



Road Development Agency

CONSULTANTS' AND CONTRACTORS' VENDOR RATING SYSTEM

RDA Policy and Procedures Manual

January 2013

Table of Contents

Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms	2
1. Background.....	4
2. Areas of Performance.....	5
3. The Performance Reporting Procedure	7
4. Performance Management and Regulating Actions on Non-Performers	12
5. Feedback.....	20
6. References	20
7. Appendices:	21

Table of Abbreviations and Acronyms

CAM	Critical Areas of Measurements
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
DAB	Dispute Adjudication Board
DRB	Dispute Resolution Board
M & E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTWSC	Ministry of Transport Works Supply and Communication
OAM	Other Areas of Measurements
P & D	Planning and Design
PMS	Project Management System
PPR	Past Performance Rating
RDA	Road Development Agency
VRRC	Vendor Rating Review Committee
ZPPA	Zambia Public Procurement Authority

1. Background

- 1.1. The Road Development Agency promulgated the vendor rating system in 2012 for both the consultants and the contractors so as to continuously measure their performance as stipulated in consultancy and works contracts.
- 1.2. The purpose of this manual is to clearly spell out the Road Development Agency's Policy and procedures regarding the reporting of consultants' and contractors' performance. This will entail, inter alia, performance tracking, documenting and monitoring. The system will also be used in considering past performance in tender selection exercises, actions against non-performing consultants and contractors, and other related matters. The manual establishes a standardised process within RDA to identify, document and communicate performance of consultants and contractors.
- 1.3. The process used provides the Agency Staff the ability to identify performance issues, if any, as they arise. This will afford staff the opportunity to work with the consultants and contractors to correct issues of noncompliance or deficiencies. The performance evaluation process provides feedback to consultants and contractors with satisfactory or exemplary performance as well as unsatisfactory performance. Further the performance evaluation process provides a basis for rating consultants and contractors, which result is considered in subsequent procurements.
- 1.4. Interim Performance evaluations shall occur quarterly throughout the contract period. However, special Performance evaluations shall be carried out at any time during the project implementation in exceptional circumstances upon identifying a major default from the consultant/contractor. A final evaluation will occur at the end of the life of the contract. Vendor rating shall be conducted for all major contracts for consultancy

services and works undertaken by the Agency for construction, upgrading, rehabilitation and periodic maintenance of road.

- 1.5. The results of each evaluation, interim, special and final will be communicated to the consultants and contractors for review and comment. The purpose of sharing the results of the evaluations with the contractor and consultant is to provide feedback on performance.
- 1.6. All evaluations result in a rating of the contractor's/consultant's performance. Only the Past Performance Rating (PPR) resulting from the interim Reports, Final Report and Special Reports will be recorded in the Project Management System (PMS) at RDA which will be accessible by Contractors, Consultants, other Road Sector Agencies, the Ministry of Transport Works Supply and Communications and other stakeholders in the Road Transport Sub-Sector.

2. Areas of Performance

- 2.1. To allow for RDA Project Management Teams to consistently measure and manage the performance on consultancy services and works contracts including feedback, the following areas of assessment have been identified:
- 2.2. For consultancy services involving Feasibility studies and Detailed Design, the areas of assessment shall be:
 - i. Project Scope Management;
 - ii. Project Time Management;
 - iii. Project Cost Management;
 - iv. Project Quality Management;
 - v. Project Human Resource Management;
 - vi. Project Communications Management;

- vii. Project, Risk Management; and
 - viii. Project General Assessment;
- 2.3. For consultancy services involving design review and construction supervision, the areas of assessment shall be:
All as listed in item 2.2 with an addition of Project Contract Administration.
- 2.4. For works contracts by contractors, the areas of assessment shall be:
All as listed in items 2.2 and 2.3 with an addition of Project Environmental, Health and Safety Management.
These areas of assessment are designed to capture a holistic approach to contract performance, and are referred to in this document as Aspects of Performance, where measured continuous improvement is desired, and Acceptable Performance where ultimately compliance is desired with a maximum score achieved with full compliance.
- 2.5. The areas of assessment identified under items (2.2, 2.3 and 2.4) for both consultancy services and works contracts have been categorized into two: that is, Critical Areas of Measurements (CAM) and Other Areas of Measurements (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.
- 2.6. The scoring system used for each aspect under areas of measurement 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.
- 2.7. Furthermore, 0 denotes **Not Applicable**. The minimum acceptance performance score for both consultancy services and works contracts is 60%. For a score below 60%, the consultant or contractor should be declared technically incompetent, and the implications of such a performance rating are clearly dealt with in Section 4.

3. The Performance Reporting Procedure

The System

- 3.1. Performance Reports on consultants and contractors shall be submitted using the PMS, and will be accessed through the RDA website. Lodging, countersigning and endorsing a performance report shall be carried out by the Reporting Officer (RDA Project Engineer or Desk Officer), Senior Manager or Head of Department representing the Director from respective Implementing Departments like Planning & Design, Construction and Maintenance including the Chairperson of the Vendor Rating Review Committee (M&E Unit) via the PMS.
- 3.2. To effect the three-tier signing/endorsement of the performance reports, users of the PMS will be divided into different user groups which have different access rights in the system. Departmental system Administrators or Desk Engineers are assigned the right to update and amend the user list of their departments, while the other two (2) users will verify and authenticate the updates or amendments.

Joint Venture

- 3.3. In case of an agreement being undertaken by an unincorporated joint venture of a consortium of consultants or contractors, the performance report and the associated assessment shall be identically applied to each of the joint venture partners irrespective of the share of the individual joint venture partner in the agreement.
- 3.4. An incorporated joint venture company, being a separate legal entity, will be treated as a new consultant or new contractor, and the performance assessment on such firms will not be applied to their parent companies. The report will, however, not be applied to any sub-consultants or sub-contractors who do not have a contractual relationship with the Agency.
- 3.5. User Departments may keep separate reports on sub-consultants or sub-contractors and formulate performance rating for their future reference. Such reports should however not be inputs into the PMS.

Interim Report

- 3.6. An Interim Report on the performance of a consultant or contractor should be submitted for every quarter covered by the period from start to completion of an agreement. The reporting periods for such quarterly Interim Reports end on the last day of March, June, September and December. The Report consists of two parts. Part I gives the Summary of Performance while Part II gives Detailed Assessment of the Performance. The Performance Report form to be generated by PMS should be as given in the ***Appendix A***. More details are provided in the separate User's Manual; Volumes 1, 2 and 3 for design & Studies, Supervision and works respectively.
- 3.7. The User's Manuals provides detailed guidance notes for completion of consultants' and contractors' performance reports.

- 3.8. Upon filling in Part II – Detailed Assessment of Performance of the Report form, a Performance Score would be computed for the Report.

Final Report

- 3.9. Besides the Interim Report for the last reporting quarter, a Final Report shall also be submitted together with the last Interim Report upon completion or termination of an assignment using the same report form as in ***Appendix A***.
- 3.10. The purpose of the Final Report is to give an overall assessment on the performance of a consultant or contractor through the entire duration of the assignment. This facilitates the Procuring or Implementing Department to have a general review of the quality of consultancy services or contractor's works and provide feedback to the consultant or contractor in order to assist them in seeking continuous improvement.
- 3.11. The Detailed Assessment of the Performance of the report form (Part II) is not required to be completed for a Final Report. In other words, no performance scores will be computed for the Final Report.

Special Report

- 3.12. In exceptional circumstances, for instance, upon identifying a major default of the consultant/contractor or any serious incident regarding the performance of the consultant in an assignment, Agency shall carry out an instant assessment and come up with a Special Report on the performance of the consultant/contractor using the same form (***Appendix A***).
- 3.13. Since Special Reports often contain new information on the performance of the consultant /contractor, it is fair that such reports should be accounted for in the compilation of the Past Performance Rating (PPR) of the

consultant or contractor. The Performance Report Form should, therefore, include Part II and the performance score will be used in computing the firm's PPR in the same way as that of an Interim Report.

- 3.14. The Special Report shall be compiled independently by the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit of the RDA, and may be submitted between the submission of the quarterly Interim Reports or even after the submission of the Final Report, if warranted.
- 3.15. To ensure timely inclusion of the performance score for computation of the PPR, a Special Report needs to be submitted together with the quarterly Interim Reports but may be input into the PMS anytime in a quarter.
- 3.16. Upon endorsement of any Interim Report, Final Report or Special Report on a consultant or contractor by a Chairperson of Vendor Rating Review Committee (VRRRC), the user department shall print a full copy of the report from the PMS and forward it to the Consultant concerned. As such copy is produced by the PMS; signing on the copy by the subject officers is not required.

Submission Deadline

- 3.17. Interim Reports on all consultancy and works contracts shall be submitted through the PMS not later than the 14th day of the month following the end of each assessment quarter, and submission is effected once the report is "endorsed" by the Chairperson of VRRRC in the PMS. If the 14th day falls on a public holiday or a Saturday or Sunday, the latest date for submission shall automatically be extended to the first working day immediately after the 14th day.
- 3.18. An Interim Report should also be submitted even if no detailed assessment could be made due to various reasons, such as no activity being carried out by the consultant or contractor or the assignment being suspended during the reporting quarter.

Past Performance Rating (PPR)

- 3.19. The Past Performance Rating for a consultant and contractor will be obtained by applying the weights calculated based on the percentages of physical works or services completed to the consultant's or contractor's scores of all contracts signed with the Agency currently running, or immediate past.
- 3.20. The formula for deriving the firm's current PPR is described in worked examples given in User's Manual.
- 3.21. The PMS will generate the current PPRs based on the performance reports already input into the system.
- 3.22. Upon generating the quarterly updated PPRs, the consultants/contractors will receive only by email their individual PPR.
- 3.23. The updated PPR data will be generated even if there is an unsettled appeal on the consultants' /contractors' performance report by the pre-determined date. Necessary amendments shall be made to the database when such appeal is settled. Nevertheless, any amendment made as a result of settlement of the appeal will not have any retrospective effect on the award of consultancies or decisions made in any consultant or contractor's selection exercise that has already been conducted.
- 3.24. The latest PPR generated by the Agency on or before the due date for submission of Expression of Interest or Technical Proposal or bid for works shall be used in the short listing stage or selection stage during tender evaluation.
- 3.25. To ensure the smooth running of the system, user departments shall strictly observe the deadline for submission of Interim Reports as specified in 3.17 above. A late report may not be accounted for in the quarterly PPR updating but may be incorporated in the next quarterly updating.

4. Performance Management and Regulating Actions on Non-Performers

Responsibilities of RDA Project Management Team

- 4.1. RDA Project Management Teams are composed of technical personnel from the Regional Manager's Office as well as the Project Engineer, who is the Desk officer based at the RDA Headquarters directly responsible for the particular projects.
- 4.2. They shall be responsible for carrying out the initial assessments of both the consultants and the contractors for their respective projects. In order to enhance transparency and accountability, the scoring will be done by at least three members of the project teams comprising the Regional Manager and one of his Engineers and a Desk Engineer. The assessment will be totaled and averaged to arrive at the Performance rating for a given contractor or consultant. Both Forms where individual scores including comments and aggregated scores are entered will be signed.
- 4.3. This exercise will be chaired by either the Regional Manager or an officer at the level of RDA 4 or higher. It will be the responsibility of the Desk Engineer to consolidate the report whether it be Interim or Final and lodge it into the PMS for it to be countersigned and endorsed by the Head of User Department /Director and Chairperson of the Vendor Rating Review Committee (VRRRC).
- 4.4. Note that hard copies for performance scores will be required for verification purposes before calling for the VRRC meetings.

Responsibilities of Vendor Rating Review Committee

- 4.5. The Vendor Rating Review Committee (VRRRC) shall be constituted by the Agency to manage consultants' and contractors' performance reporting and to take remedial actions (such as recommendation for approval by Management to suspend from bidding) against poor performers.
- 4.6. The composition of the members shall be Senior Manager Monitoring and Evaluation, who shall be the Chairperson, 4 Senior Managers drawn from departments of; Planning & Design, Construction, Maintenance and Procurement. The Secretary will be an officer from the Monitoring and Evaluation Unit at senior engineer level or above. Members from the VRRRC from the M & E Unit will have no right to vote as the unit will also be involved in assessments.
- 4.7. The terms of reference for the VRRRC are:
 - i. To review the performance of the consultants/contractors providing consultancy services and executing works on behalf of the Agency.
 - ii. To endorse performance reports and make supplementary comments, if necessary.
 - iii. To decide and make appropriate recommendations for attention of Management such as suspension from bidding and lifting of any suspension imposed previously, against consultants or contractors receiving two or more consecutive adverse Interim Reports, and keep the relevant log(s) in the PMS on regulating actions updated.
 - iv. To consider circumstances, other than adverse Interim Reports as Technical Incompetence.
 - v. To obtain necessary approval from Senior Management before taking actions to consultants' and contractors' poor performance.

Responsibilities of Senior Management

- 4.8. The Board and Senior Management of the RDA must ensure that policies and procedures of Vendor Rating are implemented in an open and transparent way by giving necessary help to the VRRRC.
- 4.9. Senior Management should review and approve all appeals brought to them by the Consultants and Contractors through VRRRC.
- 4.10. The Senior Management should seek further guidance and approvals from ZPPA as regards the issues of barring non-performing consultants and contractors in the bidding of RDA projects.

Responsibilities of Monitoring & Evaluation Unit

- 4.11. The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit will be responsible for ensuring the smooth implementation of the Vendor Rating System through tracking of how RDA Project Management Teams are conducting rating of their projects by quarterly summarizing all the PPR compiled in the quarter.
- 4.12. They will provide secretariat for VRRRC by setting the agenda and keeping minutes of past meetings.
- 4.13. They will provide key lessons learnt and suggest to Senior Management and the Board improvement strategies and communicates to consultants and contractors on best practices for continuous improvement.
- 4.14. They will build capacity in the Agency especially in the Regions on how best to conduct performance assessment of contractors and consultants
- 4.15. They will be involved in carrying out independent performance assessment on selected projects and prepare Special Reports for projects which are experiencing serious performance challenges so as to guide senior management on the way forward.

Adverse Report

4.16. The consultant or contractor should be forewarned on his unsatisfactory performance, as far as possible, before the issue of an adverse report. The warning should be in the form of a letter signed by Director and Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or an officer of at least Senior Manager level, and addressed to the consultant at principal level or to the contractor at Director level so that their senior personnel could be promptly alerted. The adverse reports should be adequately justified with facts and evidence.

Regulating Actions (Adverse Report)

4.17. In the case of works or services being undertaken by an unincorporated joint venture, the suspension shall be applied to all individual consultants and contractors in the joint venture.

4.18. The consultant or contractor shall be suspended from bidding for new tenders of the same category(ies) as the agreement being assessed for a minimum period of one (1) year and maximum period of five (5) years as stipulated in clause 65 (3) of No. 12 of 2008 of the Public Procurement Act. The affected firm(s) shall only be suspended after receiving two consecutive adverse Interim Reports on an assignment.

4.19. The commencement date of suspension shall be determined by the VRRC, subject to the approval of Management. The consultant/contractor shall be notified in writing, and notwithstanding the above, the lifting of the suspension shall be determined by the VRRC and approved by Management.

Regulating Actions (Technical Competence)

4.20. Technical competence of consultants/contractors would normally be assessed before they are engaged during tender evaluation. However, it cannot be ruled out that some consultants/contractors may fall below standards

during the course of their business. As such, the Reporting Officer (Desk Engineer), is required to assess and confirm if a consultant/contractor is technically competent in Part I of the Performance Report.

- 4.21. If the performance report is not adverse, by default, the consultant is assumed to be competent. To enhance consistency in assessment and to take follow up actions, some guidelines as listed below apply:
- i. Technical incompetence is a serious observation towards a consultant/contractor; therefore such assessment must be carefully considered and substantially justified.
 - ii. If the consultant/contractor is assessed as technically incompetent in a performance Report (irrespective of whether it is an Interim, a Special Report or a Final Report), the consultant shall be suspended from bidding for at least one (1) year and maximum of five (5) years. For unincorporated joint ventures, the regulating action shall apply to all individual parties in the joint venture. The commencement date of suspension shall be determined by the VRRC and approved by Management.
 - iii. The suspension shall only be lifted upon the VRRC being satisfied that the consultant/contractor has become technically competent. In addition, the VRRC may also interview the consultant's or contractor's top management, conduct quality audit on the consultant's/contractor's services or works, respectively, and require the consultant/contractor to provide necessary evidence of improvement as appropriate.
 - iv. Apart from taking regulating action based on the number of consecutive adverse Interim Reports received by the consultant or contractor or any assessment indicating that the consultant/contractor is not technically competent to undertake further assignment, the Agency may recommend to ZPPA to permanently bar the consultant/contractor in procurement on the basis of substantial non-performance or under-performance of contractual obligations as stipulated in Procurement Act no. 12 of 2008, clause 67 (b).

- v. The performance assessment may not be used to terminate contracts, but shall only apply for future tenders.

Appeal

- 4.22. A consultant/contractor who does not agree with the performance assessment made on him or the regulating action imposed on him, may appeal (1st-First Appeal) in writing, with substantiations and supporting evidence through the user Department within fourteen (14) calendar days from the date when the copy of performance report or suspension notice is sent to the consultant/contractor. The appeal can be delivered by post and will only be considered valid if received by the Agency. Late submission will not be considered and are invalid.
- 4.23. The head of the user department should decide on the case within one (1) month if applicable, and such decision shall be final should there be no second appeal. Any imposed regulating actions will only be lifted when the head of department is satisfied that the appeal is sustained. If the appeal is sustained and the original assessment has to be amended, the user department shall annul the original report and resubmit a new version in the PMS.
- 4.24. The result of the successful appeal will not have any retrospective effect on the award of contracts or decisions made in any selection exercise already conducted or concluded. A log of appeals from consultants/contractors should also be input into the PMS by the departments concerned.
- 4.25. When a consultant/ contractor makes a second (2nd) appeal, both parties will have to provide evidence for a cause RDA has used to render it a non-performer and shall be subjected and referred to a Dispute Adjudication Board or Dispute Resolution Board or an Arbitrator before any such contested rating is documented. The use of an independent party such as a Dispute Adjudication Board (DAB) or Dispute

Resolution Board (DRB) shall be in accordance with the contractual obligation. The decision by an independent party will be final. The consultant/contractor will cover all expenses for the 2nd appeal to the DRB or DAB.

Sub-consultants/Sub-contractors

4.26. Regulating actions will not be applied to sub-consultants/sub-contractors who do not have direct contractual relationship with the Agency. In case of circumstances, however, where sub-consultants/sub-contractors record substantial non-performance of contractual obligations, regulating actions of barring the firms from bidding for the Agency's projects should also be seriously considered as stipulated in item 4.21

Consideration of Past Performance in Selection Exercise of Consultants and Contractors

- 4.27. To encourage consultants and contractors to seek continuous improvement, the Agency will incorporate past performance as one of the quality criteria in the final stage of consultants' and contractors' selection with effect from 2013. This criteria will be included during the preparation of new bidding documents for services and works contracts.
- 4.28. For the selection process of the consultants, the marks for the criterion of past performance in the final stage of consultant selection are set at twenty (20) to thirty (30) points out of the total scores.
- 4.29. For the selection process of the contractor which is mostly qualitative, only contractors with the minimum acceptable score of sixty (60) percent shall be technically qualified to the criterion of the past performance.
- 4.30. The Evaluation Committee shall assess the consultant or contractor in both the short listing as well as the final selection and award of the contract using the PPR obtained from the RDA PMS.
- 4.31. For a bidder who is an unincorporated joint venture, its PPR shall be taken as the average of PPRs of all its participants that have a PPR.

4.32. A consultant or contractor who is under suspension from bidding shall not be shortlisted for submission of a bid until the suspension is lifted.

Consideration of Past Performance of Sub-consultants and Sub-contractors

4.33. Past performance of sub-consultants and sub-contractors is a mandatory assessment criterion at bidding stage. If it is determined that past performance of sub-consultants and sub-contractors should be assessed, the decision shall be made prior to invitation of bids and shall be clearly stated in the solicitation documents.

4.34. For consistency, the following guidelines should be followed in assessment of past performance of the sub-consultant or sub-contractor during the selection process:

4.35. Assessment of past performance of the consultant and his sub-consultants or contractor and his sub-contractors (where applicable) should be carried out separately, based on their updated PPR in the PMS.

4.36. Where a consultant or contractor proposes more than one sub-consultant or sub-contractor, respectively, the PPR shall be taken as the average of the PPRs of those sub-consultants or sub-contractors who have a PPR.

Where a proposed sub-consultant /sub-contractor is suspended from bidding under a category relevant to its work under the consultancy or works contract concerned, respectively, the weighted mark for the sub-consultants/contractors shall be zero.

5. Feedback

If you have any queries, comments or suggestions for improving the Consultants' and Contracts' Vendor Rating System, RDA Policy and Procedures Manual, 2013, please contact the Road Development Agency, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, Lusaka.

Email: rda_hq@roads.gov.zm

6. 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.

7. Appendices:

Performance Reports and Forms

CONSULTANCY SERVICES		
FEASIBILITY STUDY AND DETAILED DESIGN		
Name of the Firm		
Project/Contract Name		
Date of Assessment		
Scope of Works		
Assessed by		
Checked by		
Approved by		

	Summary Consultant's Performance Report-Feasibility Studies and Detailed Design		
Part I	Summary of Performance		
1	Department/office		
	Stage Period		
	Consultant's % Score	20%	
	Performance Rating	Technically Incompetent	
2	Remarks by Reporting officer at a rank of Principal Engineer		Date & Signature
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		
4	Counter Signing by (SMR/Head of Department/Unit) and any remarks		Date & Signature
5	Supplementary if any-Vendor Rating review Committee Chairperson		Date & Signature

	Part II-Detailed Assessment of Performance									
1.0	Project Scope Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
1.1	Engineering Investigations, Feasibility Studies					X		5.00	1	1
1.2	Design Criteria					X		5.00	1	1
1.3	(Design Solutions) Geometric & Pavement					X		5.00	1	1
1.4	Economic Analysis					X		5.00	1	1
1.5	Environmental Issues					X		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 1							25.00	5.00	5.00

2.0	Project Time Management										
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score	
2.1	Meeting of Milestones/Deliverables					x		5.00	1	1	
2.2	Doing it right for the first time					x		5.00	1	1	
2.3	Planning and Scheduling of Activities					x		5.00	1	1	
2.4	Reliability & Responsiveness to technical direction					x		5.00	1	1	
2.5	Problem Identification and Solving within Time.					x		5.00	1	1	
2.6	Completion of additional work					x		5.00	1	1	
	Sub Total 2							30.00	6.00	6.00	

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	
4.8	Estimated Cost of works compared to Bid Sums Received					x		5.00	1	1	
4.9	Development of cost estimates					x		5.00	1	1	
	Sub Total 3							30.00	6.00	6.00	

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 and certification attached to every stage of approval					x		5.00	1	1
4.3	Innovations, alternate options.					x		5.00	1	1
4.4	Adherence to SATCC design codes and standards or Best practices.					x		5.00	1	1
4.5	Overall Quality of design and design reports					x		5.00	1	1
4.6	Quality of Contract Package (Applies to Detail Design assignments only)					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 4							30.00	6.00	6.00

5.0	Project Human Resource Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	V P	N A	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
5.1	Client Relations					x		5.00	1	1
5.2	Drive and Determination					x		5.00	1	1
5.3	Personnel Resource Management					x		5.00	1	1
5.4	Personnel Effectiveness					x		5.00	1	1
5.5	Technical Competence					x		5.00	1	1
5.6	Availability of approved or original personnel on the project					x		5.00	1	1
5.7	Employment and Support to locals					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 5							35.00	7.00	7.00

7.0	Project Risk Management										
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score	
7.1	Risk Identification					x		5.00	1	1	
7.2	Risk Management Plan					x		5.00	1	1	
7.3	Risk and Monitoring Control					x		5.00	1	1	
	Sub Total 7							15.00	3.00	3.00	

8.00	Project General Assessment									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
8.1	Provision of Effective Management (Management of Sub consultants)					x		5.00	1	1
8.2	Problem Resolution and Customer Satisfaction					x		5.00	1	1
8.3	Appreciation of Government requirements and procedures, local laws, standards					x		5.00	1	1
8.4	Public/Stakeholders Relations / Corporate Social Responsibility					x		5.00	1	1
8.5	Tendering Assessments					x		5.00	1	1
8.6	Integrity and ethical conduct of consultant and Consultants personnel					x		5.00	1	1
8.7	Value for money					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 8							35.00	7.00	7.00

Summary Feasibility Studies and Detailed Design								
		Aspect of Rating	Max Score	Score	Weight	Factors	Max Applicable Score	Weighted Score
Critical Areas of Measurement (80%)	1	Project Scope Management	25.00	5.00	0.1	0.40	10.00	2.00
	2	Project Time Management	30.00	6.00	0.15	0.50	15.00	3.00
	3	Project Cost Management	30.00	6.00	0.15	0.50	15.00	3.00
	4	Project Quality Management	30.00	6.00	0.3	1.00	30.00	6.00
	5	Project Human Resource Management	35.00	7.00	0.1	0.29	10.00	2.00
		Sub Total A	150.00	30.00	0.80		80.00	16.00
Other Areas of Measurement (20%)	6	Project Communications Management	25.00	5.00	0.05	0.20	5.00	1.00
	7	Project Risk Management	15.00	3.00	0.05	0.33	5.00	1.00
	8	Project General Assessment	35.00	7.00	0.1	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 Consultant's responses, if any:

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%

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														
Consultant/Contractor's Current Past Performance Score (Average)														

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	

	Part II-Detailed Assessment of Performance									
1.0	Project Scope Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
1.1	Design Review					X		5.00	1	1
1.2	Works done according to specifications and within contract provision.					X		5.00	1	1
1.3	Optimisation of resources					X		5.00	1	1
1.4	Scope Control on Services and works.					X		5.00	1	1
1.5	Environmental issues					X		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 1							25.00	5.00	5.00

2.0	Project Time Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Consultant's Score
2.1	Management Schedule Control					X		5.00	1	1
2.2	Reliability and Accuracy of programming activity					X		5.00	1	1
2.3	Approvals of Updated programs					X		5.00	1	1
2.4	Meeting of Milestones/Deliverables					X		5.00	1	1
2.5	Reliability and responsiveness to clients direction					X		5.00	1	1
2.6	Problem Identification and solving within Time					X		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 2							30.00	6.00	6.00

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	Innovations, alternate options.					X		5.00	1	1
4.5	Adherence 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 personnel 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	Communication Accuracy					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 Assessment										
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 personnel					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 Measurement (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

CONTRACTOR		
CONSTRUCTION WORKS		
Name of the Firm		
Project/Contract Name		
Date of Assessment		
Scope of Works		
Assessed by		
Checked by		
Approved by		

	Part II-Detailed Assessment of Performance									
1.0	Project Scope Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score
1.1	Contractor executing work within the specified scope					x		5.00	1	1
1.2	Works done according to specifications and within contract provision.					x		5.00	1	1
1.2	Scope Control-Works.					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 1							15.00	3.00	3.00

2.0	Project Time Management										
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score	
2.1	Meeting of targets as specified on schedule					x		5.00	1	1	
2.2	Doing it right for the first time (avoid double handling)					x		5.00	1	1	
2.3	Updating work Schedules regularly					x		5.00	1	1	
2.4	Reliability & Responsiveness to technical direction					x		5.00	1	1	
2.6	Completion of additional work					x		5.00	1	1	
2.7	Contractors early warning					x		5.00	1	1	
	Sub Total 2							30.00	6.00	6.00	

3.0	Project Cost Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score
3.1	Budget Variance (Variations)					x		5.00	1	1
3.2	Accuracy of IPC (Claims)					x		5.00	1	1
3.3	Pricing of Contract addendum					x		5.00	1	1
3.4	Demonstrate proper Use of Advance payment					x		5.00	1	1
3.5	Cost Efficiency (Use of Cost efficient approaches)					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 3							25.00	5.00	5.00

4.0	Project Quality Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score
4.1	Quality Assurance Plans for the execution of works					x		5.00	1	1
4.2	Quality assurance Plans Implementation					x		5.00	1	1
4.3	Quality Compliant					x		5.00	1	1
4.4	Quality of documented project files.					x		5.00	1	1
4.5	Innovations, alternate options.					x		5.00	1	1
4.6	Adherence to SATCC design codes and standards or Best practices.					x		5.00	1	1
4.7	Quality of Product					x		5.00	1	1
4.8	Quality of Product performance					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 4							40.00	8.00	8.00

5.0	Project Contract Administration									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor'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	Management of Subcontractors					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 5							25.00	5.00	5.00

6.0	Project Human resource Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor'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					x		5.00	1	1
6.5	Technical Competence					x		5.00	1	1
6.6	Availability of approved or original personnel 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	Contractor's Score
7.1	Communication Management Plan					x		5.00	1	1
7.2	Response to Instruction or Inquiries					x		5.00	1	1
7.4	Knowledge and Understanding of RDA project procedures					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 7							15.00	3.00	3.00

8.0	Project Environmental, Health and Safety Management										
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score	
8.1	Environmental Management Plan documentation					x		5.00	1	1	
8.2	Environmental Management Plan applied-dust, borrow pits					x		5.00	1	1	
8.3	HIV Aids Program documentation					x		5.00	1	1	
8.4	HIV Aids Program implementation - reports					x		5.00	1	1	
8.5	General Workers provided with PPE					x		5.00	1	1	
8.6	Work signage adequate					x		5.00	1	1	
8.7	General Safety of site establishment					x		5.00	1	1	
	Sub Total 8							35.00	7.00	7.00	

9.0	Project Risk Management									
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	VP	NA	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score
9.1	Risk Identification					x		5.00	1	1
9.2	Risk Management Plan					x		5.00	1	1
9.3	Risk and Monitoring Control					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 9							15.00	3.00	3.00

10.0 Project General Assessment										
Item	Aspects of Performance	VG	G	S	P	V P	N A	Max. Score	Applicable Max. Score	Contractor's Score
10.1	Problem Resolution and Customer Satisfaction					x		5.00	1	1
10.2	Appreciation of Government requirements and procedures, local laws, standards					x		5.00	1	1
10.3	Public/Stakeholders Relations / Corporate Social Responsibility					x		5.00	1	1
10.4	Relationship with other contractors & Consultant									
10.5	Integrity and ethical conduct of consultant and Consultants personnel					x		5.00	1	1
10.6	Value for money					x		5.00	1	1
	Sub Total 10							25.00	5.00	5.00

Summary Contractor-Works								
		Aspect of Rating	Max Score	Score	Weight	Factors	Max Applicable Score	Weighted Score
Critical Areas of Measurement (75%)	1	Project Scope Management	15.00	3.00	0.05	0.33	5.00	1.00
	2	Project Time Management	30.00	6.00	0.15	0.50	15.00	3.00
	3	Project Cost Management	5.00	5.00	0.1	2.00	10.00	10.00
	4	Project Quality Management	40.00	8.00	0.3	0.75	30.00	6.00
	5	Project Contract Administration	25.00	5.00	0.1	0.40	10.00	2.00
	6	Project Human resource Management	35.00	7.00	0.05	0.14	5.00	1.00
		Sub Total A	150.00	34.00	0.75		75.00	23.00
Other Areas of Measurement (25%)	7	Project Communications Management	15.00	3.00	0.05	0.33	5.00	1.00
	8	Project Environmental, Health and Safety Management	35.00	7.00	0.05	0.14	5.00	1.00
	9	Project Risk Management	15.00	3.00	0.05	0.33	5.00	1.00
	10	Project General Assessment	25.00	5.00	0.1	0.40	10.00	2.00
		Sub Total B	90.00	18.00	0.25		25.00	5.00
			Total Performance Score					6.00