**CONTRACTORS PERFORMANCE**

**(MEASURED BY AUTHORITY PROJECT TEAM AT PRACTICAL COMPLETION)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project** |  |
| **Date of Review Meeting** |  |
| **Contractor** |  |
| **Attended by** |  |
| **Signed** |  |
| **Client Authority** |  |
| **Attended by** |  |
| **Signed** |  |
| **Architect** |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | |  | | **Score 1-10** | | **COMMENT** |
| **1.** | **Time Management** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **2.** | **Financial Management** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **3.** | **Health & safety** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **4.** | **Management of Supply Chain** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **5.** | **Quality of Workmanship** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **6.** | **Progress in making good defects** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **7.** | **Collaborative Approach** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **8.** | **Contractor Design** *(if applicable)* | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **9.** | **Contractors contribution to making project cost savings** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **10.** | **Approach to CSR** | |  | |  | |
|  |  | |
| **11.** | **Overall performance** | |  | |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Definition** | **Prompts**  ***(All numbers between 1 to 10 may be used)*** | |
| **1**  **Time**  **Management** | How well did the contractor plan and progress the project? | **10** | **Excellent:** On time project delivery. Contractor took the leading role |
| **8** | **Good:** On time project delivery, good approach. Any delays proactively minimised by contractor |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: On time project delivery, good approach |
| **4** | **Poor:** Late project delivery, reactive approach. Minor delays caused or exacerbated by contractor. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable:** Inadequate approach. Major delays caused by contractor |
| **2**  **Financial Management** | How well did the contractor manage costs?  Was cost reporting timely and accurate? | **10** | **Excellent:** Fully proactive, contractor took the leading role, significant contribution to cost management |
| **8** | **Good:** Proactive approach. All cost reporting timely, without prompting |
| **6** | **Acceptable:** some added value with adequate results, occasional late or incomplete reporting. |
| **4** | **Poor:** Reactive and at times adversarial approach to cost management |
| **2** | **Unacceptable:** No cost management. Adversarial and claims conscious |
| **3**  **Health & Safety** | How well did the contractor mange H&S?  Include:   * quality of H&S plan, * management on site, * accidents and incidents, * site safety checks * audits | **10** | **Excellent**: Fully proactive. H&S management was exemplary with no issues or concerns throughout the project. AFR less than 0.1 |
| **8** | **Good:** Proactive approach, valuable contribution made only very minor issues or concerns. AFR less than 0.2 |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: some added value with adequate results. AFR less than 0.4 |
| **4** | **Poor:** reactive approach to H&S management with no added value, AFR greater than 0.4 |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: inadequate approach to H&S management, multiple reportable incidents or HSE Prohibition Notice |
| **4 Management of Supply Chain** | Management of the sub-contractors & suppliers procurement process  On site Co-ordination & management of sub-contractors and suppliers | **10** | **Excellent**: Tender engagement very well planned. Fully defined packages & interfaces with no errors & omissions. Tender list agreed with client. Sub-contractors & suppliers involved early. Excellent on site co-ordination and performance management of sub-contractors and suppliers |
| **8** | **Good:** As Excellent but with some minor errors or omissions which did not affect overall project completion. |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Co-ordinated tenders. Most subcontractors and suppliers involved at right time. Minor issues due to late appointments. Late ordering, minor errors, or site co-ordination or performance management |
| **4** | **Poor:** Tenders not planned containing errors or unresolved qualifications. Significant issues due to late appointments. Late ordering and poor site co-ordination or performance management. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: No planning of tenders. Significant unresolved errors or omissions. Major issue(s) due to late appointments, late ordering errors, lack of site co-ordination or performance management |
| **5**  **Quality of Workmanship** | Did the contractor achieve the quality of work required by the specification?  Consider the number and seriousness of defects at practical completion. | **10** | **Excellent**: workmanship exceeded specification. No defective installations. |
| **8** | **Good:** workmanship meets specification. No defective installations |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: workmanship meets specification. Minor defective work at practical completion that do not affect use of building |
| **4** | **Poor:** workmanship does not meet specification. Numerous or major defective work that affects use of building. Rework required. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: numerous and/or major defective installation requiring extensive re-work |
| **6**  **Progress in making good defects** | How quickly did the contractor resolve defects after practical completion?  Allow for both the seriousness of the defect, and the time taken to resolve. | **10** | **Excellent**: no defects to resolve |
| **8** | **Good:** all defects resolved within the agreed timeline after practical completion |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: all defects resolved within 1 month of practical completion |
| **4** | **Poor:** Disappointing approach to clearance of defects**,** some defects outstanding after 3 months |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: defects outstanding after 3 months; contractor unwilling to resolve. |
| **7**  **Collaborative Approach** | Did the Contractor work collaboratively during the life of the project | **10** | **Excellent**: contractors took the lead in collaborative working |
| **8** | **Good:** contractor was a proactive member of the team |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: contractor worked well with the team but sometimes adopted a Traditional approach |
| **4** | **Poor:** traditional approach. Contractor waited to be directed. Unwilling to engage in team working |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: adversarial and negative approach possibly resulting in claims or disputes. |
| **8**  **Management of the Design Process (Contract led Design only)** | How well were the professional designers appointed and managed  For novated consultants – how was the novation process handled | **10** | **Excellent**: Designers identified and appointed early with clear and co-ordinated brief from contractor. Proactive management of designers by contractor as part of collaborative team. Design output fully met client brief, on time and within project budget. |
| **8** | **Good: D**esigners identified and appointed on time. Full management of designers by contractor. Design output fully met client brief on time and within project budget |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Designers identified and appointed on time. Minor co-ordination issues, omissions or late delivery of design information that did not affect overall project delivery. |
| **4** | **Poor:** Poorly planned designer appointed and reactive or inadequate management of design. Late delivery or unacceptable quality of design information that did not fully meet client brief or budget. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: No planning or management of designers. Late delivery or unacceptable quality of design information causing significant issues with project delivery. |
| **9**  **Contribution to cost savings** | Contractors approach to creating project cost savings  (does not measure £ actually saved) | **10** | **Excellent**: Pro-active leadership of team, innovative approach. Significant saving identified. Framework wide approach adopted. |
| **8** | **Good:** Active participation in cost savings. Significant savings identified. |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Active participation in cost savings. Some savings identified. |
| **4** | **Poor:** Indifferent to cost saving initiatives, even when prompted. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Negative approach to cost savings, indifferent to client’s project budget. |
| **10**  **Approach to CSR** | Consider the overall attitude of the contractor to the wider CSR agenda and limitations the particular project may have had in delivering agreed CSR targets | **10** | **Excellent**: contractor made every effort to promote CSR, achieved or exceeded agreed targets. |
| **8** | **Good:** Contractor promoted CSR well and achieved most agreed targets |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Contractors performance was good but agreed targets were not achieved in 50% or more areas |
| **4** | **Poor:** Contractor didn’t make sufficient effort to achieve agreed targets, less than 25% of targets were met |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Contractor paid lip service to CSR and no effort to achieve any targets |
| **11**  **Overall Performance** | Consider the overall delivery of the project building including   * communication, planning and organisation; * site management; * consideration for other site users & general attitude | **10** | **Excellent**: contractors performance was exemplary in all areas |
| **8** | **Good:** Contractors performance was good in all areas |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Contractors performance was good but improvement in specific issues identified. |
| **4** | **Poor:** Contractors performance was poor in several areas |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Contractors performance was unacceptable causing major issues. |