

**C7551 – Supplementary Conditions of Offer**

# **Prequalified Consultants for Engineering Projects**

**November 2022**

## Copyright

© The State of Queensland (Department of Transport and Main Roads) 2022.

## Licence



This work is licensed by the State of Queensland (Department of Transport and Main Roads) under a Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 International licence.

## CC BY licence summary statement

In essence, you are free to copy, communicate and adapt this work, as long as you attribute the work to the State of Queensland (Department of Transport and Main Roads). To view a copy of this licence, visit: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

## Translating and interpreting assistance



The Queensland Government is committed to providing accessible services to Queenslanders from all cultural and linguistic backgrounds. If you have difficulty understanding this publication and need a translator, please call the Translating and Interpreting Service (TIS National) on 13 14 50 and ask them to telephone the Queensland Department of Transport and Main Roads on 13 74 68.

## Disclaimer

While every care has been taken in preparing this publication, the State of Queensland accepts no responsibility for decisions or actions taken as a result of any data, information, statement or advice, expressed or implied, contained within. To the best of our knowledge, the content was correct at the time of publishing.

## Feedback

Please send your feedback regarding this document to: [tmr.techdocs@tmr.qld.gov.au](mailto:tmr.techdocs@tmr.qld.gov.au)

**Contents**

- 1 Basis of Offer .....2**
- 2 Prequalification requirements .....2**
- 3 Form of the Offer.....2**
- 4 Assessment process .....3**
  - 4.1 Assessment method ..... 3
  - 4.2 Assessment Panel ..... 3
  - 4.3 Non-Price (Envelope 1) ..... 4
    - 4.3.1 *Scoring procedure* .....4
    - 4.3.2 *Agreed ratings* .....4
    - 4.3.3 *Weighted total scores – Qualification Based Selection (QBS)*.....4
    - 4.3.4 *Clarification process (QBS)* .....5
  - 4.4 Price (Envelope 2) ..... 5
    - 4.4.1 *Price aspect scores – Value Based Selection (VBS)* .....5
    - 4.4.2 *Weighted total scores (VBS)* .....7
    - 4.4.3 *Assessment panel discretion (VBS)* .....7
    - 4.4.4 *Clarification process (VBS)* .....7
- 5 Assessment criteria (Non-Price) .....7**
  - 5.1 Technical skills of Key Team Members ..... 8
  - 5.2 Delivering the service ..... 9
  - 5.3 Relationship management ..... 11
  - 5.4 Local benefits test ..... 11
  - 5.5 Quality of deliverables ..... 11
- 6 QBS Weightings (for both Prequalified and Non-Prequalified Consultants)..... 12**
- 7 VBS Weightings (for both Prequalified and Non-Prequalified Consultants)..... 13**
- 8 Rating of non-price criteria ..... 13**
  - 8.1 Technical skills of Key Team Members ..... 13
  - 8.2 Delivering the service ..... 14
  - 8.3 Relationship management ..... 14
  - 8.4 Local benefits test ..... 15
  - 8.5 Quality of deliverables ..... 16

## 1 Basis of Offer

This Offer is for the supply of Consultant Services to the Department of Transport and Main Roads (the department):

- a) associated with engineering projects
- b) by Offerors prequalified under the department's Engineering Consultant Prequalification System for nominated categories to the appropriate level
- c) involving Private Invitations to prequalified Invitees
- d) with selection / assessment for acceptability of the "preferred" Offeror on Qualification Based Selection (QBS) methods or Value Based Selection (VBS), and
- e) with any *Letter of Acceptance* (C7599) or equivalent sent after successful clarification involving scope and price of the Consultant Services.

## 2 Prequalification requirements

- a) The Offeror shall be prequalified under the department's Prequalification System for Consultants on Engineering Projects at the levels for the nominated categories as set out in Item 1.6.1.1 of the *Invitation for Offer* (C7585).
- b) If the Prequalification levels for the nominated categories do not currently apply to the Offeror (including deficiencies in Quality Assurance System certification or Controlled Self Assessment documentation (for Cost Estimating Levels 1 and 2, Economic Studies all levels, Financial / Commercial all levels, Intelligent Transport Systems Levels 1 and 2, Transport Planning Levels 1 and 2), Professional Engineer registration, status of Professional Indemnity and/or Public Liability Insurance, and so on), the Offeror should immediately notify the person indicated in Item 3.1 of the *Invitation for Offer* (C7585).

## 3 Form of the Offer

Offers shall include:

- a) Completed the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component* (C7586), which includes all the Assessment Schedules.
- b) Completed *Statutory Declaration – Professional Indemnity Insurance and Public Liability Insurance* (Form C7547) or equivalent as specified in the *General Conditions of Offer* (C7542).
- c) Complete the *Offer for Consultant Service – Price Component* (C7587), which sets out the following:
  - A description of the work proposed to be performed for each work item in the fee schedule together with a detailed list of deliverables, that is, what work is the consultant committing to in the proposal for the offered fee, and
  - A fully itemised pricing schedule aligned to the schedule of fees in a format suitable to the consultant. The schedule will show resources cost rates and hours for each activity / task proposed to deliver each identified service.

- d) Monitoring and Control Tools:
- A fully detailed and resourced Gantt chart showing all work activities.
  - Resource schedules showing resources for each work activity with weekly productivity, and
  - Predicted cash flow "s" curve.
- e) Proposed Organisation Structure that reflects the general capacity to handle project type and ability to provide backup in the event of changes to key team members.
- f) Curriculum Vitae for each person nominated in the offer documents and shall include qualifications and relevant recent experience to support the proposed role(s) nominated.
- g) Where the consultant envisages additional but necessary work not covered by the fee schedule in order to successfully deliver the required outcomes then the consultant shall include the details and cost of this additional work as an integral part of the offer, and
- h) Other information nominated in the Offer Documents.

For offers submitted to an Offer Lodgement Box, the original and copies of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (C7586)* shall be sealed in an envelope marked “Envelope 1 – Non-Price Component” and the original and copies of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Price Component (C7587)* sealed in an envelope marked “Envelope 2 – Price Component”. These two envelopes and the remaining documents above, prepared also in accordance with Clause 5.1(k) of the *General Conditions of Offer*, should be sealed in an envelope, addressed to the person / place nominated in Item 1.1 and 1.2 the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (C7586)*, and clearly indicating the Invitation Number.

Offers submitted using a secure electronic tendering system used by the Principal shall be in accordance with instructions contained in the *Invitation for Offer (Form C7585)*. The *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (C7586)* shall be submitted as a separate file named “(Organisation) – (Invitation Number) Envelope 1 – Non-Price Component” and the *Offer for Consultant Service – Price Component (C7587)* submitted as a separate file named “(Organisation) – (Invitation number) Envelope 2 – Price Component”.

Offers that do not include a fully completed *Offer for Consultant Service – Price Component (C7587)* in Envelope 2 will be treated as nonconforming.

## **4 Assessment process**

### **4.1 Assessment method**

The assessment method to be used (QBS or VBS) will be as indicated in Item 2.1 of the *Invitation for Offer (C7585)* using the weightings in Clause 6.

Note – for VBS, if more than six (6) offers are received, shortlist to six offers using the non-price ranking.

### **4.2 Assessment Panel**

The Assessment Panel must be appointed and briefed before invitations for offers are issued.

Where the estimated Contract Amount is less than \$300,000 (including GST), the Assessment Panel may be one person. Where the estimated contract Amount is greater than \$300,000 (including GST) the Assessment Panel must include at least two persons.

For situations other than well-understood, straight-forward projects, the Assessment Panel must include at least three appropriately qualified and experienced persons, including at least one independent panel member (preferably not from the project team, but from, for example, a different Division / Branch / Unit / Team within the department, or a non-departmental employee), or where the estimated Contract Amount exceeds \$500,000.

External project stakeholders must be excluded from the Panel as their presence would constitute a conflict of interest.

### **4.3 Non-Price (Envelope 1)**

#### **4.3.1 Scoring procedure**

The scoring methodology to be used in the assessment of non-price selection criteria is detailed as follows:

- a) Ratings may range between 1 and 10 (refer to Clause 8 for rating method).
- b) The minimum increment is to be 0.5, that is, decimal increments are permitted.
- c) The best candidate does not have to be awarded a rating of 10, and
- d) Some non-price selection criteria may need to be evaluated on more than one basis. In such a case, the constituent parts of that non-price selection criterion should be assessed separately, rated on a 1 to 10 range and by using a percentage correlating with parts, the resulting ratings added.

When all non-price selection criteria have been assessed by the Panel and rated accordingly, the weighting factors should be applied by multiplying the criterion rating (or part rating) for each non-price selection criterion by the weighting factor for that non-price selection criterion.

#### **4.3.2 Agreed ratings**

The Panel shall, at a joint meeting consider each Offeror's response (in Envelope 1 only) to each of the Non-Price Assessment Criteria described in Clause 5 below. Averaging of individual Panel ratings is not permitted. The Panel shall agree on a rating for each Offeror for each criterion based on the rating method set out in Clause 8 (the "agreed rating"). The Panel may moderate the agreed ratings, taking into account the contents of recent Performance Reports made in accordance with the Prequalification provisions.

#### **4.3.3 Weighted total scores – Qualification Based Selection (QBS)**

For a QBS process, the individual agreed ratings shall be subject to weighting in accordance with Clause 6 and a weighted total score ("wts") determined for each Offeror. The Offeror with the highest "wts" will be the "preferred" Offeror and will proceed to the next stage of the process. In the event of two or more Offerors obtaining the same wts, those Offerors will be subject to a further process where the ratings will be reassessed using half marks (0.5) where necessary to make discrete differentials in the scoring until a single Offeror has the highest wts.

The Panel will advise the Principal's Delegate of the identity of the "preferred" Offeror.

#### 4.3.4 Clarification process (QBS)

**Table 4.3.4 – QBS scenario**

Scenario	Action
Preferred offeror determined, has highest non-price score.	The top ranked offeror is the “preferred offeror” and the second submission containing the offered contract amount and Price Schedule is opened, reviewed and clarification conducted, to have confidence that all components of the service has been scoped and included. The other offered contract amount envelopes (or files if submitted electronically) are not opened.

Note – For QBS scenario, the department can disclose the estimated budget. However, this will be under sole discretion of individual project team.

For situations involving well understood, uncomplicated projects, the Principal’s Delegate will forward a Letter of Acceptance to the “preferred” Offeror on the basis of its wts without going through a clarification process.

For situations other than well understood, uncomplicated projects, the “preferred” Offeror will be invited to a “clarification process” involving a meeting with the Principal’s Delegate where the contents of the “preferred” Offeror’s Price Component will be considered in conjunction with the extent of the Consultant Services (including timing) in an attempt to reach agreement. Where agreement is reached, the Principal’s Delegate will forward a Letter of Acceptance to the “preferred” Offeror on the basis of the clarified agreement.

Where the Principal’s Delegate and the “preferred” Offeror cannot agree within a reasonable time, the Principal’s Delegate should request the Panel to select a new “preferred” Offeror based on the next highest wts from the process in Clause 4.3.3. The new “preferred” Offeror will be invited to go through the clarification process and so on until agreement is reached or the Offerors are all eliminated. Any previous “preferred” Offerors cannot be brought back into selection consideration.

#### 4.4 Price (Envelope 2)

##### 4.4.1 Price aspect scores – Value Based Selection (VBS)

The certified procurement officer will store Envelope 2 Price Component (whether submitted in hard copy or electronically) in a secure place and only release to the Assessment Panel when the non-price evaluation has been completed.

For a VBS process, following finalisation of the non-price agreed scores (in accordance with Clause 4.3.2) for each of the Offerors, based on their responses in the Non-Price Component in Envelope 1, the Panel will open each Envelope 2 containing the Price Component.

##### 4.4.1.1 For Engineering Consultancies

The Panel may, where there are any errors, discrepancies, alternatives or matters that would otherwise result in an unfair assessment, adjust the Offered Amount from the Fee Schedules to obtain a Comparison Amount ( $C_{Am}$ ) for each of the Offers.

The average of the Comparison Amounts ( $C_{Amt_{AV}}$ ) is then determined and the calculated scores for each Offer are determined in accordance with the mandated formula for assessing the price rating for engineering consultancies (Figure 4.4.1.1).

**Figure 4.4.1.1 – Price Rating Formula**

$$\text{Price Rating} = 10 - 10 \times \frac{|C_{Amt} - C_{Amt_{AV}}|}{C_{Amt_{AV}}}$$

All price offers are preliminarily processed to determine if there are any exceptionally low bids. The intent is to establish if any of the bids fall outside of the tolerance zone. The tolerance zone is set at 30% of the mean price above and below the mean price. For the offers which score outside the tolerance zone, these may be considered on a discretionary basis with adequate justification. Approval to include such offers in the assessment process is required from Executive Director (Program Management and Delivery). Otherwise, they receive the rating (minimum) of 1. For all the other offers the calculation is used as above.

Note – the Principal’s Estimate must be included in the price rating.

**4.4.1.2 For Non-Prequalified Consultancies on Engineering Projects**

Each criterion is to be rated using a numeric rating system (1 to 10) with half marks (0.5) permitted.

A zero rating for criteria (except price) should normally disqualify the offer on the grounds of non-conformance unless there are exceptional circumstances. A zero rating would not normally apply when prequalified consultants are used.

The price rating is to be calculated using the formula and ratings from 1 to 10 as shown below in Figure 4.4.1.2.

**Figure 4.4.1.2 – Price Rating Formula**

$$\text{Price Rating} = 5 + 10 \times \left( \frac{\$M - \$T}{\$M} \right)$$

Where  $\$M$  = the median price for three or more proposals, or the mean price if two proposals are being considered.

Where  $\$T$  = Offer Price

Where the use of the formula gives a result which is:

- a) negative, then the adopted rating shall be 1, or
- b) greater than 10, then the adopted rating shall be 10.

The above formula is not to be used for calculating the price rating when assessing engineering consultancy offers.

Note – the Principal’s Estimate must be included in the pricing rating.



#### **4.4.2 Weighted total scores (VBS)**

For a VBS process, the individual agreed ratings (non-price) and calculated rating (price rating) shall be subject to weighting in accordance with Clause 7 and a weighted total score determined for each Offeror. The Offeror with the highest weighted total score will be the “recommended” Offeror and the Panel will proceed to advise the Principal’s Delegate of the identity of the “recommended” Offeror.

#### **4.4.3 Assessment panel discretion (VBS)**

*(Applies only when offers have been assessed as having the same relative total assessment score.)*

Where the selection process determines that the non-price and price criteria for all offers are assessed as having the same relative total score (within a 5% point score spread) then the Panel may select the lowest price offer, taking into consideration:

- a) whether the Offeror is fully conversant with local district requirements, and
- b) small businesses generally have lower overheads than larger businesses.

#### **4.4.4 Clarification process (VBS)**

For situations involving well understood, uncomplicated projects, the Principal’s Delegate will forward a *Letter of Acceptance* (C7599) or equivalent to the “recommended” Offeror on the basis of its weighted total score without going through a clarification process.

For situations other than well understood, uncomplicated projects, the “recommended” Offeror will be invited to a meeting with the Principal’s Delegate where the contents of its Price Schedule will be considered in conjunction with the extent of the Consultant Services, including timing, in an attempt to clarify its Offer (the “clarification process”). Where clarification is agreed, the Principal’s Delegate will forward a *Letter of Acceptance* (C7599) or equivalent to the “recommended” Offeror on the basis of the clarifications.

Where the Principal’s Delegate and the “recommended” Offeror cannot agree within a reasonable time, the Principal should request the Panel to select a new “recommended” Offeror based on the next highest weighted total score from the process in Clause 4.4.2. The new “recommended” Offeror will be invited to go through the clarification process and so on until agreement is reached or the Offerors are all eliminated.

Any previous “recommended” Offerors cannot be readmitted to the clarification process.

### **5 Assessment criteria (Non-Price)**

For the purposes of this clause, “Key Team Members” means those persons with appropriate qualifications and experience who will oversee technical / non-technical aspects of the Consultant Services or act as specialists / experts. The consultant’s capacity to provide appropriately skilled resources for the duration of the consultant services will be a significant assessment consideration.

Where required, project specific “key sub-criteria” will need to be addressed in the Offer (refer to Item 4 of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component* (C7586)). These considerations will be given emphasis during the criteria assessment process.

The offer assessment process will be a two-staged approach:

1. The first stage assesses the criteria rating based on the information included in the "*Offer for Consultant Services – Non-Price Component*" (refer to Item 4 of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (C7586)*), and
2. The second stage will confirm or modify the first stage rating taking into consideration past performances of the consultant. The purpose of this second stage is to provide a reality check between the offer submission statements and actual known performance.

The non-price assessment of all consultant offers will be based on the following criteria:

- a) Technical Skills of Key Team Member
- b) Delivering the Service
- c) Relationship Management
- d) Local Benefits Test, and
- e) Quality of Deliverables.

### **5.1 Technical skills of Key Team Members**

The Offeror shall demonstrate that its Key Team Members / Sub-Consultants have relevant experience / expertise in their proposed role in Consultant Services of a generally similar nature as well as any locally nominated areas. This includes any overseas personnel nominated.

The assessment process for rating this criterion will take into consideration the following:

- a) Technology expertise / knowledge relevant to these Consultant Services as set out in the Functional Specification or Brief.
- b) Understanding the department's design and construction standards and relevant processes, especially those in the following Manuals comprising the primary sources:
  - Road Planning and Design
  - Road Drainage Design
  - Drafting and Design Presentation Standards
  - Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices
  - Pavement Rehabilitation
  - Pavement Design Supplement
  - Design Criteria for Bridges and Other Structures
  - Geotechnical Design Standards
  - The four Standard Drawings Roads Manuals
  - The five categories of Standard Specifications
  - The department's Transport Infrastructure Project Delivery System
  - Project Cost Estimating, and
  - Environmental Management Manuals.

- c) Expertise / capacity to deliver suitable outputs, for example, Engineering Drawings, Supplementary Specifications, Program, Schedules, Estimates, Electronic Models, Tender Documents, Quality Plans and so on. Where indicated in Item 4 of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (C7586)*, additional emphasis during assessment will be given to expertise / capacity in the nominated outputs.
- d) Expertise / knowledge of the department's local design and construction requirements (for example, blacksoil design issues, environmental management such as sediment control, noise barriers, and so on.) Where indicated in Item 4 of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (C7586)*, additional emphasis during assessment will be given to expertise / knowledge in the nominated areas, and
- e) General capacity to handle project type and ability to provide backup in the event of changes to key team members (include the proposed Organisation structure).

## 5.2 Delivering the service

An evaluation will be made of the Offeror's approach methodology and apparent understanding of the need to be satisfied and the expected outcomes to be achieved by the completed project.

Where applicable the Offeror shall detail the systems and computer programs to be used:

- a) The Offeror shall articulate its proposed approach methodology for delivering the specified Consultant Services on time and in accordance with the Invitation to Offer documents.
- b) The Offeror shall supply a precedence diagram showing how completion of the project will be achieved within the program cost and timeframe is essential. Activities shall relate to the items specified in the Schedule of Services (refer to Item 4 of the *Offer for Consultant Service – Non-Price Component (Form C7586)*).

Specified milestones shall be included as reference or hold points in the precedence diagram (refer to Item 1.8 of the *Invitation for Offer (Form C7585)*).

Specified discussion times for the Principal's audit and/or review before work can proceed to the next stage.

- c) The Offeror's detailed approach to the areas listed in the following Table 5.2 is required.

**Table 5.2 – Area of work (Planning Vs Design)**

Planning	Design
Review of Environmental Factors and Environmental Management Plan (Planning)	Environmental Design Report
Public engagement and consultation	Public engagement and consultation
Traffic Counting and Analysis	Hydraulic Analysis and Design
Hydraulic Analysis	Provision for Traffic and Sidetracks
Bridge Planning Report	Landscaping
Planning and Preliminary Design Layouts and Report	Road Design and Drawings
Geotechnical Investigation, Analysis and Report	Bridge Design and Drawings
Project Proposal Report / Business Case	Quality in documentation and design

For each area of work listed above the Offeror shall detail the specific methodology for that area. In particular the offeror shall include detail on the issues described below together with all other aspects of the relevant areas:

- a) The incorporation of specific environmental requirements into all aspects of the project together with how the impacts will be managed.
- b) The proposed strategy for handling public consultation throughout the contract, including the proposed procedures for addressing complaints from the public and communication with Members of Parliament.
- c) The proposed strategy for collection of traffic data (including type and location of traffic surveys), methodology for predicting future traffic and the methodology for analysing the traffic data (including all software to be used).
- d) The details of any additional geotechnical work the offeror considers is necessary and intends to carry out including frequency, locations, and testing details. The Offeror shall separately identify the cost of such additional geotechnical work.
- e) The methodology for conducting hydraulic design, including proposed analytical tools (including computer programs) to be used.
- f) Details of any electronic 3D modelling (12D).
- g) Details of any mesoscopic transport modelling (planning or development stage).
- h) Details and methodology of any bridge planning and design.
- i) Details and methodology of any road design plan work.
- j) Details and methodology of any signalisation / lighting design / electrical design.
- k) Comprehensive understanding of project management methodology and elements and how they will be applied including the use of:
  - Integration management
  - Scope management
  - Time management
  - Cost management
  - Quality management
  - Human resources management
  - Communication management
  - Risk management
  - Procurement management, and
  - Stakeholder management.

### **5.3 Relationship management**

The Offeror shall demonstrate its commitment to:

- a) Working in a collaborative manner to manage the Consultant Services.
- b) Working together with the Principal on the basis of the Principal playing an informed leadership role.
- c) Working in a relational way where the Principal will be part of the decision making process on a progressive basis.
- d) Setting up and attending regular project meetings together with relevant Key Team Members (including sub-consultants), as appropriate.
- e) Progressively identify and resolve variations at the earliest opportunity at project meetings.
- f) Doing business in a positive way, for example, without 'creative variations' (as a Prequalified Consultant, the nature of the work is understood and therefore a negotiated and agreed brief should include an 'in principle' approach not to seek variations for minor discrepancies in the documents), and
- g) Performance reporting at agreed milestones during the contract, a final performance report at the end of the design phase, and a post-construction report at the completion of any construction works that resulted from the design.

### **5.4 Local benefits test**

The offeror shall demonstrate that it can provide a local benefit through designing for:

- Local conditions
- Local supply chains and materials
- Local community requirements, and
- Road user requirements.

The Offeror shall demonstrate its approach to how the project team interface is to be undertaken.

It would be an advantage to have the availability of local personnel with local expertise and capacity, enabling face to face communication for project reviews and a local team for any site inspections.

### **5.5 Quality of deliverables**

The Offeror shall demonstrate its commitment to quality, including how this will be put into practice.

- General reputation for work quality
- Design Quality:
  - Appropriateness of Design Solutions
  - Design compliance with design standards
  - Design Presentation Clarity
  - Freedom from errors
  - Appropriateness for approval purposes

- Engineering Drawings Quality:
  - Drafting compliance with Drafting Standards
  - Drawing Readability / Clarity
  - Freedom from errors
  - Appropriateness for construction purposes
  - RPEQ certification from appropriately qualified engineer in relevant discipline
- Documentation Quality:
  - Number of Notices to Tenderers due to errors
  - Number of requests for 'creative' variations
  - Extent of rework
  - Value of claims by the Principal for rectification costs
- Estimating (Scheduling and Costing):
  - Accuracy and completeness of Scheduled Work Items
  - Accuracy of Work Item Quantities
  - Appropriateness and accuracy of identified risks
  - Accuracy of Risk Contingency provisions
  - Accuracy of Unit cost rates
  - Accuracy of Project Construction Cost (P50 and P90 estimates).

## 6 QBS Weightings (for both Prequalified and Non-Prequalified Consultants)

The Panel should use the following weightings (Table 6) for the non-price assessment criteria.

**Table 6 – QBS Weightings**

Criteria	QBS Default Weightings (%)
Technical Skills of Key Team Members	40
Delivering the Service	30
Relationship Management	10
Local Benefits Test	10
Quality of Deliverables	10
<b>Total</b>	100

The individual Default Weightings above may be adjusted to suit specific job requirements in Item 2.2 of the *Invitation for Offer* (C7585), to provide the weightings for assessment of this Offer.

Where the boxes for Actual Weightings (QBS) are not completed in Item 2.2 of the *Invitation for Offer* (C7585), the Default Weightings above will apply.

## 7 VBS Weightings (for both Prequalified and Non-Prequalified Consultants)

Weighting on price should be between 20% and 50% for non-engineering consultancies and 20% (Fixed) for engineering consultancies. The selection of the price weighing should be done on a project-by-project basis but it shall not reduce the required quality and value in the transaction.

The Panel should use the following weightings (Table 7) for a VBS assessment process for engineering consultancies.

**Table 7 – VBS Weightings**

Criteria	VBS Default Weightings (%)
Technical Skills of Key Team Members	40
Delivering the Service	13
Relationship Management	9
Local Benefits Test	9
Quality of Deliverables	9
Price	20
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>

The individual Default Weightings above may be adjusted to suit specific job requirements in Item 2.2 of the *Invitation for Offer* (C7585) to provide the weightings for assessment of this Offer.

Where the boxes for Actual Weightings (VBS) are not completed in Item 2.2 of the *Invitation for Offer* (C7585), the Default Weightings above will apply.

## 8 Rating of non-price criteria

The Panel should use the following rating method (ratings may range from a value of 1 to 10) for the non-price assessment criteria as indicated in the following Tables 8.1, 8.2, 8.3, 8.4 and 8.5.

### 8.1 Technical skills of Key Team Members

**Table 8.1 – Non-Price assessment criteria – technical skills of Key Team Members**

Rating	Assessment
10	Key Team Members have comprehensive “relevant qualifications and technical experience” (appropriate to the nominated Consultant Services) giving full confidence that they will form an effective team
9	Key Team Members have extensive “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving a high level of confidence that they will form an effective team
8	Key Team Members have extensive “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving confidence that they will form an effective team
7	Key Team Members have sound “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving confidence that they will form an effective team
6	Key Team Members have sound “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving some confidence that they will form an effective team
5	Key Team Members have adequate “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving some confidence that they will form an effective team
4	Key Team Members have adequate “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving limited confidence that they will form an effective team

Rating	Assessment
3	Key Team Members have limited “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving little confidence that they will form an effective team
2	Key Team Members have limited “relevant qualifications and technical experience” giving no confidence that they will form an effective team”
1	Not addressed

## 8.2 Delivering the service

**Table 8.2 – Non-Price assessment criteria – delivering the service**

Rating	Assessment
10	Outstanding project management approach – gives full confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
9	Excellent project management approach – gives high level confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
8	Excellent project management approach – gives confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
7	Sound project management approach – gives confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
6	Sound project management approach – gives some confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
5	Adequate project management approach – gives some confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
4	Adequate project management approach – gives limited confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
3	Unsatisfactory project management approach – gives little confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
2	Unsatisfactory project management approach – gives no confidence that the project will run efficiently and effectively
1	Not addressed

## 8.3 Relationship management

**Table 8.3 – Non-price assessment criteria – relationship management**

Rating	Assessment
10	Outstanding commitment to appropriate management relationships (seeks to create win-win project environments) – gives full confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
9	Excellent commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives high level confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
8	Excellent commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
7	Sound commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
6	Sound commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives some confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
5	Adequate commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives some confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project



Rating	Assessment
4	Adequate commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives limited confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
3	Unsatisfactory commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives little confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
2	Unsatisfactory commitment to appropriate management relationships – gives no confidence that team relationships will contribute to a successful project
1	Not addressed

#### 8.4 Local benefits test

**Table 8.4 – Non-price assessment criteria – local benefits test**

Rating	Assessment
10	Outstanding commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives full confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
9	Excellent commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives high confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
8	Excellent commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
7	Sound commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives high confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
6	Sound commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives some confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
5	Adequate commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives some confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
4	Adequate commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives limited confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
3	Unsatisfactory commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives little confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
2	Unsatisfactory commitment to local requirements (regional delivery capability using local personnel, application of local design requirements, knowledge of local conditions) – gives no confidence that the Offeror recognises and is committed to addressing regional project requirements.
1	Not addressed

## 8.5 Quality of deliverables

**Table 8.5 – Non-price assessment criteria – quality of deliverables**

Rating	Assessment
10	The organisation has an extremely impressive industry record of delivering excellent quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving absolutely full confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
9	The organisation has an impressive industry record of delivering excellent quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving high level confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
8	The organisation has a very good record of delivering good quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
7	The organisation has a good record of delivering good quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
6	The organisation has a sound record of delivering good quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving some confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
5	The organisation has an adequate record of delivering good quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving some confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
4	The organisation has an adequate record of delivering excellent quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving limited confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
3	The organisation has an unsatisfactory record of delivering excellent quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving little confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
2	The organisation has an unsatisfactory record of delivering good quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving no confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.
1	The organisation has an unacceptable record of delivering good quality for design, documentation and construction cost estimating giving absolutely no confidence that these requirements will be achieved in the delivery of the project.

