

Guide

**Transport Infrastructure Project Delivery System
Performance Report Scoring – Asphalt Prequalification**

July 2015

Copyright



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/au/>

© State of Queensland (Department of Transport and Main Roads) 2015

Feedback: Please send your feedback regarding this document to: tmr.techdocs@tmr.qld.gov.au

Contents

1 Application1

2 Performance ratings1

1 Application

This scoring guide provides guidance to support use of the template performance report for prequalified asphalt contractors.

2 Performance ratings

The prequalified asphalt 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 with other performance reporting undertaken by TMR.

There should be no 'Unacceptable' performance rating unless evidence exists to demonstrate lack of achievement of the required standard of performance. Each criterion has an overall score that is equal to the average of the sub-criteria scores.

Table 1 - Performance scoring generic rating descriptions

Score	Rating	Descriptor (the extent to which the prequalified 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	Good	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		Sound achievement of the required standard of performance. Minimal minor errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which are acceptable as offered
7	Acceptable	Reasonable achievement of the required standard of performance. Some minor errors, risks, weaknesses or omissions which may be acceptable as offered
6		Reasonable achievement of the required 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	Unacceptable	Moderate weaknesses. Does not always meet the required standard of performance
3		Significant weaknesses. Performance is often below the required standard of performance
2		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

GUIDE NOTE:

It is possible that not all sub-criteria will be assessed for every contract. Where a sub-criterion is not assessed, the remaining sub-criteria will be averaged to provide a score at the criterion level.

Table 2 - Performance criteria and detailed rating descriptions

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
1. Time management and progress	a) Supply/placement program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program did not meet the minimum requirements Inadequate planning, coordination and execution of activities, work processes and critical operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program is satisfactory Satisfactory planning, coordination and execution of activities, work processes and critical operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good-quality program Good planning, coordination and execution of activities, work processes and critical operations. Good effort made to keep on schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent, highly detailed program Excellent planning, coordination and execution of activities and work processes. Very proactive in keeping ahead of schedule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supply and/or placement program Copies of dated correspondence confirming time obligations met or not met Site meeting minutes
	b) Supply/placement of asphalt in accordance with program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractual obligations not met within the prescribed time limits on many occasions, having a moderate to significant impact on the contract 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractual obligations generally met within prescribed time limits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractual obligations met within the prescribed time limits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractual obligations met ahead of the prescribed time limits Early warning of potential issues Early warning of possible variations 	
2. Project management	a) Management of subcontractors (including consultants and suppliers)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low level of contractual responsibility for subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A satisfactory level of contractual responsibility for subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full level of contractual responsibility for subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full level of contractual responsibility for subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Audit reports. Written feedback from subcontractors

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Project management (cont.)	Management of subcontractors (including consultants and suppliers) (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient time allowed for submissions requesting approval of subcontractors Activities of subcontractors not properly integrated into project/process management plans Inadequate management and coordination of subcontractors, with negative impacts on the delivery of the work under the contract Inadequate control of the performance and work processes of subcontractors, with some failing to meet contractual obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sufficient time allowed for submissions requesting approval of subcontractors Major activities of subcontractors integrated into project/process management plans Satisfactory management and coordination of subcontractors, with no significant impacts on the delivery of the work Satisfactory control of the performance and work processes of subcontractors. Some subcontractor non-compliances of a minor nature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests for approval of subcontractors made in a timely manner Majority of activities of subcontractors integrated into project/process management plans Good management and coordination of subcontractors - impacts on delivery of the work minimal/negligible Good control of the performance and work processes of subcontractors. Subcontractors met all contractual obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests for approval of subcontractors made well in advance, with all proper processes followed All subcontractor activities fully integrated into project/process management plans Excellent management and coordination of subcontractors High levels of control over the performance and work processes of subcontractors. Subcontractors met all contractual obligations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily diaries Interim performance reports

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Project management (cont.)	Management of subcontractors (including consultants and suppliers) (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealings with subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealing with subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealing with subcontractors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outstanding performance with regard to the timeliness of payment and fairness of dealing with subcontractors 	
	b) Management of resources Plant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract Inadequate availability of plant Plant use was below the acceptable standard and only moderately effective. Plant in poor condition and not properly maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract Satisfactory availability of plant Plant use met the acceptable standard and was effective Plant in reasonable condition and generally well-maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract Good availability of plant Plant use was above the acceptable standard Plant in good condition and well-maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proper selection of plant for the tasks involved in the contract Plant consistently available Plant use was well above the acceptable standard Plant in excellent condition and well-maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prestart checklist Daily diaries Minutes of meetings Monthly progress reports Statutory declarations Audit reports Interim performance reports

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Project management (cont.)	Personnel	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate number of key project-level and operational personnel. Some difficulty in delivering the contract Some adverse effects on processes and outcomes Some adverse effect on progress and quality caused by high levels of turnover in key operational personnel Key operational personnel sometimes off site during critical operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate number of project-level and operational personnel. Little difficulty in delivering the contract. Insignificant adverse effect on processes and outcomes Insignificant adverse effect on progress and quality due to turnover in key operational personnel Key operational personnel on site at most times, but always for critical operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of project-level and operational personnel more than sufficient. No difficulty in delivering the contract. No adverse effect on outcomes and processes No adverse effect on progress and quality caused by turnover in key operational personnel Key project and operational personnel always on site for critical operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract extremely well resourced. No difficulty in delivering excellent contract outcomes. Resourcing had a significant positive effect on processes and outcomes A positive effect on progress and quality from key operational personnel Key project and operational personnel always on site and present at all critical operations 	
	c) Contract administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract was below the acceptable standard 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acceptable compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract 	Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract was above the acceptable standard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with the administrative and legal requirements of the contract well above the acceptable standard 	

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Project management (cont.)	Contract administration (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract records system inadequately maintained Some difficulty in ensuring that up-to-date drawings, specifications were used Inadequate follow-up action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract records system satisfactorily maintained Usually ensured that up-to-date drawings, specifications were used Discrepancies rectified in a reasonable timeframe with only minimal or negligible impacts on the delivery of the work Satisfactory follow-up action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract records system properly maintained Up-to-date drawings, specifications were typically used Any discrepancies rectified quickly, with no impact on the delivery of the work Good follow-up action 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintenance of the contract records system was excellent Up-to-date drawings, specifications consistently used Proactive follow-up action 	
	d) Cooperative relationships (e.g. with administrator, head contractor, other contractors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inadequate commitment and attitude to working relationships within the contractual environment (e.g. respect, trust, cooperation, openness and the ready exchange of information) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory commitment and attitude to working relationships within the contractual environment (e.g. respect, trust, cooperation, openness and the ready exchange of information) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong commitment and positive attitude to working relationships within the contractual environment (e.g. respect, trust, cooperation, openness and the ready exchange of information) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent commitment and positive attitude to working relationships within the contractual environment (e.g. respect, trust, cooperation, openness and the ready exchange of information) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily diaries Minutes of meetings Monthly progress reports Correspondence Interim performance reports

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Project management (cont.)	Cooperative relationships (e.g. with administrator, head contractor, other contractors) (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues mostly resolved slowly and inefficiently due to generally ineffective communication and poor attitude 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues resolved in a reasonable timeframe through open and effective communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues always resolved quickly and efficiently through open and very effective communication 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issues always resolved very quickly and efficiently through excellent communication. Very proactive in maintaining relationships required to deliver the project 	
	e) Stakeholder management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder liaison almost always fails to meet contract/specification requirements Responses to enquiries from stakeholders rarely provided on time Contract administrator required to resolve disputes with stakeholders that could have been avoided Multiple stakeholder liaison non-compliances raised on the same issue 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder liaison sometimes fails to meet contract/specification requirements Some late responses to enquiries from stakeholders Reactive management of stakeholder liaison Stakeholder liaison non-compliances raised on high-risk issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder liaison almost always complies with contract/specification requirements Contractor provides timely responses to enquiries from stakeholders Professional conduct in managing issue resolution with external stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder liaison often exceeds contract/specification requirements Proactive management of stakeholder issues in a highly effective manner No non-compliances issued regarding stakeholder liaison 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily diaries. Complaints register Commitment register Interim performance report

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
3. Utilisation of management systems Note: Assessment will focus on both quality of system and whether it was utilised (successfully on the contract)	a) Quality management (including inspection and testing)	Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality management representative has limited knowledge and experience. Performance was below the acceptable standard Quality management representative sometimes off site for critical operations Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality plan and inspection and test plans (ITPs) did not meet the minimum requirements 	Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality management representative has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard Quality management representative on site at most times, but always on site for critical operations Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory quality plan and ITPs 	Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality management representative has good knowledge and experience. Performance was above the acceptable standard Quality management representative almost always on site, but always on site for critical operations Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good quality plan and ITPs 	Personnel <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality management representative has excellent knowledge and experience. Performance was well above the acceptable standard Quality management representative always on site and present at all critical operations Preparation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality, comprehensive quality plan and ITPs Quality plan in line with AS/NZS ISO 10005: 2005 <i>Quality management systems - guidelines for quality plans</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract requirements and contract quality plan Quality plan/ Asphalt Quality Plan ITPs Lot records, test results, survey and nonconformance reports Nonconformance register Compliance audit reports, internal and third party Monthly progress reports Daily diaries Copies of meeting minutes Correspondence

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.)	Quality management (including inspection and testing) (cont.)	Implementation (including inspection and testing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality management system not coordinated with systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Execution of work process was below the acceptable standard Inadequate execution of ITPs. Many lots not visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance Nonconformances often poorly reported and not satisfactorily addressed 	Implementation (including inspection and testing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some degree of coordination between quality management system and systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Execution of work process met the acceptable standard Satisfactory execution of ITPs Adequate provision of lot records, test results, survey and other measurements and nonconformance reports 	Implementation (including inspection and testing) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable degree of coordination between quality management system and systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Execution of work process was above the acceptable standard Good execution of ITPs Lot records, test results, survey and other measurements and nonconformance reports readily provided 	Implementation (including inspection and testing) <p>Quality management system effectively coordinated with systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Execution of work process was well above the acceptable standard Excellent execution of ITPs, with ITPs used effectively as a management tool All lots visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interim performance reports

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.)	Quality management (including inspection and testing) (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repetitions of the same nonconformance type with moderate to significant consequences • A medium to significant level of rework • Observance of hold points inadequate • Internal audits not carried out as per the quality plan • Internal audits identified an inadequate level of compliance • Refusal/reluctance to make test data and analysis available to the administrator and/or head contractor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Almost all lots visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance • Nonconformances satisfactorily reported and generally satisfactorily addressed after some prompting • Repetitions of the same nonconformance type, with minor consequences • A low level of rework • Satisfactory observance of hold points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lots visually inspected and assessed before submitting for acceptance • Nonconformances almost always reported and addressed promptly and effectively • Low number of repetitions of the same nonconformance type • Minimal or negligible levels of rework • Good observance of hold points 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconformances always reported and addressed promptly and effectively • No repetition of the same nonconformance type • No instances of rework • Excellent observance of hold points • Internal audits always carried out as per the quality plan 	

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.)	Quality management (including inspection and testing) (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No systems in place to utilise test data and trends for the purposes of management control on individual projects and across projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal audits mostly carried out as per the quality plan Internal audits identified a satisfactory level of compliance Test data and analysis made available to the administrator and/or head contractor on request Limited use of test data and trends for the purposes of effective management control on individual projects and across projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Internal audits almost always carried out as per the quality plan Internal audits identified a good level of compliance Test data and analysis submitted to the administrator and/or head contractor in a timely manner Reasonable use of test data and trends for the purposes of effective management control on individual projects and across projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactive approach to the submission of test data and analysis to the administrator and/or head contractor Contractor uses test data and trends for the purposes of effective management control on individual projects and across projects 	
	b) OHS management	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative has limited knowledge and experience. Performance was below the acceptable standard 	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard 	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative has good knowledge and experience. Performance was above the acceptable standard 	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative has superior knowledge and experience. Very high standard of performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contract requirements and site-specific OHS plan OHS audit reports, internal and third party

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.)	OHS management (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative sometimes off site for critical operations <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site-specific OHS plan did not meet the minimum requirements <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHS management system not coordinated with systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Limited safety induction program Holds toolbox meetings but not in accordance with the OHS plan Inadequate safety performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative on site at most times, but always for critical operations <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory site-specific OHS plan <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some degree of coordination between OHS management system and systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Satisfactory safety induction program Holds toolbox meetings in accordance with the OHS plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative almost always on site, but always for critical operations <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good site-specific OHS plan <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable degree of coordination between OHS management system and systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Good safety induction program Holds toolbox meetings in accordance with the OHS plan; sometimes more frequently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety representative always on site and present at all critical operations <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent site-specific OHS plan <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> OHS management system effectively coordinated with systems of other contractors and head contractor (where relevant) Comprehensive safety induction program Holds toolbox meetings in accordance with the OHS plan; usually more frequently 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly progress reports Daily diaries Incident/accident reports Worksafe improvement notices Interim performance reports

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.)	OHS management (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Standard of regular OHS reports inadequate Internal audits and inspections not usually carried out as per the OHS plan Nonconformances, incidents and accidents often poorly reported and not appropriately actioned Repetitions of the same nonconformance type with moderate consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate safety performance Standard of regular OHS reports adequate Internal audits and inspections mostly carried out as per the OHS plan Nonconformances, incidents and accidents nearly always reported and generally actioned promptly and effectively Some repetitions of the same nonconformance type, with minor consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good safety performance Good standard of regular OHS reports Internal audits and inspections almost always carried out as per the OHS plan Nonconformances, incidents and accidents always reported and typically actioned promptly and effectively Low number of repetitions of the same nonconformance type, with minimal/negligible consequences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent safety performance Standard of regular OHS reports excellent Internal audits and inspections always carried out as per the OHS plan Nonconformances, incidents and accidents always reported and always actioned promptly and effectively No repetition of the same nonconformance type 	
	c) Environmental management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant damage and/or blatant disregard for sensitive and/or significant features 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May not proactively manage environmental, cultural or heritage issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental, cultural and heritage matters approached proactively and sensitively 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental, cultural and heritage matters approached proactively and with great sensitivity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonconformance reports and registers Daily diaries

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.).	Environmental management (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonconformances, incidents and accidents in environmental, cultural and heritage matters often poorly reported and poorly actioned Repetitions of the same nonconformance type with moderate consequences Audit reports identified an inadequate level of compliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonconformances, incidents and accidents in environmental, cultural and heritage matters nearly always reported and generally actioned promptly and effectively Repetitions of the same nonconformance type with minor consequences Audit reports identified a satisfactory level of compliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonconformances, incidents and accidents in environmental, cultural and heritage matters always reported and almost always actioned promptly and effectively Low number of repetitions of the same nonconformance type, with minimal/negligible consequences Audit reports identified a good level of compliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonconformances, incidents and accidents in environmental, cultural and heritage matters always reported and always actioned promptly and effectively No repetition of the same nonconformance type Audit reports identified an excellent level of compliance 	
	d) Traffic management	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative has limited knowledge and experience. Performance was below the acceptable standard. Qualifications did not meet requirements 	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative has satisfactory knowledge and experience. Performance met the acceptable standard. Qualifications met requirements 	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative has good knowledge and experience. Performance was above the acceptable standard. Qualifications 	<p>Personnel</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative has excellent knowledge and experience. Performance was well above the acceptable standard. Qualifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports of major incidents or accidents Copies of notices or reports issued by Police or Coroner Audit reports, internal and 3rd party

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
				exceeded requirements	exceeded requirements	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.).	Traffic management (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative sometimes off site for critical times and/or events <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management plan(s) did not meet the minimum requirements <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited communication and consultation with all stakeholders Internal audits and inspections not usually carried out as per the traffic management plan(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative on site at most times, but always for critical times and/or events <p>Preparation</p> <p>Satisfactory traffic management plan(s)</p> <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Satisfactory communication and consultation with all stakeholders Internal audits and inspections mostly carried out as per the traffic management plan(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative almost always on site, and always at critical times and/or events <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good traffic management plan(s) <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good communication and consultation with all stakeholders Internal audits and inspections almost always carried out as per the traffic management plan(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic management representative always on site and present at all critical times and/or events <p>Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent traffic management plan(s) <p>Implementation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent communication and consultation with all stakeholders Internal audits and inspections always carried out as per the traffic management plan(s) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly progress reports Nonconformance reports and registers Daily diaries Interim performance reports CVs for traffic management representative and other traffic management personnel

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Utilisation of management systems (cont.).	Traffic management (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconformances, incidents and accidents often poorly reported and poorly actioned • Repetitions of the same nonconformance type with moderate to significant consequences • Audit reports identified an inadequate level of compliance • Limited complaints management. Not all complaints usually handled with respect and consideration. Some delays in achieving resolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconformances, incidents and accidents nearly always reported and generally actioned promptly and effectively • Repetitions of the same nonconformance type with minor consequences • Audit reports identified a satisfactory level of compliance • Good complaints management. With few exceptions, complaints mostly handled with respect and consideration. A few small delays in achieving resolution 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconformances, incidents and accidents always reported and almost always actioned promptly and effectively • Low number of repetitions of the same nonconformance type • Audit reports identified a good level of compliance • Very good complaints management. Complaints almost always handled with respect and consideration and nearly always resolved without delay 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconformances, incidents and accidents always reported and always actioned promptly and effectively • No repetition of the same nonconformance type • Audit reports identified an excellent level of compliance • Excellent complaints management procedure and attitude to the resolution of complaints, but few, if any, complaints received 	

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
4. Expertise of staff	a) Management level (company and project)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prequalified contractor's representative(s) has limited knowledge and experience, and is not sufficiently involved in the project Performance was below the acceptable standard Qualifications did not meet requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prequalified contractor's representative(s) has satisfactory knowledge and experience and is directly involved in key aspects of the project Performance met the acceptable standard Qualifications met requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prequalified contractor's representative(s) has sound knowledge and experience and is directly involved in the project Performance was above the acceptable standard Qualifications exceeded requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prequalified contractor's representative(s) has extensive knowledge and experience and is heavily involved in the project Performance was well above the acceptable standard Qualifications exceeded requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily diaries Audit results CVs Certificates and training records Written feedback from subcontractors
	b) Supervisory level	<p>As per row 4(a), plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of understanding of and experience with management of quality (including implementation of project quality plans, ITPs) and OHS, environmental and traffic management plans 	<p>As per row 4(a), plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some minor (non-significant) gaps in understanding of and experience with management of quality (including implementation of project quality plans, ITPs) and OHS, environmental and traffic management plans 	<p>As per row 4(a), plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid understanding of and experience with management of quality (including implementation of project quality plans, ITPs) and OHS, environmental and traffic management plans 	<p>As per row 4(a), plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed understanding of and extensive experience with management of quality (including implementation of project quality plans, ITPs) and, OHS, environmental and traffic management plans 	As per row 4 (a)

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Expertise of staff (cont.)	Supervisory level (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of competency in effective supervision and control of asphalt manufacture and/or paving operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reasonable level of competency in supervision and control of asphalt manufacture and/or paving operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High level of competency in supervision and control of asphalt manufacture and/or paving operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exceptional level of competency, resulting in highly effective supervision and control of asphalt manufacture and/or paving operations 	
	c) Operators	As per row 4 (a), plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant operator certificate(s) or equivalent non-existent or out-of-date Lack of appropriate training e.g. induction, evacuation procedures (where necessary), safe methods of operation of tools and equipment, and environmental training as it relates to the role 	As per row 4 (a), plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant operator certificate(s) or equivalent all up-to-date Evidence of appropriate training in relevant areas, though may be some minor (non-significant) areas due for refresher training 	As per row 4 (a), plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant operator certificate(s) or equivalent all up-to-date 	As per row 4 (a), plus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plant operator certificate(s) or equivalent all up-to-date 	As per row 4 (a)

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
5. Suitability of equipment	a) Manufacturing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asphalt manufacturing plants not consistently capable of supplying continuous output in line with specification or contract requirements Manufacturing plant struggles to produce registered mix design(s) in compliance with requirements of relevant specifications Many nonconformances and requirements for rework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asphalt manufacturing plants capable of supplying continuous output in line with specification or contract requirements Manufacturing plant typically produces registered mix design(s) in compliance with requirements of relevant specifications Some minor nonconformances which are quickly rectified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asphalt manufacturing plants consistently able to supply continuous output in line with specification or contract requirements Manufacturing plant typically produces registered mix design(s) in compliance with requirements of relevant specifications Nonconformances are rare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Asphalt manufacturing plants consistently able to supply continuous output in line with specification or contract requirements Manufacturing plant consistently produces registered mix design(s) in compliance with requirements of relevant specifications No instances of nonconformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Daily diaries ITPs Test results Nonconformance reports and registers Meeting minutes Monthly progress reports Interim performance reports
	b) Handling and transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Storage and handling facilities for component materials do not adequately prevent contamination and segregation issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate storage and handling facilities for component materials to prevent contamination and segregation issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Good storage and handling facilities for component materials to prevent contamination and segregation issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Excellent storage and handling facilities for component materials to prevent contamination and segregation issues 	As per row 5 (a)

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Suitability of equipment (cont.)	Handling and transport (cont.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inappropriate and/or poorly maintained equipment utilised for handling and transportation Major deficiencies in handling and transportation practices Timing of material delivery on site poorly managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and adequately-maintained equipment utilised for handling and transportation Some minor (non-critical) areas where practices could be improved Timing of material delivery on site reasonably well managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appropriate and well-maintained equipment utilised for handling and transportation Timing of material delivery on site well managed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-quality, appropriate and well-maintained equipment utilised for handling and transportation Timing of material delivery on site well managed 	
	c) Paving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient/inadequate paving plant to meet the major requirements in TMR's Specifications Plant not consistently capable of laying and compacting the mix uniformly (without segregation) to meet specified requirements for alignment, dimensions and compaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adequate paving plant available which meets the major requirements in TMR's Specifications Plant typically capable of laying and compacting the mix uniformly (without segregation) to meet specified requirements for alignment, dimensions and compaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ample, good-quality paving plant which meets the requirements in TMR's Specifications Plant typically capable of laying and compacting the mix uniformly (without segregation) to meet specified requirements for alignment, dimensions and compaction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ample, high-quality paving plant which meets the requirements in TMR's Specifications Plant consistently capable of laying and compacting the mix uniformly (without segregation) to meet specified requirements for alignment, dimensions and compaction 	As per row 5 (a)

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonconformances are rare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No instances of nonconformances 	
6. Quality of work	a) Mix design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inadequate control of raw material components • Does not take appropriate steps to arrange for revision/modification and re-registration of mix design in the event of component materials changing, or to respond to any performance issues with the mix • Insufficient level of compliance with registered mix design requirements during production 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control of raw material components generally adequate • Arranges for revision/modification and re- registration of mix design in the event of component materials changing, or to respond to any performance issues with the mix. May require some encouragement and/or prompting • Adequate level of compliance with registered mix design requirements during production. Some minor areas of nonconformance which are able to be overcome 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good control of raw material components at most times • Arranges for revision/modification and re- registration of mix design in the event of component materials changing, or to respond to any performance issues with the mix • Typically complies with registered mix design requirements during production • Nonconformances are rare 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good control of raw material components at all times • Proactively arranges for revision/modification and re- registration of mix design in the event of component materials changing, and responds to any performance issues with the mix • Consistently complies with registered mix design requirements during production • No instances of nonconformances 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract • Specifications • Mix design • ITPs • Test results • Monthly progress reports • Daily diaries • Interim performance reports • Correspondence

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Quality of work (cont.)	b) Workmanship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient surface preparation prior to laying asphalt • Low standard of workmanship, with several areas of non-compliance with specified requirements • Level of variability within asphalt production lots is unacceptable • Issues with pavement lots result in a significant number of rejections and/or reduced level of service deductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertakes adequate surface preparation prior to laying asphalt • Standard of workmanship competent and complies with specified requirements • Level of variability within asphalt production lots is acceptable • Issues with pavement lots rarely result in rejection, or reduced level of service deductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertakes adequate surface preparation prior to laying asphalt • High standard of workmanship, in compliance with specified requirements • Level of variability within asphalt production lots is very low • Minimal/negligible rejection of pavement lots or reduced level of service deductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertakes comprehensive and detailed preparation prior to laying asphalt • Exceptional standard of workmanship, which complies with all specified requirements • Level of variability within asphalt production lots is minimal/negligible • No instances of rejection of pavement lots or reduced level of service deductions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contract • Specifications • ITPs • Test results • Monthly progress reports • Daily diaries • Interim performance reports • Correspondence

Criterion	Sub-criterion	Score				Examples of documentation to support assessment
		0-4	5-7	8-9	10	
		Unacceptable	Acceptable	Good	Superior	
Quality of work (cont.)	c) Final product	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final product does not achieve the characteristics set out in the TMR specifications including warranty requirements Defects not rectified properly within the defects liability period Major weaknesses, has not met the required standard for this type of work 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final product mostly achieves the characteristics set out in the TMR specifications (including warranty requirements), but has some minor weaknesses Defects rectified properly within the defects liability period 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final product achieves the characteristics set out in the TMR specifications (including warranty requirements) Few defects which are rectified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final product fully achieves the characteristics set out in the TMR specifications (including warranty requirements) No defects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures Test results Interim performance reports Defects liability report
	d) Innovation in process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No consideration given to potential innovation in methodologies or operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited (mainly reactive) approach to potential innovation in methodologies or operations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contractor identifies some opportunities for innovation in methodologies or operations, and is receptive to potential innovations proposed by others Potential innovation areas are appropriately considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proactive approach to the identification of innovation in methodologies or operations Potential innovation areas are appropriately considered and adopted where relevant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Procedures Daily diaries Correspondence Monthly progress reports Interim performance reports

