



ATPACE Supplier Performance Management Guide

PR04-503 (Aug16)



Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	ATPACE Responsibilities	3
1.2	ATPACE System	3
2	Completing Performance Evaluations	4
2.1	Performance Evaluation Process	4
2.2	Evaluation Frequency	4
2.3	Performance Criteria	4
2.4	Evaluation Forms and types of Evaluation	4
2.4.1	Interim Evaluations	4
2.4.2	Final Evaluations	5
2.5	Grading Process	5
2.6	Supplier meeting	5
2.7	Escalation Process	6
2.8	Overall Performance Grade	6
3	Use of ATPACE Information in Tender Evaluation	7
4	Prequalification Performance Reviews	7
5	Performance Criteria – Consultant - Professional Services Category	8
6	Performance Criteria – Contractor - Asset Construction Category	10

1 Introduction

Auckland Transport Performance Assessment by Coordinated Evaluation (**ATPACE**) is a joint initiative between Procurement and Business Units.

The purpose of **ATPACE** is to:

- Enable continuous dialogue with Suppliers to encourage high levels of performance by challenging them to exceed the key objectives.
- Provide a means of systematically monitoring performance of AT's Suppliers.
- Provide a historical database to assist in Track Record assessment in future Tender Evaluations.

The intention of this guide is to describe the process used in the evaluation of Supplier performance, and provide information about the performance levels and behaviours that AT is encouraging under each performance criteria.

From this guide, the Supplier, who is the subject of the evaluation, will get an understanding where their focus should be to enable the successful delivery of their contract.

Current ATPACE implementation:

- **ATPACE** is defined in **Procurement Strategy** under Section 6.3
- **ATPACE** is currently implemented across all contracts for Engineering Professional Services (PS) and Asset Construction (AC) procurement categories* regardless of the contract value.
- For procurement categories, Road Corridor Maintenance (RM) and Public Transport (PT) that have on-going contract evaluation system they will be migrated into the **ATPACE** System at a later stage.
- For all other procurement categories i.e. BT, GS, FM, TO, **ATPACE** will be introduced and implemented once the above categories are successfully implemented.

1.1 ATPACE Responsibilities

Responsibilities for **ATPACE** evaluation assessments are as follows:

- AT's Project Managers who are the AT Representative for the relevant contracts are responsible for completing **ATPACE** evaluations via **ATPACE System**.
- AT Procurement is responsible for running the **ATPACE System** and relevant processes associated with **ATPACE**.
- AT's Group Managers (GMs) of the relevant Department will sign off the final evaluation via the system.
- AT's GMs of the relevant Department and the relevant Procurement Manager are responsible for moderation of evaluations, when required.

1.2 ATPACE System

The **ATPACE System** is a SharePoint based database that allows AT Project Managers to carry out supplier evaluation based on their contract requirements. Through initial notification via e-mails, the Project Manager and Supplier Representative are prompted to log on to the **ATPACE System** and complete their actions.

It has the ability for:

- Project Managers to generate evaluations within the system and send to the Supplier Representative.
- Supplier Representative to 'Accept/ Disagree' the evaluation.
- Supplier Representative to print off the final evaluation(s) to use as part of a tender submission.
- AT GMs to sign off the final evaluation via the system by 'Accepting'.
- Reports on overall scores to be extracted.
- AT Staff members to see final evaluations of all suppliers.

Full access to **ATPACE System** will be limited to AT employees. Supplier's access to **ATPACE System** will be limited only to supplier's specific contracts through an on boarding process by the **ATPACE** Administrator.

*Details about AT procurement categories can be found in the Procurement Strategy on website <https://at.govt.nz/about-us/procurement/procurement-framework/>.

2 Completing Performance Evaluations

2.1 Performance Evaluation Process

Performance evaluations shall be completed using the *ATPACE System*.

For a step-by-step process guide of how to use *ATPACE System* please see [Help Guide](#) posted under *ATPACE System* library.

2.2 Evaluation Frequency

The Procurement Strategy defines the frequency of the *ATPACE* evaluation. There is an expectation that performance evaluations will be subject to monthly interim evaluations over the duration of the contract if the contract term is greater than two months. The final evaluation will be completed at contract completion.

Frequency*	Description
Monthly	For capital development contracts where term is defined by the completion of works/ projects.
Quarterly	For operational expenditure.
Annually	For master services agreements (MSA) and general services contracts.

*The above are defaults unless approved by the appropriate GM.

2.3 Performance Criteria

The four *ATPACE* performance criteria are:

- **Management:** Skill levels and competency, risk management, creating a 'no surprises' environment, responsiveness, creating innovation and proactiveness.
- **Production:** Ability to meet programme, timely outputs, achieve the specified standard, accurate outputs to required standards and defect management systems.
- **Health and Safety:** Safe work practices and traffic management control.
- **Administration:** QA documentation, monthly reporting, financial and handling of variations.

Details of each performance criteria topic relevant to the contract being assessed will be explained at the first interim *ATPACE* evaluation. If not relevant the score will be 'not applicable'.

2.4 Evaluation Forms and types of Evaluation

Evaluation Form are predetermined by the procurement category and the contract type.

2.4.1 Interim Evaluations

Interim evaluations are undertaken to provide feedback on a Supplier's performance for the previous month's work, with the objective of improving performance during the contract. They should be used to:

- Facilitate performance related discussions that filter out performance issues or barriers to improving performance.
- Give objective and real time feedback.
- Aid the resolution of differences.

Interim evaluation scores may fluctuate from month to month, and only represent the performance of the Supplier in the previous month. However, they will be used as an input into the final evaluation. If a Supplier's overall grading is less than 40 or more than 80, additional specific comments are required to be entered in the overall comment box on the evaluation form, to support the evaluation grading.

2.4.2 Final Evaluations

The final evaluation should be completed shortly after contract completion or after the defects notification period, and should be an assessment of Supplier's overall performance for a particular contract, not an average of all interim evaluation scores.

All final evaluations require comments to be entered into the comments box. Such comments shall amplify features of the Supplier's performance, and any significant issues that arose during the contract period.

The appropriate GM will sign off the final evaluation via the system through 'accepting', which ensures that a greater degree of consistency is achieved in the rating of final evaluations.

Where applicable, a Supplier may enter their final evaluation score in the AT Tender documents under Track Record non-price attribute.

2.5 Grading Process

The AT Project Manager completes the evaluation by selecting an appropriate performance rating for each performance criteria. By choosing one of the numbers alongside each of the performance measures that matches that grading, an overall grading will be calculated. Where 'not applicable' has been selected the overall grading is averaged out.

For any performance measures where a rate of less than 2 or more than 4 has been given, brief comments are required to clarify the rating. On the [ATPACE](#) evaluation forms midpoint has been highlighted green. Refer to the rating table below:

Rate number	Description	
0	Unacceptable	Significant issues requiring immediate attention.
1	Serious reservations	Some deficiencies where improvement is needed.
2	Minor reservations	Some minor concerns are noted.
3	Good (Business as usual)	Supplier meets all contract requirements.
4	Very good	Supplier exceeds some requirements at some levels.
5	Excellent	Supplier exceeds all requirements at all levels.

2.6 Supplier meeting

This should ideally be a face to face meeting. The [ATPACE System](#) has the ability to send a draft evaluation to the Supplier Representative. During the meeting discussion, the initial scores can be adjusted by the Project Manager. Once agreed, this evaluation can then be resubmitted to the Supplier Representative to enable them via the [ATPACE System](#) to 'Accept/Disagree'. Or the Project Manager has the ability to Accept on behalf of the Supplier Representative if appropriate.

If the agreed document is re-submitted to the Supplier Representative (as per the process) and they do not acknowledge by either 'Accept/ Disagree' within 7 Working Days, the scores on that evaluation will be automatically accepted.

2.7 Escalation Process

The Supplier has the right to challenge any evaluation, and the right to elevate the issue if it cannot be resolved at the initial level i.e. the face to face meeting

Despite this, completion of the interim evaluation form without the 'Acceptance' of the Supplier, does not invalidate the evaluation. The resulting evaluation form shall still be considered a bona fide performance evaluation.

In the event that an **ATPACE** evaluation requires a rating to be moderated, the **ATPACE** evaluation form will be re-assessed by the applicable AT Project Manager, Supplier's Representative, the AT GM of the applicable Department and the relevant AT Procurement Manager.

In the event of any disagreement, the rating assessed by the GM and the Procurement Manager will be the final grading.

2.8 Overall Performance Grade

Performance grades are split into 6 different categories. 'Business as Usual' should be considered as a level where the Supplier fully meets contract requirements without the need for AT intervention.

The overall rating is considered in accordance with the following:

Grade	Description	
Less than 5	Inability to deliver contract requirements.	Unacceptable
5-20	Contract requirement only met through the intervention of AT.	Serious reservations
21-40	Contract requirement met with minor reservations which may or may not require AT intervention.	Minor reservations
41-60	'Business as Usual' Contract requirements fully met without the need of AT intervention.	Good
61-80	Contract requirements exceeded with potential added value features identified.	Very good
81-100	Contract requirements are consistently exceeded with significant added value features identified and delivered.	Excellent

Business as Usual is the benchmark from which all Suppliers are measured.

- The expectation is that a Supplier graded 'Good' meets the minimum requirements specified in our contract documents in all areas without the need of AT intervention.
- 'Minor reservations' means there are areas of weakness or suboptimal performance in one or more categories, and therefore will result in a score lower than Good. A number of weaknesses, particularly in areas that are identified as critical, will result in a 'Serious Reservations', or 'Unacceptable' grade.
- Achieving 'Very Good' or 'Excellent' grades is possible if the Supplier is delivering better than the specified contract standard, and doing so without AT intervention.
- 'Excellence' requires not only consistency, but value added features such as proactiveness, flexibility, identifying and pursuing innovation, and other factors that would lead you to describe the Supplier as being at the leading edge of the industry.

3 Use of ATPACE Information in Tender Evaluation

In tender evaluations, a Supplier’s previous performance is evaluated under the Track Record non-price attribute. Track Record is an assessment of the Supplier’s record of delivering works or services to the quality standards required, on time and within budget. Suppliers that wish to participate in AT Tenders will be required to include Final ATPACE ratings for contracts nominated under Track Record, as a part of their non-price attribute tender submission.

For reference contracts not undertaken for AT, or for legacy AT contracts, Tender Evaluation Panel will undertake reference checking using ATPACE methodology to assess ATPACE score for that contract.

Where the Track Record attribute is weighted, the average of the nominated contracts ATPACE scores will contribute to 80% of the Track Record score. The other 20% will be determined by using the average ATPACE score for ALL contracts completed by the Supplier in the last 5 years.

Track record in tender evaluation (100%)		
Supplier has previously been assessed by ATPACE	80% - Nominated contracts from RFP Response	20% -Supplier’s overall ATPACE score for contracts completed in the last 5 years.
New Supplier with no previous record of AT project delivery or no ATPACE scores.	100% Track Record Score on nominated contracts in RFP response.	

4 Prequalification Performance Reviews

An average ATPACE score that falls below 40 should be considered as an early warning sign to flag that a performance review might be necessary. The relevant AT Procurement Manager, in discussion with the appropriate AT GM will make a decision on whether a performance review is necessary.

A performance review will be undertaken on a Prequalified Supplier when the average ATPACE score falls below 20.

As a result of the review the Supplier could be removed from the Prequalification Register for a stand down period of 3 months.



5 Performance Criteria – Consultant - Professional Services (PS) Category

Performance Criteria – Consultant – PS	Measure	Consider	Unacceptable	Serious Reservation	Minor Reservation	Good (Business as usual)	Very Good	Excellent
Management								
Competency	Competency of management team to effectively manage the project and its progress on all necessary tasks.	Technical skills. Inter personal skills and management skills. Ability to plan for forward works and make resources available. Environmental Management. Stakeholders' view of consultant's performance, including Auckland Transport and monitoring number of complaints received.	Significant skills or competency issues noted in the management team, requiring immediate attention. Numerous complaints from Stakeholders.	Some deficiencies noted in the skills and competencies of management, or areas where improvement are needed. Several complains from received from stakeholders.	Overall have demonstrated the required skills and competencies in management, or are working well to develop in some areas to the required standard. Limited complaints from received stakeholders, or any complaints received have been appropriately handled.	Have demonstrated the required skills and competencies in management at all levels. Few complaints from stakeholders.	Easily meets all the skills and competency requirements in management for the contract, at all levels. Few or no complaints from stakeholders.	Skills and competencies in management demonstrated well in excess of the requirements, at all levels. All stakeholders satisfied
Creating "No Surprises" Environment	Ability to keep Auckland Transport informed on all relevant issues.	Flow of information and its accuracy and relevance. Highlighting and informing on potential problems. Highlighting and informing on potential costs.	Limited and / or inaccurate updates to Auckland Transport provided leading to serious or significant issues.	Few updates to Auckland Transport on potential changes leading to some issues.	Auckland Transport is informed on a regular basis, although some minor inaccuracies in information noted.	Auckland Transport is kept well informed and updated on any changes or issues.	Auckland Transport is kept well informed and updated on any changes or issues, with highly accurate information provided at all times, and solutions proactively provided as necessary.	Auckland Transport is kept well informed and updated on any changes or issues well in advance, with highly accurate information provided at all times, and highly effective solutions proactively provided as necessary.
Creating Innovation	Innovative ideas turned into reality in design and management	New methods New materials Value gained by the innovative ideas. Time saved by innovative ideas. New initiatives that better serve customers	Very little innovation seen. Many opportunities to innovate missed or unexplored.	Some innovation seen but several opportunities missed.	Some value adding innovation seen in some areas.	Good levels of innovation provided in critical areas, including good consideration of improved customer satisfaction techniques.	High levels of innovation provided in many areas, including good consideration of improved customer satisfaction techniques.	Extremely innovative across the full range of services provided. Excellent positive customer satisfaction initiatives identified.
Proactiveness	Effort, focus and proactive management of risks and future issues on the project	Number of new risks identified, quantified and planned for. Early detection of issues which may cause problems. Accurate identification of issues, risk consequence and outcomes. Proactive risk management and speedy identification of mitigating measures. Puts customers first and deals quickly with customer issues	Irresponsible risk management adversely affecting the project and Auckland Transport's reputation	Several key risks not identified or managed, adversely affecting the contract.	Most key risks are identified and managed appropriately with minor effects on the contract.	All key risks are identified and managed appropriately.	Risks and opportunities very efficiently managed, significant improving outcomes.	Risks and opportunities very efficiently managed at all times, great customer service initiatives developed, and outstanding outcomes achieved.
Responsiveness	Provides efficient and timely responses and exception reporting	Turnaround of queries and completeness of responses. Level of service provided to Auckland Transport. Mitigate the effect of environmental issues.	Response more than five days late	Response two to five days late	Majority of responses on time	All responses on time.	Response between two days early and on time	Response more than two days early
Production								
Timely outputs	Effective management and resourcing to produce the required outputs on time	Current completion dates (outputs may be incremental) relating to those originally forecast. Resources made available as required. Flexibility in resourcing. Number of changes from last review. Progress in relation to programme.	Output delivery significantly behind target completion date.	Output delivery behind target completion date.	Output delivery on target completion date with some minor exceptions.	Output delivery on target completion date.	Output delivery ahead of target completion date.	Output delivery significantly ahead of target completion date.

Performance Criteria – Consultant – PS	Measure	Consider	Unacceptable	Serious Reservation	Minor Reservation	Good (Business as usual)	Very Good	Excellent
Accurate outputs to Required Standard	Standard and quality of output in relation to contractual obligations	Quality of output in relation to requirements in contract. Reports and documents agreeing with the scope. Management of outputs with emphasis on quality. Accurate RAMM updates.	Outputs consistently provided to a standard less than required.	Some outputs provided to the required standard, but with several exceptions noted.	Outputs generally provided to the required standard	Outputs consistently provided to the required or higher standard.	Outputs consistently provided to a higher than required standard	All outputs provided to a higher than required standard, with numerous outputs significantly better than required.
Defect Management System	Ability to identify and rectify non-compliances and errors	Self-monitoring and ability to identify non-conformances. Early detection of non-conformances. Number of non-conformances originally identified externally. Speedy rectification of errors.	20+% non-conformances outstanding more than one month	Less than 20% non-conformances outstanding more than one month.	Less than 10% non-conformances outstanding more than one month	Less than 5% non-conformances outstanding.	No non conformances	Pro-active Defect Management System ensuring all standards exceed specification
Health and Safety (H&S)								
Safe Work Practices	Effort focus and proactive management of safety	Reporting and action on incidents. Work practices agreeing with OSH requirements. Company Safety Plan.	Significant deficiencies from required standard.	A number of deficiencies from required standard.	Evidence of good implementation of Contractor's OSH management information on site.	Contractor's OSH management information has been fully implemented on site.	A number of enhancements from required standard.	In addition to meeting the required standard significant enhancements have been deployed.
Administration								
Quality Assurance Documentation	Level of proactive effort applied to the quality system.	Level of innovation and management of the system. Paper trail functional and accessible through the system. Availability of self-auditing and self-monitoring documentation. Certification of personnel capabilities.	Significant deficiencies from required standard.	A number of deficiencies from the required standard.	Minimal deficiencies from the required standard.	No deficiencies from the required standard and some enhancements noted.	A number of enhancements above the required standard	A significant number of enhancements to the required standard
Monthly Report	Accuracy and relevance of Monthly Report	Quality of contents. Relevance of contents with reference to the scope. Timeliness of availability of report.	Report delivered to a poor standard, inaccurate information or/and with late delivery.	Report delivered to a low standard, some with inaccurate information or/and with late delivery.	Reports generally delivered to an acceptable standard and quality, and on time.	All reports delivered to an acceptable standard and quality, and on time.	All reports delivered to a high standard and quality, and on time. Often delivered significantly ahead of time, or with numerous additional value adding information.	All reports delivered to a very high standard and quality, and always ahead of time. All report contain significant additional value adding or insightful information.
Financial	Effort and proactive management of the project budget, cashflow and its accuracy (professional services and physical works contrasts)	Variations between forecast for the month and financial year based on original forecast and current forecast. Accuracy of invoicing. Accuracy of forecasting physical works expenditure for the month and financial year.	Delivery significantly above target Budget.	Delivery above target budget.	Slight variance from target budget.	Delivery on target budget.	Delivery below target budget.	Delivery significantly below target budget.
Handling of Variations	Necessary changes being incorporated effectively and managed satisfactorily.	Keeping up with contract, and project changes. Awareness of current documents. Documents and drawings updated and distributed.	Approach to pricing and signalling variations lacks proactiveness, with limited if any forward visibility of pending claims. Dispute about handling and/or pricing of variation(s) requiring Auckland Transport intervention to resolve.	Approach to pricing and signalling variations lacks proactiveness. Dispute about handling and/or pricing of variation(s) requiring Auckland Transport intervention to resolve.	Variations priced, approved and recorded in a reasonably timely fashion.	Variations efficiently priced, approved and recorded in timely fashion and remain within forecast. All parties keep informed and generally working collaboratively.	Variations efficiently and proactively priced, approved and recorded in timely fashion. All parties keep well informed throughout and working collaboratively to reduce Auckland Transport costs.	Variations highly efficiently and proactively priced, approved and recorded in timely fashion. Significant proactive steps taken to avoid variations. All parties keep well informed throughout and working collaboratively to reduce Auckland Transport costs.

6 Performance Criteria – Contractor - Asset Construction Category

Performance Criteria – Contractor - AC	Measure	Consider	Unacceptable	Serious Reservation	Minor Reservation	Good (Business as usual)	Very Good	Excellent
Management								
Skill level and competency	Competency of management team to effectively manage the project and its progress	Technical skills, Inter personal skills and management skills; Environmental Management	Significant skills or competency issues noted in the management team, requiring immediate attention.	Some deficiencies noted in the skills and competencies of management, or areas where improvement are needed.	Overall have demonstrated the required skills and competencies in management, or are working well to develop in some areas to the required standard	Have demonstrated the required skills and competencies in management at all levels.	Easily meets all the skills and competency requirements in management for the contract, and exceeds at some levels	Skills and competencies in management demonstrated well in excess of the requirements, at all levels.
Risk management	Effort, focus and proactive management of risks on the project	Number of new risks identified, quantified and planned for. Accurate identification of risk consequence and outcomes. Proactive risk management and mitigating measures. Speedy mitigation or management of high risks.	Irresponsible risk management adversely affecting the project and Auckland Transport's reputation	Several key risks not identified or appropriately managed, adversely affecting the project	Most key risks are identified and managed appropriately with minor effects on the project	All key risks are identified and managed appropriately.	All key risks are efficiently managed improving the project quality. A number of opportunities proactively identified to the benefit of the project.	Superior risk management processes developed and managed, improving the project quality, and raising the bar in terms of the risk management standards. Great efforts taken to identify and progress opportunities to the benefit of the project.
Responsiveness	Provides efficient and timely responses and reporting.	Turnaround of queries and completeness of responses. Achieving documentation and reporting deliverable dates.	Response and deliverables more than five days late	Response and deliverables two to five days late	Majority of responses and deliverables on time	All responses and deliverables on time.	Response and deliverables between two days early and on time	All Response and deliverables more than two days early
Production								
Ability to meet Programme	Effort and Proactive management of the programme together with accuracy in relation to on site production	Current completion date with that originally forecast. Resources made available as required. Flexibility in resourcing. Quantum and number of changes from last review. Progress in relation to programme.	Delivery significantly behind target completion date.	Delivery behind target completion date.	Delivery on target completion date with some minor exceptions.	Delivery on target completion date.	Delivery ahead of target completion date.	Delivery significantly ahead of target completion date.
Achieves the Specified Standard	Standard and quality of output in relation to contractual requirements	Quality of output in relation to requirements. Test results to prove quality of outputs. Number of "Notices to Contractor" (NTC's) issued relating to quality of completed work not being of an acceptable standard. Supervision with emphasis on quality. Training of staff. Certification of materials corresponding with requirements.	Products disfigured and/or in a poor state of operation. Overall site looks like a tip, unloved and presents a safety hazard.	Products in poor state and/or potential to be blamed for operational issues. Overall site untidy, no pride in the look of the site and potential for safety issues to arise.	Defects to products or operational requirements not hard to find. Overall site tidy but frequent occasions of litter, detritus, spoil etc. Site team unaware of look.	Occasional defect to products and/or isolated operational problems corrected in timely fashion. Site very tidy, but odd area needs improvement and/or response time has not been meet. Good pride in overall look.	No defects to products and/or isolated operational problems. Site very tidy and/or response times being meet. Good pride in overall look.	Products exceed standard specified and in excellent operational condition. Site clean, tidy, ordered and a pleasure to the eye. Site team happy to point out the performance.
Defect Management System	Ability to identify and rectify non compliances	Number of Non Conformances and number not rectified. Self-monitoring and ability to identify non-conformances. Early detection of non-conformances. Number of non-conformances originally identified externally. Speedy rectification of errors.	30+% non-conformances outstanding more than one month.	20% non-conformances outstanding more than one month.	10% non-conformances outstanding more than one month.	5% non-conformances outstanding.	No non conformances	Pro-active Defect Management System ensuring all standards exceed specification.
Health and Safety (H&S)								

Performance Criteria – Contractor - AC	Measure	Consider	Unacceptable	Serious Reservation	Minor Reservation	Good (Business as usual)	Very Good	Excellent
Safe Work Practices	Effort focus and proactive management of safety on site.	Reporting and action on incidents. Work practices agreeing with H&S (OSH) requirements. Number of lost time Injuries (LTI's) during the month. Number of repeated near miss incidents or subsequent LTI's. Company Safety Plan. Site Safety Plan. Number of near misses identified.	Significant deficiencies from required standard.	A number of deficiencies from required standard.	Evidence of good implementation of Contractor's OSH management information on site.	Contractor's OSH management information has been fully implemented on site.	A number of enhancements from required standard.	In addition to meeting the required standard significant enhancements have been deployed.
Traffic Management Control	Effort and Proactive management of traffic flows and public safety.	Disruption to traffic flows Public safety Public perception Complaints Traffic Management Plan: Development and updating Traffic Management Plan: Implementation	Development of Site Specific Traffic Management Plans (TMP's):					
			TMP's completed and implemented without any prior consultation with outside parties.	TMP's completed and implemented with minimal prior consultation with outside parties.	Majority of TMP's completed and implemented with prior consultation with outside parties.	Majority of TMP's completed and implemented with full and proper consultation with outside parties.	All TMP's proactively completed well in advance and implemented with full and proper consultation with outside parties.	All TMP's proactively completed well in advance and implemented with full and proper consultation with outside parties and addressing any comments, STMS has copy of TMP.
			Implementation of Site Specific Traffic Management Plans (TMP):					
			Dangerous. Poor level of traffic control set-out. Average Audit score greater than or equal to 51.	Needs Improvement. Inadequate level of traffic control set-out. Average Audit score 26-50.	Acceptable level of traffic control set-out on majority of sites. Average Audit score 11-25.	Acceptable level of traffic control set-out on all sites, with some evidence of higher standard sites. Average Audit score 5-10.	Acceptable level of traffic control set-out on all sites, with several very high standard sites. Average Audit score 1-5."	High Standard of traffic control set-out on all sites. Average Audit score 0.
Administration								
QA Documentation	Level of proactive effort applied to the quality system.	Level of innovation and management of the system. Paper trail functional and accessible through the system. Availability of test results. Availability of material certificates.	Significant deficiencies from required standard.	A number of deficiencies from the required standard.	Minimal deficiencies from the required standard.	No deficiencies from the required standard and some enhancements noted.	A number of enhancements above the required standard	A significant number of enhancements to the required standard
Financial	Effort and proactive management of the project budget, cashflow and its accuracy.	Variations between forecast for the month and financial year based on original forecast and current forecast. Accuracy of invoicing. Change in final forecast cost from last month	Delivery significantly above target budget and limited financial information provided in required reports.	Delivery above target budget and incomplete or inaccurate financial information provided in required reports.	Slight variance from target budget and reasonable financial information provided in reports.	Delivery on target budget and good financial information provided in reports.	Delivery below target budget, and excellent financial information provided in reports.	Delivery significantly below target budget, and first class financial information consistently provided at all times.
Handling of Variations	Necessary changes being incorporated effectively and managed satisfactorily.	Keeping up with contract changes. Awareness of current documents. Documents and drawings kept up to date. Time and cost effective solutions to variations giving Auckland Transport good value for money	Approach to pricing and signalling variations lacks proactiveness, with limited if any forward visibility of pending claims. Dispute about handling and/or pricing of variation(s) requiring Client intervention to resolve.	Approach to pricing and signalling variations lacks proactiveness. Dispute about handling and/or pricing of variation(s) requiring Client intervention to resolve.	Variations priced, approved and recorded in a reasonably timely fashion.	Variations efficiently priced, approved and recorded in timely fashion and remain within forecast. All parties keep informed and generally working collaboratively.	Variations efficiently and proactively priced, approved and recorded in timely fashion. All parties keep well informed throughout and working collaboratively to reduce Client costs.	Variations highly efficiently and proactively priced, approved and recorded in timely fashion. Significant proactive steps taken to avoid variations. All parties keep well informed throughout and working collaboratively to reduce Client costs.