**LOCAL AUTHORITY PROJECT TEAM PERFORMANCE**

**(MEASURED BY CONTRACTOR AT PRACTICAL COMPLETION)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project** |  |
| **Date of review meeting** |  |
| **Contractor** |  |
| **Attended by** |  |
| **Signature** |  |
| **Client Authority** |  |
| **Attended by** |  |
| **Signature** |  |
| **Architect** |  |
| **Attended by** |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | **Score1-10** | **COMMENT** |
| **1.** | **Appointment of Contractor**  |  |  |
|  |  |
| **2.** | **Payment -Time** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **3.** | **Design Information - Time** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **4.** | **Design Information - Quality** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **5.** | **Contract administration** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **6.** | **Agreeing Costs** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **7.** | **Collaborative Approach** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **8.** | **Management of Change Control** |  |  |
|  |  |
| **9.**  | **Overall performance** |  |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measure** | **Definition** | **Prompts*****(All numbers between 1 to 10 may be used)*** |
| **Appointment of Contractor** | Was the preconstruction appointment process suitable and well managed?Was the quality of information provided with the Enquiry good?Were you appointed at an early enough stage of the project? | **10** | **Excellent:** All requirements and information provided. Early contractor appointment. Well run process. Excellent mini competition used. |
| **8** | **Good:** Most requirements and information provided. Early contractor appointment. Well run process. Good mini-competition if used |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Some information missing but did not affect appointment. Earlier contractor appointed would have been beneficial. Acceptable mini competition, if used |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Fragmented or incorrect information. Contractor appointed too late to have meaningful contribution. Appointment process poorly run. Excessive length mini competition. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable:** Key information missing Mini-competition used as a traditional Tender. Late contractor appointment caused significant delay/cost to project |
| **Payment -Time** | How satisfied were you with the time taken for payment? | **10** | **Excellent:** Payments made early |
| **8** | **Good:** Payments made to contract timescales |
| **6** | **Acceptable:** Most payments made to contract timescales |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Many payments made late. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable:** Payments remain outstanding |
| **Client brief / Design Information - Time** | How satisfied were you with the **time** taken to issue information?* Were key design decisions made at the appropriate time?
* Were design changes quickly agreed?
 | **10** | **Excellent**: All decisions made at appropriate time. All information issued promptly. Quick change control. |
| **8** | **Good:** All decisions and information issued at appropriate time with no effect on any part of project programme |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Most decisions made and information issued at appropriate time. No effect on project completion date. |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Some design decisions or information issued late caused significant effect on project programme. |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Design decisions or information late caused work to stop |
| **Client Brief / Design Information - Quality** | How satisfied were you with the quality of the information provided. | **10** | **Excellent**: All information accurate, clear and complete  |
| **8** | **Good:** Majority of information generally accurate, clear and complete |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Minor information missing or unclear but no impact on project |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Some information missing or unclear with some impact on project |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Much information missing, unclear or inaccurate with significant impact on project |
| **Contract Administration** | How well did the Local Authority’s project team manage the contract? | **10** | **Excellent**: Proactive planning and management with clear processes agreed and followed |
| **8** | **Good:** Mostly well planned and managed with processes clear and generally followed |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Reasonably planned and managed, but sometimes unclear or not followed. |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Processes not defined or followed. Traditional management approach |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Reactive management without clear processes or with significant impact on project. Adversarial approach |
| **Agreeing Costs** | Did the Local Authority’s project team have a proactive, timely and collaborative approach to agreeing prices, contract sum and variations? | **10** | **Excellent**: Proactive and collaborative approach to agreeing costs. Fair costs agreed promptly |
| **8** | **Good:** Collaborative approach to agreeing costs. Reasonable timescales and outcomes |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Generally collaborative approach to agreeing costs contract. Timescales and outcome adequate, but could be improved. |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Traditional approach to agreeing costs. Sometimes adversarial. Slow process with some poor outcomes |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Adversarial approach to agreeing costs. Unacceptable timescales and/or outcomes |
| **Collaborative Approach** | Did the Local Authority’s team work collaboratively with you during the project?*(including Authority’s approach to cost reduction)* | **10** | **Excellent**: Authority’s project team open and willing to address all project issues jointly |
| **8** | **Good:** Authority’s project team open and willing to address most issues jointly |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Occasionally adopted Traditional approach |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Traditional, and sometimes adversarial approach |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Adversarial approach |
| **Management of Change Control** | Was there a defined change control process and was it well managed? | **10** | **Excellent**: Exemplary process, well managed, all instructions issued promptly |
| **8** | **Good:** Good processes generally well-managed, instructions generally issued in good time |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Adequate process reasonably managed, some late instructions |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Poorly defined process, not well managed, many late instructions |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: No change control process with unwillingness to issue instructions |
| **Overall Performance** | Overall, how satisfied were you with the performance of the Local Authority team during the project? | **10** | **Excellent**: Team performance exemplary in all areas |
| **8** | **Good:** Team performance good in all areas |
| **6** | **Acceptable**: Team performance good, but specific improvement identified |
| **4** | **Disappointing:** Team performance was poor |
| **2** | **Unacceptable**: Team performance was unacceptable causing major issues. |