

Vendor Evaluation

Guideline for Contractors





Contents

Purpose.....	2
Scope	2
Definitions	3
Roles and Responsibilities	3
Guidelines	4
Performance Areas	4
Time.....	5
Quality.....	6
Site Management and Contract Administration.....	7
Relationships	9
OSH	10
Environment.....	12
Communication with Public and Stakeholders	14

Purpose

This guideline supports the vendor evaluation process performed in the Water Corporation's eProcurement system to ensure a consistent approach for scoring the performance of contractors and suppliers. The information provided can then be used to assess suitability of contractors for future contracts during HSE prequalification, bid evaluations and HSEQ risk planning.

Scope

Vendors are evaluated by Water Corporation employees during the claim approval process. The frequency and questions vary depending on the product category allocated in the purchase order.

Construction and works type purchase orders are evaluated every month during the progress claim approval process. Other categories such as consultancies, plant hire, goods supply etc. have set probabilities (such as 25per cent or one evaluation for every four invoices) and are evaluated based on these frequencies.

This guideline focuses on the construction and works questionnaire as it is the most detailed. Similar assessments are used when completing questionnaires for other product categories.



Definitions

Abbreviations, acronyms, terms or words used in this document which may not be commonly known by all readers. Some readers may be external to the Water Corporation, work in an unrelated area, or are otherwise unfamiliar with the terminology used.

Supplier, Vendor and Contractor	Provider of goods and services including works to the Water Corporation.
Contract Manager	The Contract Manager is an authorised representative of the Water Corporation responsible for the management of a contract. “Contract Manager” includes the Superintendent, Superintendent’s Representative, Principal, Principal’s Representative, Project Manager, Consultant or Agent.
Goods Recipient	Water Corporation authorised business partner who confirms receipt of goods and services. The Goods Recipient is responsible for approving invoices for payment.
Non-claim relevant order	The Water Corporation authorised business partner who confirms receipt of goods and/or services. The Goods Recipient is responsible for approving claims for payment from Suppliers.
SRM	The Supplier Relationship Management system is how Water Corporation operates its eProcurement processes.
Product Categories	A commodity classification designed to categorise the types of goods and services acquired by the Water Corporation.
Confirmation	A document created in SRM to confirm that the goods have been delivered or the services have been performed. For claim relevant orders it's a progress claim, for non-claim relevant orders it is a receipt.
BW and BW Reports	Business Warehouse, a data warehouse application component within SAP and a Corporate reporting tool that extracts data from SRM, SAP and cProjects overnight to provide reports to manage the business.

Roles and Responsibilities

Contract Manager	Completes the vendor evaluations and communicates the ratings to the contractor.
Goods Recipient	Completes the vendor evaluations of non-claim relevant orders.



Guidelines

Vendor evaluations must be completed on all approved claims for work performed, goods delivered or services provided.

The construction and works evaluation is broken up into seven performance areas these being; Time, Quality, Site Management & Contract Administration, Relationships, OSH, Environment and Communications with Public and Stakeholders. Questions relating to other purchasing categories are tailored to suit the product or service being supplied.

When a progress claim is submitted, it is the responsibility of the Contract Manager to complete an evaluation and provide comments on performance. Scoring takes into consideration all audit and inspections completed during the month by HSE consultants, managers and inspectors.

Where the purchase order is not claim relevant, the Goods Recipient will be required to complete the evaluation.

For construction and works, an evaluation is completed for every claim. Vendor evaluations would be communicated to the contractor at the next contract meeting to ensure that the contractor is aware of how their performance is assessed by the Water Corporation.

Performance Areas

Contractors performance is scored on; Time, Quality, Site Management & Contract Administration, Relationships, OSH, Environment and Communications with Public and Stakeholders.

There are four possible scores for each area; **100 %, 75 %, 50 % or 25 %.**



Time

Time management is essential for contracts to run efficiently. The contractor's understanding of the works and their methodology are reflected in the construction program. Under the contract, contractors are required to mitigate any delays, so it is important that the impact of delays is understood by the contractor as well as Water Corporation employees managing the contract. For vendor evaluation the contractor is measured on the following criteria:

Quality of Construction program

- A score of **100 %** would be given where a detailed construction program is submitted in the format requested under the contract, shows the works are well planned and its logic is perfect, and is fully resourced.
- If the standard of the construction program is what would be expected, (i.e. it is in the form of a Gantt chart, has a baseline and contains the proposed sequencing of works showing the critical path).
- Then, a score of **75 %** would be given.
- A score of **50 %** would be given if the program lacks detail and the works are not well planned and a score of
- **25 %** would be given where time is not being managed and there is no schedule.

Time management and use of the construction program

The construction program could be very good yet it might not be adhered to or resourced.

- A score of **100 %** would be given where a construction program is well implemented and used as a time and resources management tool.
- A **75 %** score is given when management of time is done satisfactorily
- A score of **50 %** is given where there is no adherence to the construction program and time management is not of an acceptable level.
- A score of **25 %** is given where there is no program and time management is not satisfactory. .

Management of delays and disruptions

Contractor's schedules may slip behind due to various reasons, some delays are within their control and others may be due to external factors.

Good contractors work around delays and manage them. For example, by introducing additional resources or utilising different construction methodologies.

- A score of **100 %** would be given for contractors who successfully work around delays to an outstanding level.
- For a good level of management of delay a score of **75 %** would be given.
- A score of **50 %** would be given when contractors fall behind and their management of delays is sporadic and a score of **25 %** would be allocated when contractors fail to manage delays and disruptions and are constantly behind schedule.



Quality

The calibre and the integrity of the quality management system developed and implemented are measured on the following criteria: Compliance with procedures, standards & specifications, Inspection and Test Plans, Non-Conformances, Site Inspection and Audit Outcomes and Quality of Deliverables.

Compliance with procedures, standards and specifications

- A score of **100%** is given for compliance with all procedures, standards and specification at all times with checks and audits routinely carried out to confirm compliance.
- A score of **75 %** is given for an acceptable compliance with procedures, standards and specification.
- A score of **50%** is given when a contractor fails repeatedly to meet specification, standards and procedures and does not make effort to rectify.
- When a contractor fails constantly and continuously to adhere to procedures, standards and specification, a lowest score of **25 %** is given.

Inspection and Test Plans

- A score of **100%** is given when a contractor demonstrates constant adherence to and producing high quality Inspection and Test Plans and Procedures (ITP's) that are managed and submitted ahead of time, and notices to witness tests, hold points etc. is given in advance to all involved.
- A score of **75%** is given when the contractor carries out inspections and present good quality ITP's as per the contract with no or little reminders.
- A score of **50%** is given when a contractor puts little effort in the management, submission, quality and adherence to its ITP's and has to be reminded constantly to comply.
- When a contractor fails constantly and continuously to comply with its ITP's requirements under the contract, a score of **25%** is given.

Non-Conformances

- When a contractor's deliverables are constantly delivered with high quality and error-free and conforming to the contract then a score of **100%** would be appropriate.
- When the quality of most of the deliverables conform to the requirement of the contract with only minor non-conformances are evident thought out the contract and were rectified as soon as the contractor was informed of the non-conformance, a score of **75%** would be acceptable.
- A **50%** score is recommended when there are substantial errors in one or more of the deliverables required under the contract
- When non-conformances are not rectified promptly causing significant amount of rework and leading to major delays, a score of **25%** would be appropriate.



Site inspection and Audit Outcomes

- When findings of site inspections and audits confirm that the contractor complies consistently with procedures, standards and specification relevant to the contract, then the appropriate score would be **100%**.
- When site inspections and audits show that the contractor complies with procedures, standards and specification relevant to the contract most of the time and addresses and rectifies non-compliance promptly when directed, then the appropriate score would be **75%**.
- A score of **50%** is given for a contractor when audits reveal noncompliance with the contract and majority of the recommendations of the audit or inspection were not acted upon when a repeat audit is carried out.
- When audits and inspections reveal that the contractor is not complying with the contract and repeated audit still show non-compliance and findings and recommendations were not acted upon, then a score of **25%** would be given.

Quality of Deliverables

- When a contractor's deliverables such as ascons, manuals etc are consistently delivered on time and of high quality and error-free and conforming to the contract then a score of **100%** would be appropriate.
- A **75%** score is given when all deliverables are as per the requirement of the contract in both quality and timing.
- A **50%** score would be given when there are substantial errors in one or more of the deliverables required under the contract and are of poor non –compliant quality.
- When the deliverables provided by the contractor are found to be not fit for purpose or are not provided at all, then a score of **25%** would be given.

Site Management and Contract Administration

The criterion depict the competency of contractors managing; the site, personnel, the works and risks associated with the works, restorations to the satisfaction of customers and councils, compliance with contractual commitments, how claims are submitted for variations or payment and how subcontractors are managed. Attention is focused on; accessing competent resources if falling behind schedules, legitimacy of claims submitted for consideration and providing the deliverables in accordance with the contract and administration records.

Standard of Site Management

- An outstanding performance warranting a score of **100%** means correct contractual approach to site management which is vital to successful working environment. This would mean that a highly competent site manager is always available on site, dealing with delays and risks efficiently, keeping the site safe during construction, workforce planning carried out properly to avoid disruptions and delays.
- A score of **75%** score is given when most of the time similar site management occurs, the site is managed well by a competent supervisor who is available most of the time and the site is under control.
- **50%** score would be given when a contractor is not in control of the site, site manager is not competent or not available majority of the time and would leave majority of site management to subcontractors.
- A score of **25%** would mean that the contractor has failed their duty to maintain a proper site and lost control of its day to day management, either by leaving it to subis or no control at all.



Restoration and Reinstatement

As work in many occasions involves digging up trenches, roads and going through backyards etc., reinstating the areas that work may have damaged is paramount. Site must be left unharmed and as close as possible to its original state.

- When reinstatement and restoration of damaged areas are carried out to an exceptional standard, without disruption to residents or businesses and without any delays a score of **100%** is given.
- When contractual quality and timing of restoration the standard is adhered to score of **75%** is given.
- A score of **50%** is given when restoration standard falls below the standard we expect and restored areas are not close to preconstruction state as well as the lack of the timeliness of restoration.
- When quality and timeliness of restoration and reinstatement is unacceptable, residents, businesses and council are not satisfied, a score of **25%** would be given.

Management of Subcontractors

Main contractors may engage and manage subcontractors to carry out specific parts of the works. Subcontractors perform the works they undertake under the policies and procedures of the main contractors.

- A score of **100%** is given for subcontractors managed outstandingly by the main contractor where subcontractors adhered continuously to policies and procedures of the main contractor.
- Effective management of subcontractors as expected would warrant the score of **75%**.
- When management of subcontractors requires attention as non-compliance with the policies and procedures of the main contractor are observed or subcontractors are left without supervision or managed most of the time, then a score of **50%** is given.
- Any performance below this would be a total lack of sub-contractors management and a score of **25%** would be given.

Compliance with contractual commitments i.e. Aboriginal Engagement, Local Content

Aboriginal engagement and local contents criteria are part of evaluation of bids and become contractual obligation upon award of the contract to the successful bidder.

- When a contractor shows exceeding level of commitment to these specific obligations beyond what was agreed and contractual and always seeks opportunities to engage Aboriginal supplier and subcontractors, then a score of 100% is given.
- A 75% score when the contractor complies with the contract.
- For partial compliance with commitments a score 50% is recommend but when a contractor fails to comply then a failed score of 25% is given.

Variations and Claims

Claims for extensions of time, change of scope, additional works, latent conditions, defects, design changes etc., and are all permissible under the contract. The nature of claims, legitimacy and evaluation is what the contract administrator, superintendent, superintendent's rep or principal's rep undertakes. The performance of the contractor under this criterion is evaluated for providing evidences and substantiation.





- If a contractor, actively and in timely manner provides notices of claims and are all legitimate and substantiated with all the details required under the contract thus making the decision taken by the contract manager less arduous, a score of 100% is given.
- If a contractor submits claims that are not excessive yet all substantiated and with almost all the details required under the contract, then a score of 75% would be given.
- If a contractor submits excessive number of claims without substantiation that would occupy the contract administrators' time to go through them then reject/request more info, then a score of 50% would be given but if a contractor continues to submit all claims without substantiation, the lowest score for performance of 25% would be given

Progress Claims

- If progress claims are submitted fully supported with documentation, appropriate reports and statutory declaration for payment of subcontractors and are on time thus requiring minimal effort from contract managers to check to further progress them, a score of this performance would be 100%.
- If progress claims are submitted on time and with almost all the details required under the contract and if asked to provide further details then the contractor would provide promptly then a score of 75% is given.
- If a contractor submits all claims late with or without documents that would waste contract managers' time to go through them and request more info leading sometimes to delays in processing these claims, then a score of 50% would be given.
- And if a contractor continues to submit all progress claims late and without supporting documents, the lowest score of 25% for such performance would be given.

Relationships

Strong relationship between Contractor and Principal and all personnel administering the contract is vital to the smooth running of the contract. Contractors responding to contract managers and vice versa in a timely manner avoid getting bogged into delays and costs arising from delays in making decisions for example.

For the purpose of vendor evaluation, the Contractor is measured on the following:

Meeting attendance

- A score of **100 %** would be given when contractors who are always available, has completed the actions that require completion and come fully prepared for meetings including unscheduled meetings that fall outside of the frequency established in the contract.
- A score of **75%** is given when the contractor attends meetings and also comes prepared as is expected under the contract.
- A score of **50 %** would be given when a contractor fails to attend some meetings, does not delegate, is not fully engaged when attending meetings and does not come prepared.
- Failing to attend meetings despite being a contractual obligation and continuous requests from contractor manager means a score of **25%** is given.



Level of co-operation

- A score of **100 %** is given to a contractor who continuously co-operates with the Contract Manager to finish the works with a ‘win-win’ outcome for all parties, is open and transparent and shares information for the good of the contract.
- A score of **75 %** is given when a contractor cooperates within the boundaries of the contract.
- A score of **50 %** is given if a contractor does not fully cooperate with the Contract Manager and ignores what’s best for the other party and contract and
- a score of **25 %** is given when a contractor fails completely to cooperate and ignores the other party despite repetitive requests

Response to directions

- A score of **100 %** is given when a contractor exceeds contract managers’ expectations in responding to their directions promptly and goes beyond what is called for in the general conditions.
- A score of **75 %** is given when the contractor responds to direction within the boundaries of the contract.
- A score of **50 %** is given when a contractor fails to respond to a few directions from the contract manager and any response is sporadic.
- A score of **25 %** is given where no response is received to directions by the contract manager.

Nature of communications

General conditions of contract require a certain level of communication to be maintained between the contractor and personnel administering the contract, such as Superintendent’s Representatives, Superintendents or Principal’s Representative.

- A score of **100 %** would be given when a contractor exceeds expectations by pursuing open and professional communications.
- A score of **75 %** would be given for the standard level of communication as per the contract.
- A score of **50 %** would be given if no regular communication takes place between the parties.
- For a contractor to be scored **25%** for their performance means that the contractor simply avoided contract managers and did not communicate with the parties to the contract.

OSH

There is NO compromise on OSH. Final vendor evaluation at Practical Completion rates OSH performance separate to all other criteria combined.

Scores that are 75% and above for overall OSH performance renders the vendor acceptable for future works, unlike the overall score of 60% and above for all other remaining criteria. Contractors are measured on their safety culture and management attitude towards safety, the quality of JSA’s, how well and fully compliant they are with Water Corporation procedures and notifications of incidents etc.

For vendor evaluation, the contractor is measured on the following criteria:



Safety culture demonstrated by management e.g. active participation, consultation and compliance

- A score of **100 %** is given when contractors are proactive displaying active participation and consultation, lead by example and empower workers, are visible on site, have scheduled formal audits and inspections, and actively consult with personnel.
- A score or **75 %** is given when the contractor's management attend site to engage and consult with personnel as is required under the contract.
- A score of **50 %** is given when the contractor's management are not visible until something has gone wrong. They react to situations rather than prevent them.
- A score of **25 %** is given if there is no visibility of the contractor's management and no consultation with site personnel.

Safety culture displayed by personnel (including subcontractors) by compliance with procedures and system

- A score of **100 %** is given when a contractor is proactive when it comes to safety. Site personnel actively identify and control hazards and look after their own and each other's safety. Safety management systems are understood and implemented on site. Safety behaviour includes looking to drive systemic improvement. The contractor's attitude towards safety is "we always work safely, even when nobody is watching."
- A score of **75 %** is given when safety management systems are fully implemented and systemic improvements are occasionally identified, but only when prompted. Behaviour reflects "we do it because we have to, not because we want to."
- A score of **50 %** is given when a contractor has a reactive approach to safety and only takes action in response to a situation. Prevention strategies are not regularly identified.
- A score of **25 %** is given when personnel are negative towards safety. The safety management system is not implemented on site and unsafe behaviours are frequently observed.

Quality of safe job planning e.g. management of contractor's risk register, JSA's, SWMS, CTW, change management

- A score of **100 %** is given when a comprehensive risk register has been developed. The register is a live document so it is reviewed whenever hazards and incidents are reported, after inspection and audit findings. JSAs are performed for all activities that are new, non-routine and/or of significant risk. JSAs are not generic and do not remain open beyond a week. JSAs are reviewed and updated when circumstances change.
- A score of **75 %** is given when a satisfactory risk register has been developed and is reviewed and updated as required. JSAs are developed for high risk activities and are reviewed every week.
- A score of **50 %** is given when improvement is required because the risk register is kept as a static document that is not formally reviewed and updated. JSAs are generic and do not adequately identify and control risk of the high risk activities.
- A score of **25 %** is given for contractors not performing to an acceptable level and fail to review risk registers. JSAs are either not performed or are generic and not subjected to review. Site personnel do not know or provide input to the content.



Site Inspection and Audit Outcomes

- When audits and inspections demonstrate contractors' full compliance with all OSH requirements with no identified improvements, a score of 100% is given.
- A score of **75 %** is given when audits and inspections demonstrate full compliance and require a few identified improvements.
- A score of **50 %** is given when contractor performance requires improvement. Audits and inspections regularly identify improvements required and slow responses follow to address and close out issues.
- A score of **25 %** is given when contractor performance is unacceptable. Audits and inspections identify reoccurring and significant improvements required. Contractor performance creates a significant risk to the Water Corporation.

Adequacy of Supervision of Personnel and Subcontractors

- A score of **100 %** is given to contractors when all works, including those of sub-contractors, have a dedicated full time supervisor appointed.
- A score of **75 %** is given for contractors performing satisfactorily, with all works, including that of sub-contractors, having a dedicated supervisor appointed by the main contractor who has a regular but not full time presence.
- A score of **50 %** is given when contractors have supervisors allocated, but not enough to cover all works and there is very little supervision of sub-contractors.
- A score of **25 %** is given when there is inadequate or no supervision of the works performance is simply unacceptable.

Management and Response to Incidents and Hazards (Inc. HPI's)

A score of **100 %** is given for proactive performance in identifying and reporting all incidents, hazards and HPI's with reports excelling in time and quality, no prompts is required, full disclosure of all incidents and hazards that took place on site and corrective actions in place to eliminate/stop incidents etc. from happening.

- A score of **75 %** is given when performance meets the reporting requirements of the contract i.e. OSH statistics and data input into the system is correct and complete.
- A score of **50 %** is given when improvement is required as not all of OSH reporting requirements of the contract have been met with no corrective actions taken into account.
- A score of **25 %** is given for an unacceptable OSH reporting performance. The contractor does not comply with the contract and is constantly prompted to comply.

Environment

As Principal, the Water Corporation provides essential water, wastewater and drainage services to the community in Western Australia. We take water from the environment and we return it treated without any compromise or harm to the environment. Water Corporation is legally bound to comply with the environmental regulation and we could be fined if we don't. We, alongside our contractors ensure that, no un-authorised emissions, noise, overflow, discharge or spillage from pump stations, un- authorised clearing of native vegetation etc. take place.





Contractors' full compliance with the regulations and legislations relevant to environmental laws is our expectations and we make it clear to our contractors in our contract documentations and requirement for prequalification for works with us. Contractors' performance is measured on how well they carry out the works complying with the environmental aspects of the contract.

Compliance with environmental requirements

Each contract has specific environmental requirements to adhere to and could require a comprehensive Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). Some requirements are of such importance they exceed the requirements of the General Conditions and are explicitly expressed by way of special conditions. We have duty to our regulators and could be fined if we don't comply.

- When a contractor fully and proactively complies with the environmental requirements of the contract and the CEMP without the contract managers alerting them to comply, then a score of **100%** is considered for such performance.
- **75%** score is given for an acceptable level of environmental management and compliance with the contract requirement with occasional reminders to comply when slip up take place few times but these non-compliances are rectified immediately.
- For non-compliance with the contract requirement on a number of occasions and the remedy is tardy and of an unacceptable level, then a failed score of **50%** is given.
- Any performance below that and work is carried out without consideration to the environmental issues; a score of **25%** is given.

Management and Response to Incidents and Hazards

- An exceeding performance with a score of **100%** means that the contractor is proactive in identifying and reporting all incidents and hazards with reports excelling in time and quality, no prompts is required, full disclosure of all incidents and hazards that took place on site and corrective actions in place to eliminate/stop incidents etc from happening.
- A score of **75%** is given when performance meets the reporting requirements under the contract and data input into the system is correct and complete.
- A score of **50%** is a failed score this is when the contractor does not meet all the reporting requirement under the contract, is frequently being prompted to comply and no corrective actions are taken into account so this score becomes a notice for improvement.
- The lowest score of **25%** is given for an unacceptable performance where the contractor does not comply with the reporting requirement under the contract and is always being prompted to comply.

Adequacy of Supervision of Personnel and Subcontractors

- Exceeding performance with the highest performance score of **100%** is given when all works including that of sub-contractors have a dedicated full time supervisor appointed by the main contractor for all their environmental works.
- A score of **75%** is given for contractors performing satisfactorily and all works including that of sub-contractors have a dedicated supervisor appointed by the main contractor with regular but not full time presence on site.
- When contractors have supervisors allocated but not enough to cover all works and there is very little supervision of sub-contractors. Such performance requires improvement and a score of **50%** is given.



- When there is inadequate or no supervision of the works, the lowest score of **25%** is given, i.e. we see the performance of contractors as simply unacceptable.

Site Inspection and Audit Outcomes

- An exceeding performance a score of **100%** is given when audits and inspections demonstrate full compliance with environmental requirements and no identified improvements.
- A score of **75%** is given for good performance when audits and inspections demonstrate full compliance with few identified improvements.
- A failed score of **50%** is given when contractors' performance requires improvement as audits and inspections regularly identify improvements with slow response time to address and close out.
- The lowest score of **25%** is given when performance is unacceptable as audits and inspections identify reoccurring and/or significant improvements required creating a significant risk to the Corporation.

Communication with Public and Stakeholders

Carrying out works may involve in many occasions dealing with the public and variety of stakeholders such as councils and other services providers. Maintaining good relationships with the public, councils and service providers and timely advice on works and satisfactory restoration of damaged areas is vital.

Water Corporations' contractors represent the Water Corporation and our reputation is affected by how well a job is done and how relations with the public has been maintained. Bad reputation for contractors is BAD for Water Corporation. For vendor evaluation, the contractor is measured on the following criteria:

Minimising community impact

Carrying out the works particularly in urban areas and when it takes quite lengthy periods could affect people's daily routine by living close to traffic detours that are part of traffic management, dust and vibration generated from construction activities, damage to driveways, disturbing or even sometimes demolishing backyards or damage to existing reticulations etc. That's why our contracts require that contractors are to keep damages and disturbance to a minimum and compliance with restoration timing is paramount.

- When contractors are proactive in reducing to an absolute minimum the impact of the works on the community by implementation of good quality practices to reduce noise, dust etc. and meticulous timing and high quality of restorations then a perfect score of **100%** is given.
- When a contractor is complying with the contract requirement minimising the impact of the works on the community, the standard score of **75%** is recommended.
- When little effort is made to reduce the effect of the works that has taken its toll on the community then such performance requires improvement as requests made to the contractor might push them to perform satisfactorily but until then a score of **50%** is recommended.
- The lowest score of **25%** is given to contractors with they perform the works without regards to its impact on the community and repeated requests from the contract managers were not complied.

Adequacy of Notifications

This criterion revolves around the communications and notifications from the contractor to the Water Corporation and keeping personnel abreast of the progress of the works.





- When contractors keep Water Corporation personnel well informed with the progress of the works and give a well in advance notification of changes to the works that has a great impact on the community, then a score of **100%** is given.
- A satisfactory score of **75%** is given when a contractor provides adequate notification of how the work is progressing and any changes to the relevant Water Corporation staff.
- A **50%** is given when a contractor provides inconsistent notification to Water Corp and customers and stakeholders and improvement is required to this performance.
- Any performance below this means that the contractor has failed in its obligation to communicate to Water Corp and stakeholders and community with the progress of the works and changes to the work and warrants a score of **25%**.

Information Distribution to the Community

- Contractors are required to give notices and communicate with the effected residents, shires and councils and other stakeholders (as applicable) when work is soon to commence. When the community and key stakeholders are kept well informed of when work is to commence, planned work and progress of the works and notices are issued to all well in advance the timeframes exceeding the requirement of the contract and without any delays, a score of **100%** would be given.
- When communications and notices are issued satisfactorily and only as required in the contract an acceptable level with a score of **75%** is given.
- A score of **50%** would be given when a contractor does not comply with issuing notices (commencement and or entry notices) on numerous occasions and communication with all concerned is of poor quality.
- The lowest score of **25%** is given when contractors do not communicate with the community and stakeholders and notices are provided on ad hoc basis.

Response to complaints and customers issues

Complaint-free works are what contractors and Principals aspire to achieve during the life of the contract. Complaints could be minor or major and when some are not responded to in a prompt and appropriate manner, customers go up the ladder of “complaining” all the way to the Minister, that’s why contractors’ response to complaints is important for the good of the contract.

- When complaints are dealt with proactively and are readily responded to and promptly, addressed and rectified without delay, then a score of **100 %** is given.
- A score of **75%** is given when complaints are dealt with in a timely manner and within the requirement of the contract.
- When it takes contractors a considerable amount of time to respond to and resolve customers complaints as well as rectification of the complaints were not up to their satisfaction, a score of **50%** is given.
- A score of **25%** for performance is given when a contractor simply did not respond to or managed any complaint.