard of monthly OH&amp;S<br/>reports excellent.</li> <li>Monthly OH&amp;S reports always<br/>submitted much earlier than<br/>required by the contract.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections<br/>always carried out as per the<br/>Safety Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents<br/>and accidents always reported<br/>and always actioned promptly<br/>and effectively.</li> <li>No repetition of the same non-<br/>conformance type.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified an<br/>excellent level of compliance.</li> </ul> | Reports.   |
|          | (b) Quality<br>management | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Quality management<br/>representative has limited<br/>knowledge and experience.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Quality management<br/>representative has satisfactory<br/>knowledge and experience.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Quality management<br/>representative has good<br/>knowledge and experience.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Quality management<br/>representative has excellent<br/>knowledge and experience.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Copies of<br/>suitability and<br/>compliance audit<br/>reports, internal</li> </ul> |

|                      |  | Sc  | ore   |  | Examples of  |
|----------------------|--|---|---|--|--|
| Criteria Subcriteria | 0-4  | 5-7   | 8-9   | 10   | documentation to<br>support  |
|                      | Unacceptable   | Acceptable  | Good  | Superior   | assessment   |
|                      | <ul> <li>Performance was below the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Quality management representative sometimes off-site for critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>An initial Quality Plan that did not meet the minimum requirements.</li> <li>Initial Quality Plan finalised and accepted later than required or after some delays and later than the time required by the contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Execution of work process was below the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Inadequate execution of Inspection and Test Plans. Many lots not visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance.</li> <li>Non-conformances often poorly reported and not satisfactorily addressed.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-conformance type with</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Performance met the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Quality management representative on-site at most times but always on-site for critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>A satisfactory initial Quality Plan.</li> <li>Initial Quality Plan finalised and accepted on time or in the time required by the contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Execution of work process met the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Satisfactory execution of Inspection and Test Plans. Most lots visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance.</li> <li>Non-conformances satisfactorily reported and generally satisfactorily addressed after some prompting.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-conformance type with minor consequences.</li> <li>A low level of rework.</li> <li>Satisfactory observance of hold points.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Performance was above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Quality management representative almost always on-site but always on-site for critical operations.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>A good initial Quality Plan.</li> <li>Initial Quality Plan finalised and accepted earlier than required or earlier than the time required by the contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Execution of work process was above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Good execution of Inspection and Test Plans. Almost all lots visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance.</li> <li>Non-conformances almost always reported and addressed promptly and effectively.</li> <li>Low number of repetitions of the same non-conformance type.</li> <li>A very low level of rework.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Performance was well above<br/>the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Quality management<br/>representative always on-site<br/>and present at all critical<br/>operations.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>An excellent initial Quality<br/>Plan.</li> <li>Initial Quality Plan finalised<br/>and accepted much earlier<br/>than required or much earlier<br/>than the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Execution of work process<br/>was well above the acceptable<br/>standard.</li> <li>Excellent execution of<br/>Inspection and Test Plans. All<br/>lots visually inspected and<br/>assessed before submitting for<br/>acceptance.</li> <li>Non-conformances always<br/>reported and addressed<br/>promptly and effectively.</li> <li>No repetition of the same non-<br/>conformance type.</li> <li>An insignificant level of<br/>rework.</li> <li>Excellent observance of hold</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>and 2nd party.</li> <li>Non-compliance<br/>with contract<br/>requirements<br/>and contract<br/>Quality Plan.</li> <li>Monthly progree<br/>reports.</li> <li>Lot records, ter<br/>results survey<br/>and other<br/>measurements<br/>and non-<br/>conformance<br/>reports</li> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> <li>Copies of<br/>meeting minute</li> <li>Non-<br/>conformance<br/>register.</li> <li>Correspondence<br/>Statutory<br/>declarations.</li> </ul> |

Scoring Guide December 2010

|          |                                 | Score  |  |   |   |  |
|----------|---------------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| Criteria | Subcriteria                     | 0-4  | 5-7  | 8-9   | 10  | documentation to<br>support  |
|          |                                 | Unacceptable   | Acceptable   | Good  | Superior  | assessment   |
|          |                                 | <ul> <li>moderate-to-significant<br/>consequences.</li> <li>A medium level of rework.</li> <li>Observance of hold points<br/>inadequate.</li> <li>Internal audits not usually<br/>carried out as per the<br/>Quality Plan.</li> <li>Internal audits identified an<br/>inadequate level of<br/>compliance.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified<br/>an inadequate level of<br/>compliance.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>as per the Quality Plan.</li> <li>Internal audits identified a satisfactory level of compliance.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a satisfactory level of compliance.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>points.</li> <li>Internal audits almost always carried out as per the Quality Plan.</li> <li>Internal audits identified a good level of compliance.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a good level of compliance.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>points.</li> <li>Internal audits always carried out as per the Quality Plan.</li> <li>Audits identified an excellent level of compliance.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified an excellent level of compliance.</li> </ul>  |  |
|          | (c) Environmental<br>management | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Environmental<br/>management representative<br/>has limited knowledge and<br/>experience. Performance<br/>was below the acceptable<br/>standard. Qualifications did<br/>not meet requirements.</li> <li>Environmental<br/>management representative<br/>often off-site for critical<br/>times and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation</li> <li>An initial Environmental<br/>Management Plan that did<br/>not meet the minimum</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Environmental management<br/>representative has satisfactory<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance met the acceptable<br/>standard. Qualifications met<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Environmental management<br/>representative on-site at most<br/>times but always for critical times<br/>and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation         <ul> <li>A satisfactory initial<br/>Environmental Management<br/>Plan.</li> <li>Initial Environmental</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Environmental management<br/>Representative has good<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was above the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Environmental management<br/>representative almost always<br/>onsite but always on-site at<br/>critical times and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation</li> <li>A good initial Environmental<br/>Management Plan.</li> <li>Initial Environmental</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Environmental management<br/>representative has excellent<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was well above<br/>the acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Environmental management<br/>representative always on-site<br/>and present at all critical times<br/>and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation</li> <li>An excellent initial<br/>Environmental Management<br/>Plan.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Copies of<br/>environmental<br/>audit reports,<br/>internal and 2r<br/>party.</li> <li>Non-compliane<br/>with contract<br/>requirements<br/>and contract<br/>Environmental<br/>Management<br/>Plan.</li> <li>Inspection<br/>reports.</li> <li>Monthly progree<br/>reports.</li> <li>Non-</li> </ul> |

|          |             | Score   |  |   |  |   |  |
|----------|-------------|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| Criteria | Subcriteria | 0-4   | 5-7  | 8-9   | 10   | documentation to<br>support   |  |
|          |             | Unacceptable  | Acceptable   | Good  | Superior   | assessment  |  |
|          |             | <ul> <li>requirements.</li> <li>Initial Environmental<br/>Management Plan finalised<br/>and accepted later than<br/>required or after some<br/>delays and later than the<br/>time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Implementation         <ul> <li>Significant damage and/or<br/>blatant disregard for<br/>sensitive and/or significant<br/>features.</li> <li>Internal audits not usually<br/>carried out as per the<br/>Environmental<br/>Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances,<br/>incidents and accidents in<br/>environmental, cultural and<br/>heritage matters often<br/>poorly reported and poorly<br/>actioned.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same<br/>non-conformance type with<br/>moderate consequences.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Management Plan finalised and accepted on time or in the time required by the contract.</li> <li>Implementation         <ul> <li>May not proactively manage environmental, cultural or heritage issues.</li> <li>Internal audits mostly carried out as per the Environmental Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents in environmental, cultural and heritage matters nearly always reported and nearly always actioned promptly and effectively.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-conformance type with minor consequences.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a satisfactory level of compliance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Management Plan finalised<br/>and accepted earlier than<br/>required or earlier than the<br/>time required by the contract.</li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Environmental, cultural and<br/>heritage matters approached<br/>proactively and sensitively.</li> <li>Internal audits almost always<br/>carried out as per the<br/>Environmental Management<br/>Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents<br/>and accidents in<br/>environmental, cultural and<br/>heritage matters almost<br/>always reported and almost<br/>always actioned promptly and<br/>effectively.</li> <li>Low number of repetitions of<br/>the same non-conformance<br/>type.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a<br/>good level of compliance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Initial Environmental<br/>Management Plan finalised<br/>and accepted much earlier<br/>than required or much earlier<br/>than the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Implementation         <ul> <li>Environmental, cultural and<br/>heritage matters approached<br/>proactively and with great<br/>sensitivity.</li> <li>Internal audits always carried<br/>out as per the Environmental<br/>Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents<br/>and accidents in<br/>environmental, cultural and<br/>heritage matters always<br/>reported and always actioned<br/>promptly and effectively.</li> <li>No repetition of the same non-<br/>conformance type.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified an<br/>excellent level of compliance.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>conformance<br/>reports and<br/>registers.</li> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> </ul> |  |
|          |             | an inadequate level of compliance.  |  |   |  |   |  |

|          |                           |  | Sc  | ore   |   | Examples of  |
|----------|---------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|
| Criteria | Subcriteria               | 0-4  | 5-7   | 8-9   | 10  | documentation to   |
|          |                           | Unacceptable   | Acceptable  | Good  | Superior  | <ul> <li>support<br/>assessment</li> </ul>   |
|          | (d) Traffic<br>management | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative has limited<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was below the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications did not meet<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative sometimes<br/>off-site for critical times<br/>and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation <ul> <li>An initial Traffic<br/>Management Plan that did<br/>not meet the minimum<br/>requirements.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation <ul> <li>Initial Traffic Management<br/>Plan finalised and accepted<br/>later than required or after<br/>some delays and later than<br/>the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Other traffic management<br/>personnel have fair<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was below the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications did not meet<br/>requirements.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative has satisfactory<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance met the acceptable<br/>standard. Qualifications met<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative on-site at most<br/>times but always for critical times<br/>and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation         <ul> <li>A satisfactory initial worksite<br/>Traffic Management Plan.</li> <li>Initial Traffic Management Plan<br/>finalised and accepted on time or<br/>in the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation         <ul> <li>Other traffic management<br/>personnel have good knowledge<br/>and experience. Performance<br/>met the acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications met requirements.</li> <li>Satisfactory individual traffic<br/>control diagrams.</li> <li>Maintenance of daily diaries met<br/>the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Satisfactory communication and</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative has good<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was above the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative almost always<br/>on-site but always on-site at<br/>critical times and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation         <ul> <li>A good initial Traffic<br/>Management Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Implementation         <ul> <li>Initial Traffic Management<br/>Plan finalised and accepted<br/>earlier than required or earlier<br/>than the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Other traffic management<br/>personnel have very good<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was above the<br/>acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Good individual traffic control<br/>diagrams.</li> <li>Maintenance of daily diaries</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Personnel</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative has excellent<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was well above<br/>the acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Traffic management<br/>representative always on-site<br/>and present at all critical times<br/>and/or events.</li> <li>Preparation         <ul> <li>An excellent initial Traffic<br/>Management Plan.</li> <li>Implementation             <ul> <li>Initial Traffic Management<br/>Plan finalised and accepted<br/>much earlier than required or<br/>much earlier than the time<br/>required by the contract.</li> <li>Other traffic management<br/>personnel have excellent<br/>knowledge and experience.<br/>Performance was well above<br/>the acceptable standard.<br/>Qualifications exceeded<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Excellent individual traffic<br/>control diagrams.</li> <li>Maintenance of daily diaries</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Reports of major<br/>incidents or<br/>accidents.</li> <li>Copies of notices<br/>or reports issued<br/>by Police or<br/>Coroner.</li> <li>Copies of audit<br/>reports, internal<br/>audit and 2nd<br/>party.</li> <li>Copies of<br/>inspection<br/>reports.</li> <li>Monthly progresss<br/>reports.</li> <li>Mon-<br/>conformance<br/>reports and<br/>registers.</li> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> <li>CVs for traffic<br/>management<br/>representative<br/>and other traffic<br/>management</li> </ul> |

Contractor Performance Report

Page 16 of 22

|                      |  | Sc   | ore   |  | Examples of<br>documentation to<br>support |
|----------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| Criteria Subcriteria | 0-4  | 5-7  | 8-9   | 10   |  |
|                      | Unacceptable   | Acceptable   | Good  | Superior   | assessment                                 |
|                      | <ul> <li>Limited individual traffic control diagrams.</li> <li>Maintenance of daily diaries was below the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Limited communication and consultation with all stakeholders.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections not usually carried out as per the Traffic Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents often poorly reported and poorly actioned.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-conformance type with moderate-to-significant consequences.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified an inadequate level of compliance.</li> <li>Limited complaints management. With some exceptions, complaints usually handled with respect and consideration. Some delays in achieving</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>consultation with all stakeholders.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections mostly carried out as per the Traffic Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents nearly always reported and nearly always actioned promptly and effectively.</li> <li>Repetitions of the same non-conformance type with minor consequences.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a satisfactory level of compliance.</li> <li>Good complaints management. With few exceptions, complaints mostly handled with respect and consideration. A few small delays in achieving resolution.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>was above the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Good communication and consultation with all stakeholders.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections almost always carried out as per the Traffic Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents almost always reported and almost always actioned promptly and effectively.</li> <li>Low number of repetitions of the same non-conformance type.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified a good level of compliance.</li> <li>Very good complaints management. Complaints almost always resolved without delay.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>exceeded the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Excellent communication and consultation with all stakeholders.</li> <li>Internal audits and inspections always carried out as per the Traffic Management Plan.</li> <li>Non-conformances, incidents and accidents always reported and always actioned promptly and effectively.</li> <li>No repetition of the same non-conformance type.</li> <li>2nd party audits identified an excellent level of compliance.</li> <li>Excellent complaints management procedure and attitude to the resolution of complaints, but few, if any, complaints received.</li> </ul> | personnel.                                 |

|       |                       |  | Score   |   |  |  |   |
|-------|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| Crite | Criteria              | Subcriteria  |   | 5-7 8-9   |  | 10   | documentation to  |
|       |                       |  |   | Acceptable  | Good   | Superior   | <ul> <li>support<br/>assessment</li> </ul>  |
|       |                       |  | resolution.   |   |  |  |   |
|       | ationship<br>nagement | (a) Cooperative<br>relationships<br>with principal | <ul> <li>Inadequate commitment<br/>and attitude to working<br/>relationships within the<br/>contractual environment.<br/>(e.g. respect, trust,<br/>cooperation, openness and<br/>the ready exchange of<br/>information).</li> <li>Issues mostly resolved<br/>slowly and inefficiently due<br/>to generally ineffective<br/>communication and<br/>attitude.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Satisfactory commitment and attitude to working relationships within the contractual environment. (e.g. respect, trust, cooperation, openness and the ready exchange of information).</li> <li>Issues resolved in a timely and efficient manner through open and effective communication.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Good commitment and attitude<br/>to working relationships within<br/>the contractual environment.<br/>(e.g. respect, trust,<br/>cooperation, openness and<br/>the ready exchange of<br/>information).</li> <li>Issues always resolved quickly<br/>and efficiently through open<br/>and very effective<br/>communication.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Excellent commitment and attitude to working relationships within the contractual environment. (e.g. respect, trust, cooperation, openness and the ready exchange of information).</li> <li>Issues always resolved very quickly and efficiently through excellent communication. Very pro-active in maintaining an excellent relationship.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Correspondence.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Report.</li> </ul> |

|          |   |  | Sc   | ore   |   | Examples of  |
|----------|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| Criteria | Subcriteria                                     | 0-4  | 5-7  | 5-7 8-9   |   | documentation to<br>support  |
|          |   | Unacceptable   | Acceptable   | Good  | Superior  | assessment   |
|          | (b) Community<br>relations                      | <ul> <li>An inadequate initial community engagement plan.</li> <li>Initial community engagement plan finalised and accepted later than required or after some delays and later than the time required by the contract.</li> <li>Liaison with community and stakeholders fairly effective but sometimes confrontational.</li> <li>Attitude to community engagement was below the acceptable standard.</li> <li>Inadequate complaints management. Complaints sometimes handled with respect and consideration. Complaints mostly resolved slowly and inefficiently through poor and generally ineffective communication. Some complaints remain unresolved.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>A satisfactory initial community<br/>engagement plan.</li> <li>Initial community engagement<br/>plan finalised and accepted on<br/>time or in the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Liaison with community and<br/>stakeholders mostly effective and<br/>mostly non-confrontational.</li> <li>Attitude to community<br/>engagement met the acceptable<br/>standard.</li> <li>Satisfactory complaints<br/>management. Complaints mostly<br/>handled with respect and<br/>consideration. Complaints<br/>almost always resolved in a<br/>timely and efficient manner<br/>through open and effective<br/>communication. Very few<br/>complaints remain unresolved.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>A good initial community<br/>engagement plan.</li> <li>Initial community engagement<br/>plan finalised and accepted<br/>earlier than required or earlier<br/>than the time required by the<br/>contract.</li> <li>Liaison with community and<br/>stakeholders almost always<br/>very effective and almost<br/>always non-confrontational.</li> <li>Attitude to community<br/>engagement was above the<br/>acceptable standard.</li> <li>Good complaints<br/>management. Complaints<br/>nearly always handled with<br/>respect and consideration.<br/>Complaints nearly always<br/>resolved quickly and efficiently<br/>through open and very<br/>effective communication. No<br/>unresolved complaints.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>An excellent initial community<br/>engagement plan.</li> <li>Initial community engagement<br/>plan finalised and accepted<br/>much earlier than required or<br/>much earlier than the time<br/>required by the contract.</li> <li>Liaison with community and<br/>stakeholders always excellent<br/>and always non-<br/>confrontational.</li> <li>Attitude to community<br/>engagement was well above<br/>acceptable standard.</li> <li>Excellent complaints<br/>management. Complaints<br/>always handled with respect<br/>and consideration.<br/>Complaints always resolved<br/>very quickly and efficiently<br/>through excellent<br/>communication. Very<br/>proactive in maintaining<br/>excellent community relations.<br/>No unresolved complaints.<br/>Some complimentary<br/>comments received.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Complaints<br/>register.</li> <li>Commitment<br/>register.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Report.</li> </ul> |
|          | (c) Other<br>stakeholders<br>e.g.<br>government | <ul> <li>Stakeholder liaison almost<br/>always fails to meet<br/>contract/specification<br/>requirements.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Stakeholder liaison often fails to<br/>meet contract/specification<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Late responses to enquiries from</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Stakeholder liaison almost<br/>always complies with<br/>contract/specification<br/>requirements.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Stakeholder liaison often<br/>exceeds contract/specification<br/>requirements.</li> <li>Proactive management of</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Daily diaries.</li> <li>Complaints<br/>register.</li> <li>Commitment</li> </ul>   |

Page 19 of 22

|                    |                                |   | Sc  | ore  |   | Examples of   |
|--------------------|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|---|
| Criteria           | Subcriteria                    | 0-4   | 5-7 8-9   |  | 10  | documentation to<br>support   |
|                    |                                | Unacceptable  | Acceptable  | Good   | Superior  | assessment  |
|                    | authorities,<br>utilities etc. | <ul> <li>Responses to enquiries<br/>from stakeholders rarely<br/>provided on-time.</li> <li>Superintendent required to<br/>resolve disputes with<br/>stakeholders that could<br/>have been avoided.</li> <li>Multiple stakeholder liaison<br/>non-compliances raised on<br/>the same issue.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>stakeholders.</li> <li>Reactive management of other stakeholder liaison.</li> <li>Stakeholder liaison non-compliances raised on high-risk issues.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Contractor provides timely<br/>responses to enquiries from<br/>stakeholders.</li> <li>Professional conduct in<br/>managing issue resolution with<br/>external stakeholders.</li> </ul>  | stakeholder issues in a highly<br>effective manner.<br>No non-compliances issued<br>regarding stakeholder liaison.  | register.<br>Interim<br>Contractor<br>Performance<br>Report.  |
| 5. Quality of work | (a) Design                     | <ul> <li>Frequent significant design<br/>errors/omissions resulting in<br/>increased costs of<br/>supervision to measure up<br/>and agree new quantities.</li> <li>Significant impact on<br/>constructability and<br/>maintainability.</li> <li>Plans difficult to interpret.</li> <li>Significant contribution to<br/>approved variations.</li> <li>Significant impact on<br/>contract completion timing.</li> <li>Errors/omissions caused<br/>significant difficulties to<br/>construction contractor.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Some errors and omissions.</li> <li>Minor delays to program as a result of the errors/omissions.</li> <li>Minor increase in cost to Principal.</li> <li>Design queries were answered in accordance with the contract documents.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Minor errors/omissions.</li> <li>No significant impact on<br/>overall quality of contract.</li> <li>Design errors/omissions did<br/>not cause any difficulties for<br/>the construction contractor or<br/>subcontractors.</li> <li>Design errors or omissions did<br/>not result in any significant<br/>variations to the contract or<br/>increase in cost.</li> <li>Design queries were<br/>answered promptly by the<br/>designers.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>No design errors/omissions or<br/>those that did occur could not<br/>be foreseen/were minor.</li> <li>Extra effort made by designers<br/>to make plans easy to interpret<br/>by construction personnel.</li> <li>Innovative design.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Monthly progress<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> <li>Correspondence.</li> </ul> |
|                    | (b) Construction               | <ul> <li>Inappropriate construction<br/>techniques used on many</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Occasionally inappropriate<br/>construction techniques used</li> </ul>   | Contract fully meets     specification requirements.   | <ul> <li>Innovative and advanced<br/>construction techniques used</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Inspection test<br/>results.</li> </ul>  |

| 0-4<br>Unacceptable   | 5-7   | 8-9   | 10   | documentation to  |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| Unacceptable  | 5-7 8-9   | 10  | documentation to<br>– support  |   |
| •   | Acceptable  | Good  | Superior   | assessment  |
| <ul> <li>occasions with significant<br/>impact on the contract.</li> <li>Excessive supervision<br/>required.</li> <li>Contractor seeks guidance<br/>by superintendent on<br/>frequent occasions.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>with minimal impact on overall contract.</li> <li>Supervision required was in line with expectations for this type of contract.</li> <li>Minor and infrequent issues relating to equipment and resources.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Adequate equipment and resources.</li> <li>Effective use of available equipment and resources.</li> <li>Supervision required was slightly less than expected.</li> <li>Average down time due to illness/injury or equipment breakdowns.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>to deliver a superior product,<br/>modern equipment and highly<br/>skilled resources.</li> <li>Backup resources to cover for<br/>illness/injury.</li> <li>Supervision required was<br/>minimal compared to industry<br/>norms.</li> <li>Proactive maintenance of<br/>equipment with better than<br/>average down time.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Monthly progres<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> </ul>   |
| <ul> <li>Major weaknesses, has not<br/>met the required standard<br/>of performance and is not<br/>able to carry out this type of<br/>work.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Mostly meets required standard<br/>of performance but has some<br/>weaknesses.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Better than satisfactory and<br/>sometimes exceeds the<br/>required standard of<br/>performance.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Exceptional standard, always<br/>well above the required<br/>standard of performance.</li> </ul>  |   |
| <ul> <li>amount of remedial work required</li> <li>conformance with specified performance with specified tole</li> <li>number of dispositions accept (i.e. specified) deductions</li> </ul>                 | ired, if any<br>erformance criteria<br>rances and finishes<br>red for work that did not comply with the s   |   |  |   |
| <ul> <li>Maintenance before<br/>practical completion almost<br/>always fails to comply with<br/>specification requirements.</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Maintenance before practical completion often fails to comply with specification requirements.</li> <li>Multiple non-conformances on</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Maintenance before practical<br/>completion almost always<br/>complies with specification<br/>requirements.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Maintenance before practical<br/>completion often exceeds<br/>specification requirements.</li> <li>Contractor proactively rectifies</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Monthly progres<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Interim</li> </ul>   |
|   | <ul> <li>Excessive supervision<br/>required.</li> <li>Contractor seeks guidance<br/>by superintendent on<br/>frequent occasions.</li> <li>Major weaknesses, has not<br/>met the required standard<br/>of performance and is not<br/>able to carry out this type of<br/>work.</li> <li>Standard of work will generally be         <ul> <li>amount of remedial work required<br/>conformance with specified performance with specified performance with specified to<br/>enumber of dispositions accept<br/>(i.e. specified) deductions</li> <li>performance during the defect</li> </ul> </li> <li>Maintenance before<br/>practical completion almost<br/>always fails to comply with</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Excessive supervision required.</li> <li>Contractor seeks guidance by superintendent on frequent occasions.</li> <li>Supervision required was in line with expectations for this type of contract.</li> <li>Minor and infrequent issues relating to equipment and resources.</li> <li>Major weaknesses, has not met the required standard of performance and is not able to carry out this type of work.</li> <li>Standard of work will generally be measured against the requirements of the amount of remedial work required, if any</li> <li>conformance with specified performance criteria</li> <li>compliance with specified tolerances and finishes</li> <li>number of dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the s (i.e. specified) deductions</li> <li>Maintenance before practical completion almost always fails to comply with</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Excessive supervision required.</li> <li>Contractor seeks guidance by superintendent on frequent occasions.</li> <li>Supervision required was in line with expectations for this type of contract.</li> <li>Minor and infrequent issues relating to equipment and resources.</li> <li>Supervision required standard of performance and is not able to carry out this type of work.</li> <li>Mostly meets required standard of performance and is not able to carry out this type of work.</li> <li>Standard of work will generally be measured against the requirements of the specification. In addition, the following amount of remedial work required, if any</li> <li>conformance with specified tolerances and finishes</li> <li>number of dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with the specification including dispositions accepted for more formance before practical completion almost always complex with specification requirements.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Excessive supervision required.</li> <li>Contractor seeks guidance by supervision required was in line with expectations for this type of contract.</li> <li>Minor and infrequent issues relating to equipment and resources.</li> <li>Major weaknesses, has not met the required standard of performance and is not able to carry out this type of work.</li> <li>Mostly meets required standard of performance and is not able to carry out this type of work will generally be measured against the requirements of the specification. In addition, the following matters should be considered: a mount of remedial work required, if any conformance with specified tolerances and finishes</li> <li>number of dispositions accepted for work that did not comply with be effective libelity period, if applicable.</li> <li>Maintenance before practical completion almost always fails to comply with specification requirements.</li> </ul> |

Scoring Guide December 2010

|          |             |  | Sc   | ore  |   | Examples of   |
|----------|-------------|--|--|--|---|---|
| Criteria | Subcriteria | 0-4  | 5-7  | 8-9  | 10  | documentation to<br>support   |
|          |             | Unacceptable   | Acceptable   | Good   | Superior  | assessment  |
|          |             | <ul> <li>Accident or near-miss<br/>occurs due to failure to<br/>address maintenance.</li> <li>Contractor does not rectify<br/>safety hazards that could<br/>cause an accident.</li> </ul>  | <ul><li>the same issue and no evidence<br/>of addressing the cause.</li><li>Multiple prompts required to<br/>rectify maintenance defects.</li></ul>  | <ul> <li>Contractor complies with<br/>specification requirements.</li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>maintenance defects without<br/>prompting from the<br/>superintendent, or undertakes<br/>new initiatives.</li> <li>No non-compliances issued<br/>regarding maintenance before<br/>Practical Completion.</li> </ul>   | Contractor<br>Performance<br>Reports.<br>Correspondence.  |
|          | (d) Defects | <ul> <li>Maintenance and defects rectification after practical completion almost always fails to comply with specification requirements.</li> <li>Minimal effort in rectifying defects and omissions.</li> <li>Accident or near-miss occurs due to failure to address maintenance or defects.</li> <li>Contractor does not rectify safety hazards that could cause an accident.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Maintenance and defects<br/>rectification after practical<br/>completion often fails to comply<br/>with specification requirements.</li> <li>Defects and omissions<br/>completed later than the time<br/>nominated by the superintendent.</li> <li>Multiple prompts required to<br/>rectify maintenance defects.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Maintenance and defects rectification after practical completion almost always complies with specification requirements.</li> <li>Defects and omissions completed within the time nominated by the superintendent.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Maintenance and defects<br/>rectification after practical<br/>completion often exceeds<br/>specification requirements.</li> <li>Defects and omissions<br/>completed earlier than the<br/>time nominated by the<br/>superintendent.</li> <li>Contractor proactively rectifies<br/>maintenance and defects<br/>issues without prompting from<br/>the superintendent.</li> <li>No non-compliances issued<br/>regarding maintenance after<br/>practical completion.</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Monthly progress<br/>reports.</li> <li>Daily dairies.</li> <li>Interim<br/>Contractor<br/>Performance<br/>Reports.</li> <li>Correspondence.</li> </ul> |