



ROAD DEVELOPMENT AGENCY

SUPERVISING CONSULTANT PERFORMANCE RATING TOOL KIT

January 30
2013

This document is a User's manual for the Road Development Agency on how to assess the performance of Supervising Consultants in relation to Design Reviews and Supervision of Works.

Motivation for
High Performance
Achievement and
Attainment of
Quality

Volume 2

Table of Contents

Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms	2
1 Introduction	3
2 General Information	3
3 Categories and Aspects of Evaluation	6
4 Detailed Aspects of Evaluation	8
4.1 Project Scope Management.....	8
4.2 Project Time Management	11
4.3 Project Cost Management	13
4.4 Project Quality Management.....	16
4.5 Project Contract Administration	19
4.6 Project Human Resource Management.....	22
4.7 Project Communications Management	24
4.8 Project Risk Management	25
4.9 Project General Assessment	26
5 Marking and Grading Systems	28
5.1 Marking System	28
6 Grading System	29
7 Consultants Performance Score on Multiple or Multi stage Contracts	30
8 Calculation of Individual Contractors Current Past Performance Rating (PPR).....	30
9 ANNEX A-Design Review and Supervision Services-Detailed Assessment Forms.....	32
10 ANNEX B- Example on Score on Multiple or Multi stage Contracts	0
11 ANEEX C-Other Reporting and Records Forms	1
12 ANNEX D- Referenced Documents.....	0

Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms

CAM	Critical Areas of Measurements
IPCs	Interim Payment Certificate
OAM	Other Areas of Measurements
PPR	Past Performance Rating
RDA	Road Development Agency
SATCC	Southern Africa Transport and Communications Commission
TOR	Terms of Reference

1 Introduction

Background

This document is a motivational tool to be used by the Road Development Agency in order to assess the performance of the Supervising Consultant in relation to his service contract. The tool is expected to be used and read together with the main manual (Consultants' and Contractors' Vendor Rating System, RDA Policy and Procedures' Manual) and may also be read with other volumes; that is, Volume 1-for the Design Consultant or the Engineer and Volume 3 for the Contractors during the assessment period.

This is intended to implement regular Supervising Consultant performance evaluations as a routine component of project management. The performance is defined as how a Supervising Consultant or anyone given the mandate to supervise the works of the client, carries out the obligations of a contract. This includes all requirements stated in the contract scope of work and provisions, adherence to the budget or price and the provision of customer service. The tool kit is intended to help the Agency motivate supervising consultants improve in their quality of delivery. It is a framework for continuous improvement and will provide a consistent method of continuous performance measurement and assessment.

The document provides details on the areas of evaluating the past and current performance of the Supervising Consultant on Design Reviews and Supervision of Works. However, the evaluator can use Volume 1 to carry out a detailed assessment of the design review component. In this case all items concerning design review in volume 2 will be non applicable items rated to zero. In this case, the design review and supervision will be treated as separate projects.

The overall objective of this exercise is to encourage Supervising Consultants to seek continuous improvement in the execution of their services. The evaluation and assessments are expected to be carried out quarterly for ongoing works and a final evaluation done at the end of the contract.

2 General Information

(a) Documentation

The evaluation exercise shall be carried out based on the information gathered during the course of the contract and at the end of a service contract period. The preliminary assessments are expected to be communicated to the Supervising Consultant being assessed. The details on the procedures are set out in the RDA policy and procedures manual on vendor rating. Documentations for evaluation shall include; reports, work plans and schedules, forecasts, invoices, correspondences electronic or non electronic, notes, other stakeholders concerns, minutes, site instructions, site photos and any contract or project related data and physical inspections of works. The information to be used is both hard and soft copies.

(b) Notification

The Supervising Consultant should be made aware of the evaluation process prior to starting. The notice shall be either electronic or by mail. However, the client can conduct the evaluation at its own discretion as all Supervising Consultants are bound for assessment.

(c) Evaluation Process

The evaluation procedures are provided for in the Main Manual- RDA policy and procedures manual on vendor rating. The application must be followed and their required forms must be used. The evaluations shall be carried out through out the term of an on going contract or project and at the end of the contract at any time.

(d) Weighted Scores

The following table 1 indicates weights that have been applied to the various aspects of measurements:

Table 1: Weights on Aspects of Measurements

Area	No.	Aspect of Rating	Weight
Critical Areas of Measurements (80%)	1	Project Scope Management	0.10
	2	Project Time Management	0.10
	3	Project Cost Management	0.10
	4	Project Quality Management	0.30
	5	Project Contract Administration	0.15
	6	Project Human Resource Management	0.05
Sub Total A			0.80
Other Areas of Measurement (20%)	7	Project Communications Management	0.05
	8	Project Risk Management	0.05
	9	Project General Assessment	0.10
Sub Total B			0.20
Total			1.00

(e) Types of Evaluations

The evaluation shall be carried out quarterly for ongoing works and a final evaluation done at the end of the contract. Completed and terminated projects are also bound to evaluations.

Therefore, number of the evaluations shall be detected by the contract/project period. The final evaluation will be carried out when the life of the contract/project ends and there are no possibilities of renewal. Moreover, Special Evaluations may be carried out independently by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit at any time for projects which are experiencing serious performance challenges to guide management make informed decision on the way forward.

(f) Multiple Contracts/Projects or Multi stage contracts

Supervising Consultants with multiple projects will be evaluated on all or any projects and their final performance rating will be the average of the projects rated irrespective of whether the project is design, studies, review or supervision of works. Evaluators should notice that each contract is unique and shall carry out the evaluation impartially and exclusive of other contracts.

(g) Evaluation Process

The details on the procedures and processes to carry out the evaluation are set out in the RDA policy and procedures manual on vendor rating. The evaluation and detailed assessment forms are set out to reflect the true representation of the performance of the Supervising Consultant with regard to his execution of the services.

(h) Responsibilities of the Parties and key Stake Holders to this Tool Kit

The main responsibilities of the key stake holders are set out in the RDA policy and procedures manual on vendor rating. However, the general responsibilities on the evaluation and assessment are;

1. **The Client**-The client will evaluate service contracts under Design Reviews and Supervision of Works in order to enhance and motivate the performance of the consults. The client will also keep records and evidence to support the performance of the Supervising Consultant. The client will through its tender procurement committee apply final penalties for underperformers. The penalties are detailed in the main manual RDA policy and procedures manual on vendor rating.
2. **Client's Evaluators and Assessors**; Are expected to evaluate and assess the Supervising Consultant impartially and professionally. They should carry out the evaluation in an open and transparent way. They are expected to give evidence especially on extreme low performances for the Supervising Consultant. Anything below the satisfactory mark shall be substantiated with evidence.
3. **The Supervising Consultant**-Is expected to cooperate and provide all supportive documents and information required by the client and clients' assessors. The Supervising Consultant is also expected to perform his duties professionally. The Supervising Consultant can also appeal over an assessment and should provide evidence to support the appeal.

3 Categories and Aspects of Evaluation

The Road Development Agency will use nine (9) No. categories or aspects of evaluation to assess the performance of the Supervising Consultant during the contract period. These and the same method will be used to carry out the quarterly, special as well as final assessments. The aspects or categories are as follows;

i. Project Scope Management

This category covers the issues involved in managing the scope of both the service and works contracts following the award of the two (2) contracts. It generally evolves around how the supervising consultant is managing service delivery, seeking performance improvements, and managing changes. The Supervising Consultant is expected to ensure that any changes to the scope are properly guided and carefully managed. The aspects of measurements includes **Design Review, Works Done According to Specifications and within Contract Provisions, Optimisation of Resources, Scope Control on Services and Works.**

ii. Project Time Management

This category covers the issues involved in managing the time in delivering the services in order to ensure that the two contracts for works and services happens on time, with keeping the contracts on schedule. The issues under this aspect includes **Management Schedule Control, Accuracy of Programming Activities, Approval of Updated Programs, Meeting Milestones and Deliverables, Reliability and responsiveness to Client's Direction, Problem identification and Solving within Time.**

iii. Project Cost Management

This category covers the issues involved in managing the costs of the services by keeping the cost within budget through planning and control in order to ensure that the contract is completed within the initial costs or extra costs/charges or variations are minimised and or reasonable. The issues under this aspect includes **Budget Variance-Services, Accuracy of Invoices (Billing), Pricing of Contract Addendum, Cost Efficiency (Use of cost efficient approaches), Accuracy of measurements, Accuracy of Contractors Invoices (IPCs), Variation Control-Works.**

iv. Project Quality Management

This category covers the issues involved in managing the quality of service and product provided in order to assure that the final deliverable is fit for purpose, i.e the deliverables are being used without fail. The issues under this aspect includes **Quality Assurance Plans in the Design, Quality Assurance Certificates, Documents and Certification, quality of reports, additional drawings, recommendations, Innovations and Alternate Options, Adherence to SATCC codes and Standards**

or appropriate standards, Acceptance criteria for all types of works, Acceptance criteria for tests, Appropriate and adequacy of tests on all work items, Appropriate and adequacy tests on all materials, Overall Quality of Services and works.

v. Project Contract Administration

Although generally the whole document is about project and contract administration and management, this category is general in nature. The issues under this aspect include, **Understanding the elements of contract administration, Contract Maintenance, Change Control, Asset Management – (Availability & Reliability), Checking Compliance Documents and Management of Subcontractors/Consultants.**

vi. Project Human Resource Management

This category covers the issues involved in managing the people involved in the project in order to bring out the best out of them. This involves how best the personnel resources are managed by the Supervising Consultant on the project. The issues under this aspect includes **Client Relations, Drive and Determination, Personnel Resource Management, Personal Effectiveness, Technical Competence, Availability of Approved Staff or Original Staff on the Project, Employment and Support to Locals.**

vii. Project Communications Management

This category covers the issues involved in managing communication between parties and other stakeholders. It is about identifying who needs what information, how it is to be communicated and when they need to have it in ensuring that the right people get the right information for proper decision making. The issues under this aspect includes **Keeping RDA up to date, Accuracy of Communication, Meetings, Response to Instructions, Understanding of the Project, and Knowledge of RDA procedures.**

viii. Project Risk Management

This category covers the issues involved in identifying and evaluating risks, planning responses and ensuring that the plans translate into action if the risks crystallize. The issues under this aspect includes **Risk Identification, Risk Management Plan, Risk Monitoring and Control**

ix. Project General Assessment

This category covers the issues which are of a general nature some not directly related to the scope of the project but affects the performance of the project while others are related to the execution of the project. The issues under this aspect includes **Problem**

Resolution and Customer Satisfaction, Appreciation of Government Requirements and Procedures/Local laws/ Standards, Public relations/Corporate Social Responsibility, Stakeholders Relations, Tendering Assessments, Integrity and Ethical Conduct of Supervising Consultant and Supervising Consultants' Personnel, and Value for Money.

4 Detailed Aspects of Evaluation

The Road Development Agency will use the detailed aspects of evaluation below as detailed in the specific areas of assessment, evaluation and monitoring forms. Each aspect has a maximum score of five (5) and the details of scoring are given in section 4 below and on the vendor rating matrix in **ANNEX A**. These aspects of measurement have been identified to measure and manage the performance of the Supervising Consultants. They are described to capture the entire contributions of the Supervising Consultant in relation to his performance of duties and the execution of the works contracts. In assessing the Supervising Consultant, the evaluator is expected to answer the questions set out in the detailed aspects of measurement. These detailed aspects of measurements should be graded according to the evaluator/assessors' judgement and observations on the performance of the Supervising Consultant.

4.1 Project Scope Management

(a) Design Reviews

- Did the Supervising Consultant well understood the required delivery on this aspect, and are all the reviews within the TOR and adequate? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultants collect and review all relevant additional existing data relating to the Project and was the information well interpreted and presented to further benefit the optimal out put of the project? **YES / NO**
- Has the Supervising Consultant conducted comprehensive research and has he taken due account of the information available information collected, analysed and recommended appropriately? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant shown proper judgement and constructive thought in putting forward the final recommendations? **YES / NO**
- Has the merits and usefulness of the final recommendations weighed favourably against its costs and benefits? **YES / NO**
- Has the methodology adopted by the Supervising Consultant been comprehensive, creative and imaginative in checking design solutions? **YES / NO**

- Has the design solutions complied with the relevant statutory requirements?
YES / NO

(b) Works Done According to Specifications and within Contract Provisions,

- Were the works done and supervised according to contract provisions or as contained in the SATCC Code of Practice? Or has any other criteria acceptable as best practices used? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant adequately fulfilled his role as the Engineer and ensured that the contractor delivered their work according to the contract terms? **YES / NO**
- Are the Supervising Consultant's reviewed design solutions workable, applicable and usable? Did the outputs achieve technical compliance with the contract objectives as per the specifications? **YES / NO**
- Did the client make full use of the reviewed design solutions on both the geometric and pavement design without any problems? Was the product performance relative to the specified parameters exceptionally good? **YES / NO**
- Did the supervising contractors' reviewed design solutions include priced designed options and drawings? **YES / NO**
- Has the Supervising Consultant taken care of various impacts including safety, drainage and traffic management in the reviewed design? **YES / NO**

(c) Optimisation of Resources

- Did the Supervising Consultant present the justification for undertaking the relevant works in great detail? Are the project realisation well articulated?
YES / NO
- Has the analysis provided the cost benefit ratios and returns in detail? **YES / NO**
- Was sensitivity analysis carried out in detail? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant familiar with social and economic background of the situation? **YES / NO**
- Has the Supervising Consultant drawn the client's attention to relevant new tests for the works? **YES / NO**

(d) Scope Control on Services and Works

- Were all the solutions within the scope? **YES / NO**
- if any changes, was there a process followed and approved by the Agency? **YES / NO**
- Were the changes reasonable and justifiable for both works and services? **YES / NO**
- Have the requirements in the design brief been met? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant analyse the impacts of any scope changes and were they well controlled? **YES / NO**
- Were the requested changes thoroughly reviewed against the product scope before passing onto to the next process? **YES / NO**

(e) Environmental issues (e.g on design review)

- Did the Consultant adequately review the baseline conditions of the receiving environment during the design review in relation to the main project activities that will be undertaken during site preparation and construction? **YES / NO**
- Did the Consultant review the anticipated socio-economic impacts of the project and the number of people that the project will resettle/displace or employ, directly, during site preparation and construction? **YES / NO**
- Did the Consultant review and provide details of the expected environmental impacts of the project on the bio-physical resources that may be affected through time and space? **YES / NO**
- Did the Consultant ensure that project activities were implemented in conformity with the country's environmental laws and international environmental best practices? **YES / NO**
- Did the Consultant provide- adequate mitigation measures to address any negative impacts based on the design review? **YES / NO**
- Did the Consultant provide environmentally friendly options as part of the mitigation measures based on the design review? **YES / NO**
- Did the Consultant ensure that the environmental management plan was fully implemented during the lifespan of the project? **YES / NO**

- Did the Consultant show proactiveness in ensuring that all environmental issues were addressed on the project? **YES / NO**

4.2 Project Time Management

(a) Management Schedule Control

- Were deliverables being met continuously on revised dates? (Deliverables in respect include reports, plans and other submissions which are subjects of the project) **YES / NO**
- Was the final output delivered on time; without being adversely delayed against the approved program or Supervising Consultants' program? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant continuously advising the contractor to deliver on time? **YES / NO**
- Was the average delivery time comparable to other Supervising Consultants in terms of time acceptable? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant adhering to the planned schedule on all activities? **YES / NO**

(b) Accuracy of Programming Activities

- Was consultant working together with the contractor to ensure minimal re-working of the works activities or outputs thereby enhancing impacts on the overall performance of the project? **YES / NO**
- Were there minimal defects on the overall output (Design review) resulting in negligible re-working on it or double handling of activities by the supervising consultant? **YES / NO**
- Has the Supervising Consultant learnt from instances of re-working and amendments made as a lesson? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant working on the spot by ensuring that the contractor does the works without double handlings? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant predicting time well in advance to minimise unnecessary losses for both works and services? **YES / NO**

(c) Approvals of Updated Programs

- Were the activities well defined and sequenced and was the estimated time for each activity reasonable and attainable? **YES / NO**

- Was the Supervising Consultant ensuring that the contractor was adhering to the planned schedule on all activities? **YES / NO**
- Was there any controls used to bring the delayed activities within the time frame? **YES / NO**
- Were the activities revised in the bar charts frequently? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant giving timely reminders to the contractor on any lapse of the program? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant apply required penalties on time in relation to the contractor's default on the delivery of the project in accordance with the contract provisions? **YES / NO**

(d) Meeting Milestones and Deliverables

- Was the Supervising Consultant meeting all the scheduled milestones in advance, meeting date for deliverables and meetings and overcoming significant obstacles, resulting in additional benefits to the Agency? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant delivering any additional work from the client on time without any unnecessary additional delays? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant re-scheduling the additional time accurately and no multiple extensions to the contract? **YES / NO**

(e) Reliability and responsiveness to Client's Direction

- Are the Supervising Consultants programming activities reliable and were they predictable? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant responsive to technical directions such as instructions/tasks? **YES / NO**
- When comments have been made by the Client on the draft reports or any other technical documentations, did the Supervising Consultant take into account the comments in the proceeding revised reports or documentations? **YES / NO**

(f) Problem identification and Solving within Time

- Was the Supervising Consultant demonstrating capabilities in problem identification so as to minimise them from happening? **YES / NO**

- Was the Supervising Consultant leading promptly by putting forward effective solutions in cases where problems had arisen? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant proactively resolving all significant obstacles resulting in additional benefits to the Agency? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultant providing right recommendations or solutions to the identified problems, and were they communicated to the Agency in an effective manner? **YES / NO**

4.3 Project Cost Management

(a) Budget Variance-Services

- Was the Supervising Consultant predicting any cost variances or additional cost on time? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultant give the Agency advice and recommendations on time? **YES / NO**
- Was the final estimated cost of works within the final invoice; was the final assessment within the budget? **YES / NO**

(b) Accuracy of Invoices

- Were the Supervising Consultants monthly invoices accurately presented without any unnecessary additions/omissions resulting in non-processing by the client or delays in processing by the client due to the need for corrections? **YES / NO**
- Were the Supervising Consultant's monthly invoices and forecasts/cash flows reliable and regularly revised and were they made on time? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultants' invoices well backed up with supporting documents such as measurements sheets, time sheets, receipts? **YES / NO**

(c) Pricing of Contract Addendum (Works & Services)

- Were all additional costs reasonable and acceptable to the client? **YES / NO**
- Were the Supervising Consultant's rates not unnecessarily unjustifiable? **YES / NO**
- Were all the requirements for variations or additional works submitted in complete form, accurate and submitted within the required time frame to allow adequate decision making by the client? **YES / NO**

- Did the consultant carry out any valuation of the any variation and claims and updated the client within a reasonable time? **YES / NO**
- Were the claims reasonable and justifiable? **YES / NO**

(d) Cost Efficiency and effectiveness

- Was the Supervising Consultant efficient on cost control; was the output comparable to the cost involved? **YES / NO**
- Were the contingencies for works and services used efficiently and effectively adding value to the project? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultant consider adequately the design options and selected a cost effective design (for any new works) that could be achieved under prevailing constraints such as political, traffic, program and time frame? **YES / NO**
- Was the Supervising Consultants payment records well kept and are components of payments accurate and well documented? **YES / NO**
- Was the selected design option significantly adding value to the project? **YES / NO**
- Were the final preparation of financial reports including final accounts for payment within the agreed time scales and accurate? **YES / NO**
- Are the recommendations and project outputs made with regard to the total cost over the project life minimise operational and maintenance costs? **YES / NO**

(e) Accuracy of Measurements

- Has the consultant been accurate and exercising financial controls over measurement and expenditures? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant been forecasting forth coming expenditures and kept the client aware of the financial position of the contracts, including likely costs of major variations? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant been making the client aware of any possible bankruptcy of the contractors and has he made any effort to minimise any adverse effects on the project? **YES / NO**
- Has all measurements input in the IPCs been accurately provided with clarity on both vertical and horizontal positions? **YES / NO**

(f) Accuracy of contractor's Invoices (IPCs).

- Has the consultant been accurate/realistic and expeditious in the certification of interim certificates? **YES / NO**
- Were the final preparation of financial reports including final accounts for works payment within the agreed time scales and accurate? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant kept the client aware of any claims from the contractor and any extensions of time with costs? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant dealt with the contractor's claims thoroughly, promptly and fairly/impartially taking into account the clients' position and all relevant circumstances? **YES / NO**
- Were the provided invoices clear, adequate and free from error, minimising the issues of re-preparations? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant applying all deductibles, penalties (Advance payments) on time and in accordance with the contract documents? **YES / NO**

(g) Variation Control-Works.

- Has all the risks in cost estimation during design review been accessed and risk levels assumed and are they reasonable? **YES / NO**
- Are the estimates methods used standard; and are they clear, accurate and reliable? **YES / NO**
- Are the cost estimates and variations prepared in an appropriate format? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant taken substantiated efforts to evaluate variations, giving justifiable reasons for them? **YES / NO**
- Were the Supervising Consultant's estimated costs for the works accurately predictable as compared to market forces? **YES / NO**
- Were the estimates reliable for planning purposes? **YES / NO**
- Were estimates updated and comprehensive? **YES / NO**
- Were the estimates examined sufficiently with other estimates or compared with others from similar representative projects? **YES / NO**

4.4 Project Quality Management

(a) Quality Assurance Plans in the Design

- Did the Supervising Consultant clearly identify the quality standards relevant to the project? **YES / NO**
- Was there a quality assurance plan on the project, was consultant ensuring that it was being strictly followed and implemented? **YES / NO**
- Were the Consultant's and contractor's assurance plans specific to the project deliverables and was it helpful in achieving the required quality standards? **YES / NO**
- Was there any method of identifying, reporting and tracking non-conformances and were the Supervising Consultant's employees encouraged to contribute to quality? **YES / NO**
- Was there any formal process for communicating quality requirements and feedbacks internally and with other stakeholders? **YES / NO**

(b) Quality Assurance Certificates, Documents and Certification

- Was there an internal quality assurance system within the Supervising Consultant's personnel? **YES / NO**
- Was the quality assurance system implemented through the use of quality assurance certificates signed at each work stage by various personnel? **YES / NO**
- Were the internal quality assurance certificates (such as checklists) authenticated by the appropriate staff and approved timely and accordingly? **YES / NO**
- Were they used at every stage of checking and approval externally by the Supervising Consultant and contractor and were all certificates accompanied and attached at every stage for approvals? **YES / NO**
- Was the final product submitted together with the Supervising Consultants' internal quality assurance certificates so as to assure quality for the works? **YES / NO**
- Were there any periodic reviews within the consultant's workers or in conjunction with the contractor to assess effectiveness of the quality system? **YES / NO**

- Has the consultant properly kept all site and work records appropriately and in good condition? **YES / NO**

(c) Quality of reports, additional drawings, recommendations

- Was the general service and help rendered to the client of acceptable quality? **YES / NO**
- Has the Supervising Consultant presented his facts clearly, concisely, convincingly and with sufficient details to support his recommendations? **YES / NO**
- Are the drawings, plans and figures presented legible and appealing to the readers? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultant review different packaging of the contracts and types of contract for the project; and was the selected one most suitable for the project? **YES / NO**
- Are the recommended contracts documents complete and adequate for the needs for the contractor, were the bidding documents complete and used without delays and or unnecessary clarifications? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultant incorporate all the latest amendments such as new materials and testing specifications in the contract documents? **YES / NO**
- Are the incorporated specifications acceptable and standard to the requirements of the client? **YES / NO**

(d) Innovations and Alternate Options

- Has the Supervising Consultant exhibited any technical excellence through other unique activities or recommendations or solutions to the successful performance of the contract? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant exhibited any use of and or made any recommendations for the use of recycled or existing materials or any methods unique but applicable with value addition to the product deliverables? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant provide innovative alternative design solutions which is cost effective and acceptable by the client? **YES / NO**

(e) Adherence to SATCC design codes and Standards or appropriate standards

- Were works reviewed and/or re-designed according to and accepted to standards or best practices? **YES / NO**

- Were the consultant's decisions and recommendations generally in accordance with the SATCC standard codes of practice? **YES / NO**
- Were the contractor's quality assurances documents approved and were they in accordance with SATCC or specific to the project? **YES / NO**
- Are the incorporated specifications acceptable and are of standard to the requirements of the client? **YES / NO**

(f) Acceptance criteria for all types of works

- Was there any acceptance criteria made to accept all work items in accordance with SATCC or other best practices? **YES / NO**
- Was the acceptance criteria adequately used to accept all work items such as subgrade, subbase, base and surfacing, concrete works? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant approve all work methods for various work types? **YES / NO**

(g) Acceptance criteria for tests

- Was there any acceptance criteria made to accept all tests in accordance with SATCC or other best practices? **YES / NO**
- Was the acceptance criteria adequately used to accept or tests such on materials? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant apply payment reduction factors appropriately on non compliant items? **YES / NO**

(h) Appropriate and adequacy of tests on all work items

- Were all appropriate tests carried out on work items? **YES / NO**
- Were all tests on work items carried out in accordance with SATCC or other best practices? **YES / NO**
- Were all the tests carried out on work items adequate and in accordance with SATCC or other best practices? **YES / NO**

(i) Appropriate and adequacy tests on all materials

- Were all appropriate tests carried out on materials? **YES / NO**
- Were all tests carried out on materials appropriate and in accordance with SATCC or other best practices? **YES / NO**

- Were all the tests carried out on materials adequate and in accordance with SATCC or other best practices? **YES / NO**

(j) Overall Quality of Services and Works.

- Was the overall quality of the product compliant with the quality plans, agreement documents, TORs, and in conformity with best practices and other standards? **YES / NO**
- Was the overall quality of the reviewed product acceptable and usable upon completion and handover of works without adverse costs to the client or material delays, was it reliable and durable? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultant achieve the desired outcomes with a minimum of avoidable errors and requirements? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultants carry out and supervise the works within the actual budget during implementation, that is, within 25% plus or minus acceptable values? **YES / NO**
- Did the supervising contractor's reviewed estimates or any estimates without adverse underestimations or overestimation, that is, within 25% plus or minus acceptable values? **YES / NO**
- Were the contract documents/drawings clear and free from errors without any outdated Standards and did he incorporate in the contract documents all the latest statutory regulations and laws? **YES / NO**
- Were all the submissions documents/drawings prepared concisely, comprehensively and complete with all the required information such as calculations, levels, applications for modifications and all final drawings and Supervising Consultants' internal control systems properly signed? **YES / NO**
- Was the general output and outlook of the services and works acceptable, was the workmanship generally acceptable? **YES / NO**

4.5 Project Contract Administration

(a) Understanding the elements of contract administration:

- Did the consultant ensure that the contractor's implementation of procedures is well defined? **YES / NO**
- Were the consultant's internal administrative and clerical functions smooth for the betterment of the contract? **YES / NO**

- Did the consultant have adequate understanding of the contract and conditions and were they well presented and interpreted? **YES / NO**

(b) Contract Maintenance:

- Was the consultant updating the contract documentation adequately as changes occurred? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant align and bring the contract document (identifying all relevant documentation including contract clauses) itself to an efficient and effective document, through formal change control procedures and by mutual consent, in response to changing requirements? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant keen in maintaining the contract by bring and amicably resolving any arguments to the beneficial of all parties? **YES / NO**
- Were appropriate authorities obtained and were any change control procedures followed, ensuring no changes were made without appropriate authorisation? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant recording the status of documents (current/historic, draft/final) and ensuring consistency across documents and records? **YES / NO**

(c) Change Control:

- Were the changes to services, procedures or contracts had a positive effect on service? **YES / NO**
- Did the delivery, on performance and costs and represented value for money? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant follow a change control procedures by requesting for changes? **YES / NO**
- Was there any assessment of impacts considered? **YES / NO**
- Was any prioritisation and authorization considered? **YES / NO**
- Was there any agreement with the client with regards to any control of implementation, documentation of change assessments and orders? **YES / NO**

(d) Asset Management – (Availability & Reliability)

- Did the consultant ensure that there were updated asset registers? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant ensure there was adequate control of asset movements on the project? **YES / NO**
- Was there any efforts carried out to optimize the output from the available assets? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant recording any third party use of assets e.g. If the contractor was able to deliver services to other customers? **YES / NO**
- Was there any effort carried to upgrade and replace any fault assets, were they well planned? **YES / NO**
- Was there any regular liaison with the contractor on administration, upkeep and maintenance of assets? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant take care of any assets to be delivered to client and were they properly delivered and handed over in good condition? **YES / NO**
- Was there any effort taken by the consultant to ensure reliable and efficient assets are available on site in accordance with the works contract? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant make any effort to ensure timely available of the contractors assets? **YES / NO**

(e) Checking Compliance Documents

- Was there any effort carried out to check the compliance security documents-Bonds? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant carry out any effort to ensure the contractor supply the securities within time which were not delivered? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant apply any applicable conditions for defaulting contractor in relation to the securities? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant make any effort to ensure timely insurance of assets/works and other items on the project? **YES / NO**

(f) Management of Subcontractors/Consultants

- Has the consultant managed the subcontractors well without due interference on the work of the subcontractors? **YES / NO**

- Has the consultant given the client adequate information in relation to the behaviour and works done by the subcontractors? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant coordinated the activities of sub consultants effectively? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant responded promptly and efficiently to any complaints from the client relating to sub-consultants? **YES / NO**

4.6 Project Human Resource Management

(g) Client Relations

- Was the consultant/client relationship during execution of the contract formally interactive and professional? **YES / NO**
- Were the consultant and his personnel cooperative with the client and other stakeholders (contractor) in responding to client's concerns involving the assignment? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant not engage in any unnecessary arguments with the client or clients' representatives resulting in any adverse negative impacts on the project such as delays in flow of information and project delivery? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant's claim attitude been reasonable? **YES / NO**

(h) Drive and Determination

- Did the Supervising Consultant show any drive and determination to complete the contract within time and according to specifications? **YES / NO**
- Did the Supervising Consultant's personnel had the zeal and drive to move the project forward for the benefit of the client? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant's personnel show interest in their work attitude to optimally achieve the project goals? **YES / NO**
- Did the supervising consultant show any determination in bringing any matters affecting or expected to affect the project to the attention of the contractor? **YES / NO**

(i) Personnel Resource Management

- Was there an effective and efficient project organisation structure and project team on the project? **YES / NO**
- Was the project team adequately managed? **YES / NO**

- Was there any leadership demonstrated by the project teams' top personnel in coordinating and managing all project areas, overcoming significant obstacles without much assistance from the client? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant arranging and organising his work force timely on the project and in accordance with the approved schedules? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant acquiring staff timely and was there a criteria for releasing staff from the project without affecting project deliverables.? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant ensuring that the contractor's personnel are available on site? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant effective in managing the contractors' personnel in terms of timely approvals and checking their compliance to needs? **YES / NO**

(j) Personal Effectiveness, Technical Competence

- Were the consultant's personnel technically qualified, were they competent in the delivery of the service? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant's and support staff personnel adequate and effective on the requirements of the client? **YES / NO**
- Was the right personnel applied at the right time to undertake a specified assignment? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant's personnel fully understand the project requirements and applied themselves well in delivering the product, proactively overcoming all obstacles and challenges within their control? **YES / NO**
- Did they apply the available latest resources and technology efficiently and consistently? **YES / NO**

(k) Availability of Approved Staff or Original Staff on the Project

- Did the consultant provide and maintain the original and or approved personnel from the staff? **YES / NO**
- Was there any consultants personnel represented on multiple projects? **YES / NO**
- Were the consultant's personnel physically available on the assignment through random checks? **YES / NO**
- did the consultant's personnel actively devote the necessary time and effort to the assignment? **YES / NO**

- Were any changes made to the personnel and were they made with the full knowledge and approval of the client? **YES / NO**

(l) Employment and Support to Locals

- Was the consultant's work force well represented by the local personnel according to accordingly? **YES / NO**
- Is the staff on the consultant team knowledgeable or respectful of the local conditions and customs **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant's work force gender sensitive; was there adequate female representation on the consultant's project team in accordance with government policies and guidelines? **YES / NO**

4.7 Project Communications Management

(a) Keeping RDA up to date

- Was the consultant actively, continually and timely keeping the Agency updated on the project and on any other factors that would have adversely affected the delivery of the project outputs? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant proactively communicating all information /data to the other team members and stake holders? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant cooperative and was he showing any proactive behaviour with the Client and Technical Representatives? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant approachable, helpful and ready to consult frequently with the client department? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant well represent the client on claims? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant flexible to enquires? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant approachable to enquires and any matters that are not directly related to the project, did he provide or respond to RDA inquiries promptly within tight timelines and where all responses clear and complete? **YES / NO**

(b) Accuracy of Communication

- Did the consultant make any follows up well in advance? **YES / NO**

- Was the consultant's information accurate and clear to the requirements? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant's form of communication well coordinated making decision making faster and easier? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant appropriately incorporate all recommendations and feedbacks from the client and any other project stakeholders on matters relating to the project? **YES / NO**

(c) Meetings, Response to Instructions

- Did the consultant and his project team provide responses to orders and or/change request submissions provided in a timely manner with appropriate level of detail and justification which were accepted as presented? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant conduct all meetings effectively and efficiently and had accurately presented and prepared all the minutes? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant respond to client's instructions on time? **YES / NO**

(d) Understanding of the Project/RDA procedures

- Did the consultant generally understand the project deliverables, scope, quality requirements and final product to the satisfaction of the client? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant understand all regional conditions and matters that can affect the delivery of the project? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant demonstrate extensive knowledge of all applicable RDA guidelines? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant demonstrate knowledge on RDA procedures, including Regional practices to all and any matters relating to the project? **YES / NO**

4.8 Project Risk Management

(a) Risk Identification

- Did the consultant identify any risks timely? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant apply foresight and thorough investigation and analysis when doing risk identification? **YES / NO**
- Was the risk identified appropriate and quantifiable? **YES / NO**

(b) Risk Management Plan

- Was there a risk management plan? **YES / NO**

- Has the risk management plan include a fall back plan to mitigate the anticipated risks? **YES / NO**
- Was the risk management plan effectively and efficiently applied? **YES / NO**
- Were the risks and all issues analysed thoroughly well in advance, overcoming unforeseen obstacles? **YES / NO**

(c) Risk Monitoring and Control

- Was consultant managing and controlling any risks that had arisen on the project? **YES / NO**
- Were risks brought within control without them affecting the costs, quality, and scope and time delivery of the project? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant understand all risks identified, were they registered, did the consultant do the right thing? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant apply the right techniques in controlling any risks on the project? **YES / NO**

4.9 Project General Assessment

(a) Problem Resolution and Customer Satisfaction

- Was the consultant taking the lead promptly in putting forward effective solutions in cases of problems? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant effective in solving problems? **YES / NO**
- Were the consultant solutions to problems effective and final without any complaints from affected stakeholders? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant resolving minor problems with minimal input from the client? **YES / NO**
- Were the general public generally satisfied with the performance of the consultant, consultant's work and personnel? **YES / NO**

(b) Appreciation of Government Requirements and Procedures/Local laws/Standards

- Was the consultant familiar with government requirements? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant adhering to latest policies, procedures and other legal and technical documentations? **YES / NO**

- Was the consultant familiar with local laws/custom laws and adhered to them in the execution of the project? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant active in notifying the client timely on any impediments regarding local rules and customs and the effects they may have on the project? **YES / NO**

(c) Public relations/Corporate Social Responsibility

- Was the consultant providing appropriate adequate material presentation and appropriate staff to attend meetings with other stakeholders? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant approachable to other stakeholders, was he liaising well with relevant public bodies, the community and community organisations and the general public? **YES / NO**
- Was the consultant generous to the community through his professional contributions? **YES / NO**

(d) Stakeholders Relations, Tendering Assessments

- Was the consultant's relation with other stakeholders appropriate and were there any conflicts between the consultant public bodies, the community and community organisations and the general public? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant provide adequate technical support in the tendering process to the client, facilitating the process adequately effectively and efficiently? **YES / NO**
- Did the consultant raise all important issues and other factors for consideration in the tender assessment? **YES / NO**
- Where the consultant's recommendations made to the client sound and without any legal implications? **YES / NO**

(e) Integrity and Ethical Conduct of Consultant and Consultants' Personnel

- Was the consultant and his personnel's integrity acceptable and within code of ethics applicable to local regulations and other bodies' requirements? **YES / NO**
- Has the consultant put in place a well documented code of practice or ethics for his staff? **YES / NO**
- Was there any conflict of interests in the execution of his assignment? **YES / NO**

- Was the consultant or his personnel involved or reported to be engaged in malpractices or corrupt practices in the execution of their assignment? **YES / NO**

(f) Value for Money.

- Was the consultant's overall output comparable to the cost of the project acceptable? **YES / NO**
- Was there any improvement on the cost of the project through quality delivery and timely delivery of the project? **YES / NO**
- Are the services rendered by the consultant able to stand the test of time? **YES / NO**
- Are the services rendered appreciated by key stakeholders of the project? **YES / NO**

5 Marking and Grading Systems

5.1 Marking System

- (1) The areas of performance measurement identified for both consultancy services and works contracts have been categorized into two: that is, Critical Areas of Measures (CAM) and Other Areas of Measures (OAM). The CAM will carry a weighted score of 70 to 80 percent while the OAM will carry 20 to 30 percent for both the consultancy services and works contracts. The maximum scores and scores are reduced to 100% by application of weights and weight factors. The factors are a divisible of the weights by the respective scores and then multiplied by multiplied by 100. These obtained factors are multiplied by the scores to finally reduce the scores to 100% which is the highest obtainable value in the assessment. With this, the Supervising Consultant and contractors performance are measured from 100%. The maximum scores and scores in the respective detailed assessment forms are not and will not necessarily add to 100 as they depend on the number of available detailed CAM.
- (2) The scoring system used for each aspects under areas of measures is a 5 grade system as stipulated below:
 - 5 – **Very Good** for aspects rated *totally satisfactory* by the evaluator,
 - 4 – **Good** for aspects rated *highly satisfactory* by the evaluator,

- 3 – **Satisfactory** for aspects rated *satisfactory* by the evaluator,
 - 2 – **Poor** for aspects rated *unsatisfactory* by the evaluator,
 - 1 – **Very Poor** for aspects rated very *unsatisfactory* by the evaluator.
- (3) Furthermore, 0 denotes **Not Applicable**. The minimum **acceptance performance** score for both consultancy services and works contracts is 60%. The score below 40%, Supervising Consultant or contractor should be declared technically incompetent, and the implications of such a performance rating are clearly dealt with in section 4 of the RDA policy and procedures manual.
- (4) The evaluator is expected to mark an appropriate box of performance (i.e VG,G,S,P,VP) for each applicable item with “X”. If an item is not applicable, put “X” in the NA column. The scoring is purely the evaluator’s decision and observation.

The scoring schedule is as shown in the table below;

Table 2: Schedule of Scores

Score	Definition	Score Description	Abbreviation
5	Very Good	All aspects have been met and completed to entire satisfaction and the Assessors is <u>totally satisfied.</u>	VG
4	Good	Most aspects have been met to entire satisfaction, but some aspects were only nearly satisfactory. The assessor is <u>highly satisfied.</u>	G
3	Satisfied	A few aspects have been met to satisfaction, but some aspects were only nearly satisfactory and some unsatisfactory. The assessor is <u>just satisfied.</u>	S
2	Poor	Most aspects have not been met to satisfaction. But one or two were just satisfactory. The assessor is <u>slightly dissatisfied.</u>	P
1	Very Poor	All aspects have not been met to satisfaction. The assessor is <u>totally dissatisfied.</u>	VP
0	Not Applicable	The aspects are not expected to be expedited by the Supervising Consultant. The assessor cannot assess this aspect.	NA

6 Grading System

1. Once the Supervising Consultant or contractor’s marks are entered into the excel program, then they are graded as shown in the table below:

The details of the Performance scoring are shown in **ANNEX A**.

Table 3: Schedule of Grading

Performance Score range %	Description of Grade Obtained	Recommended Actions / Comments
>89%	Totally Satisfactory Performance	Acceptable
80%-89%	Highly Satisfactory Performance	Acceptable
60%>79%	Acceptable Satisfactory Performance	Acceptable
40>59%	Slightly Poor Performance	Warning Letters
<40%	Very Poor Performance-Technically Incompetent	Exclusion from Future tenders

2. As shown above, performances of 60% and above are accepted and however, have no remunerations as Contractors and Consultants have an obligation to provide the services at 100%. A slightly Poor performance Grade will attract warning letters and penalties will be applied in accordance with the guidelines in the main manual.
3. A grade of less than 40% is technically incompetent and the actions or recommendations should be that the Supervising Consultant or contractor be excluded for future procurements with the Agency for a year.
4. Underperformances and low marks from the Supervising Consultant or contractor are expected to be substantiated with evidence and or proof for records.

7 Consultants Performance Score on Multiple or Multi stage Contracts

In cases were a Consultant has more than one project or his project involves multiple stages such as design and supervision, the services shall be treated as one project and assessed separately. However, the Contractor's performance score shall be adjusted according to percent progress contributed by each project at each stage. The percent progress shall be the physical progress or time progress or financial progress whichever produces the lowest performance score value. The last two can only be used where it is difficult to calculate the physical progress. However, the rule of averages may apply. An example is given in **ANNEX B**.

8 Calculation of Individual Contractors Current Past Performance Rating (PPR)

The contractor's Past Performance Rating shall be calculated on a three year projects period for those who have been in business with the client for the more than three years after effectuation of the vendor rating system. This will be from the latest project with the client. The following factors shall apply for subsequent years as shown in the table below:

Table 4: Schedule of Factors for various Years

Grading -Years in Business with client	Factor			
	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4
Years				
1	1	0	0	0
2	0.6	0.4	0	0
3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0
above 3	0.5	0.3	0.2	0

Example of calculation:

From the table above , it implies that if a contractor has the factored scores in Y1 (2009);68, Y2 (2007);72, Y3 (1976);45 and Y4(1977)55, then his PRR is calculated as $0.5*68+0.3*72+0.2*45=64.6$

Y1 stands for latest/current year of projects

Y2 stands for second latest/current year of the projects

Y3 stands for the third year or third last year of the project

9 ANNEX A-Design Review and Supervision Services-Detailed Assessment Forms

Summary Consultant's Performance Report-Supervision

Part I

Summary of Performance

1 Department/office

Stage Period

Consultant's % Score

20%

Performance Rating

Technically Incompetent

Date & Signature

2 Remarks by Reporting officer at a rank of Principal Engineer

3 If the performance of the consultant in any respect is poor or very poor, indicate actions taken to draw the consultant's attention to their performance and the consultant's responses

Date & Signature

4 Counter Signing by (SMR/Head of Department/Unit) and any remarks

Date & Signature

5 Supplementary if any-Vendor Rating review Committee Chairperson

CONSUTANCY SERVICES	
DESIGN REVIEW & SUPERVISION	
Name of the Firm	
Project/Contract Name	
Date of Assessment	
Assessed by	Road Development Agency- Monitoring & Evaluation Unit
Scope of Works	
Checked by	
Approved by	

3.0	Project Cost Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
3.1	Budget Variance - Services					X		5.00	1	1
3.2	Accuracy of invoices (Billing)					X		5.00	1	1
3.3	Pricing of Contract addendum					X		5.00	1	1
3.4	Cost Efficiency (Use of Cost efficient approaches)					X		5.00	1	1
3.5	Accuracy of Measurements					X		5.00	1	1
3.6	Accuracy of Contractors Invoices (IPCs)					X		5.00	1	1
3.7	Variation Control-Works					X		5.00	1	1
Sub Total 3								35.00	7.00	7.00

4.0	Project Quality Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
4.1	Quality Assurance Plans in the design					X		5.00	1	1
4.2	Quality Assurance certificates, documents and certification					X		5.00	1	1
4.3	Quality of Reports, additional drawings, recommendations.					X		5.00	1	1
4.4	Inovations, alternate options.					X		5.00	1	1
4.5	Adherance to SATCC codes and standards or Appropriate Standards.					X		5.00	1	1
4.6	Acceptance criteria for all types of works					X		5.00	1	1
4.7	Acceptance Criteria for tests					X		5.00	1	1
4.8	Appropriate and Adequate tests on all work items					X		5.00	1	1
4.9	Appropriate and Adequate tests on all material items					X		5.00	1	1
4.1	Overall Quality of Services and Works					X		5.00	1	1
Sub Total 4								50.00	10.00	10.00

5.0 Project Contract Administration											
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score	
5.1	Understanding Elements of contract administration					X		5.00	1	1	
5.2	Contract Maintenance					X		5.00	1	1	
5.3	Change Control					X		5.00	1	1	
5.4	Asset Management - availability and reliability					X		5.00	1	1	
5.5	Checking Compliance Documents					X		5.00	1	1	
5.6	Management of Subcontractors/Consultants					X		5.00	1	1	
Sub Total 5								30.00	6.00	6.00	
6.0 Project Human Resource Management											
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score	
6.1	Client Relations					X		5.00	1	1	
6.2	Drive and Determination					X		5.00	1	1	
6.3	Personnel Resource Management					X		5.00	1	1	
6.4	Personnel Effectiveness & Technical Competence					X		5.00	1	1	
6.5	Technical Competence					X		5.00	1	1	
6.6	Availability of approved or original personel on the project					X		5.00	1	1	
6.7	Employment and Support to locals					X		5.00	1	1	
Sub Total 6								35.00	7.00	7.00	

7.0	Project Communications Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
7.1	Keeping RDA Up to date-Inquiries					X		5.00	1	1
7.2	Accuracy of Communication					X		5.00	1	1
7.3	Meetings					X		5.00	1	1
7.4	Response to Instructions/RDA Inquires					X		5.00	1	1
7.5	Understanding of Project					X		5.00	1	1
Sub Total 7								25.00	5.00	5.00
8.0	Project Risk Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
8.1	Risk Identification					X		5.00	1	1
8.2	Risk Management Plan					X		5.00	1	1
8.3	Risk and Monitoring Control					X		5.00	1	1
Sub Total 8								15.00	3.00	3.00

9.0	Project General Assesment									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
9.1	Problem resolution and customer satisfaction					X		5.00	1	1
9.2	Appreciation of Government requirements and procedures, local laws, standards					X		5.00	1	1
9.3	Public Relations / Corporate Social Responsibility					X		5.00	1	1
9.4	Stakeholders Relations					X		5.00	1	1
9.5	Tendering Processes					X		5.00	1	1
9.6	Integrity and ethical conduct of consultant and Consultants personel					X		5.00	1	1
9.7	Value for money					X		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 9							35.00	7.00	7.00

Summary Design Review and Supervision

		Aspect of Rating	Max Score	Score	Weight	Factors	Max Applicable Score	Weighted Score
Critical Areas of Measure (80%)	1	Project Scope Management	25.00	5.00	0.10	0.40	10.00	2.00
	2	Project Time Management	30.00	6.00	0.10	0.33	10.00	2.00
	3	Project Cost Management	35.00	7.00	0.10	0.29	10.00	2.00
	4	Project Quality Management	50.00	10.00	0.30	0.60	30.00	6.00
	5	Project Contract Administration	30.00	6.00	0.15	0.50	15.00	3.00
	6	Project Human Resource Management	35.00	7.00	0.05	0.14	5.00	1.00
		Sub Total A	205.00	41.00	0.80		80.00	16.00
Other Areas of Measurement (20%)	7	Project Communications Management	25.00	5.00	0.05	0.20	5.00	1.00
	8	Project Risk Management	15.00	3.00	0.05	0.33	5.00	1.00
	9	Project General Assessment	35.00	7.00	0.10	0.29	10.00	2.00
		Sub Total B	75.00	15.00	0.20		20.00	4.00
Total Performance Score								20.00

General Notes

From the above assessment, is the Consultant technically competent? (please tick as appropriate)

If the performance of the Consultant is in any respect "Poor" or "Very Poor", Please indicate what actions have been taken to draw the Consultant's attention to their shortcomings and the poor performance

General Notes:

Mark appropriate box of performance (i.e. VG, G, S, P, VP) for each applicable item with "x"

Put "x" in the "NA" column for inapplicable items

Fill in "stage period" in months (to one decimal place) for the stage(s) in the quarter.

The performance scores displayed are rounded to 2 decimal places

Max. Scores are predetermined weightings assigned to the item (could not be changed)

For applicable items, applicable max. score = max. score For "NA" item, applicable max. score. = 0

VG (Very Good) G (Good) S (Satisfactory) P (Poor) VP (Very Poor)

Acceptable performance score limit is 60 which is 60%

10 ANNEX B- Example on Score on Multiple or Multi stage Contracts

For Instant, we assume that:

Table...: Adjusted Consultant's Performance Score (CPS)-Physical progress

Project	CPS (a)	% Progress (b)	Adjusted Score (c _i)
1	80	80	15.46
2	60	100	14.49
3	50	77	9.30
4	40	89	8.60
5	30	68	4.93
Sum		414 (d)	52.78 (e)

Table...: Adjusted Consultant's Performance Score (CPS)-Time progress

Project	CPS	Stage (Months) (b)	Adjusted Score (c _i)
Design 1	40	4	9.41
Design 2	60	8	28.24
Supervision	20	5	5.88
Sum		17 (d)	43.53 (e)

e.g from Table Design project No.1

Adjusted Score=CPS x Stage -months / (Sum Stages-Months)=40*4/17=9.41%. The overall consultants score is the sum of the adjusted scores.

$$C_i = a \times b / d; e = \sum C_i$$

The above method shall also be used for quarterly and yearly assessments; otherwise the rule of averages should be applied.

The consultants current past performance shall be the average of the performances in a year and shall be limited to the last three years.

11 ANEEX C-Other Reporting and Records Forms

Consultant / Contractor's Name: _____

Quarterly Records

Assignment		Consultant's Adjusted Scores												
Item	Project Title	2009				2010				2011				Responsible Officer
		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	
Report Records														
	No. of reports in Y 1													
	No. of reports in Y 2													
	No. of reports in Y 3													
Performance Records														
1	Assignment A													
2	Assignment B													
3	Assignment C													
4	Assignment D													
5	Assignment E													
Consultants' Adjusted Score														
Average Year Score		#DIV/0!				#DIV/0!				#DIV/0!				

Consultant/Contractor's Current Past Performance Score	#DIV/0!
---	----------------

References

1. Principles for service contracts- Contract management guidelines, office of government commerce, crown copy write 2002.
2. The definite guide to project management, 2nd edition, prentice hall, 2007.
3. Principles for Service Contracts, contract management guidelines-office of Government commerce.
4. Past Performance Rating for works and services, ETWB TCW No. 4/2007 superseded by DEVB TCW No. 2/2009 with effect from 1.4.2009.
5. UK vendor rating tool kit.
6. Motivating Success ,A Toolkit for Performance Measurement,- Asset Management, Framework Contracts, Version 1.02.