

Prequalification (PQC) System – contractor performance reporting



May 2020

(First published in January 2001)

© The State of Queensland

(Department of Housing and Public Works)

Enquiries should be directed to:

The Manager

Building Contract Management

Building Policy and Asset Management

Department of Housing and Public Works

Telephone 07 3008 2511

GPO Box 2457

Brisbane Qld 4001

BCMSecretariat@hpw.qld.gov.au

1.0 Introduction

This guideline forms part of the [Capital Works Management Framework \(CWMF\)](#). The CWMF is the Queensland Government's key policy for managing risks associated with the planning and delivery of building programs and projects consistent with the Government's key objectives.

Performance reports are used to assess a prequalified building contractor for continued registration on the whole-of-Government Prequalification (PQC) System and for possible inclusion on select tender lists. In addition to these functions, performance reports facilitate the identification of performance areas in which a prequalified building contractor may not be performing to a satisfactory standard, or alternatively is excelling in certain areas, on a government building project.

The performance reporting process incorporates a scoring methodology to encourage contractors to achieve a superior level of performance, which can lead to a contractor having increased future select tender opportunities on government building projects.

In accordance with the CWMF, government departments should complete a performance report for each contractor engaged through the PQC System at the construction 50 per cent complete stage, and between one and three months after practical completion of a project.

However, performance reports may also be undertaken at other times on an exception basis (e.g. if it becomes apparent that the contractor is not performing to expectations or experiencing financial or other stress, or alternatively, is displaying "superior" performance which the reporting officer wishes to highlight), or undertaken at the request of the contractor, the PQC Registrar or the department sponsoring the project.

Importantly, where performance issues are identified during a project, a performance report should be undertaken as soon as possible to facilitate timely discussion between the reporting officer (e.g. Superintendent's Representative) and the contractor.

1.1 Objective

The objective of this guideline is to provide guidance for departments on prequalified contractor performance reporting associated with government building projects. This will facilitate a consistent approach to such reporting.

A performance report can be completed by a departmental employee or a third party engaged by a department, however, the report must be approved by a departmental employee.

Scope

In particular, this guideline provides information for those managing the contract (i.e. Superintendents, Superintendent's Representatives, Principal's Representatives and Site Representatives) who are required to prepare performance reports on building contractors. The guideline focuses on the steps for completing a performance report, as well as how the information in a performance report is used by the PQC Registrar with regard to a contractor's continued registration on the PQC System.

Definitions

A **building industry contractor** or **contractor** is an organisation or individual contracted directly to the Queensland Government to provide services in relation to government building projects.

Contractor's Representative is the Contractor's nominated representative appointed to the project. For non-traditional projects an equivalent role is the Managing Contractor's Representative.

The **Superintendent** undertakes the contract management functions on the contract entered into between the Principal and Contractor. For non-traditional projects an equivalent role is the Principal's Representative.

Superintendent's Representative (SR) is the Superintendent's nominated representative. For non-traditional projects an equivalent role is the Site Representative.

Superintendent's Management is interpreted as the most appropriate manager/director of the person undertaking the role of the Superintendent.

Department has the meaning expressed in s8 of the *Financial Accountability Act 2009*.

Government building project is as defined in the Capital Works Management Framework.

The **Prequalification (PQC) System** supports the Capital Works Management Framework by providing a central register of prequalified building industry consultants and contractors. It also establishes clear and consistent performance requirements and guidelines for the selection of building industry service providers for government building projects.

The **PQC Registrar** is the key contact for the PQC System.

2.0 Approach to completing contractor performance reports

In accordance with the principles of natural justice¹, contractor performance reports must be objective, accurate and reasonable, and prepared in a way that will demonstrate that adequate opportunity has been given to the contractor to present their version of events, particularly where a report has identified poor performance.

The following must be observed during the performance reporting process:

- the reporting officer must maintain frequent and direct liaison with the contractor to be able to make factual assessments regarding the contractor's performance
- all information contained in the performance report should be discussed by the parties to the contract
- In the case of poor performance, it is preferable that those managing the contract and the contractor's representative complete a performance report at a face-to-face meeting. On some occasions, it may also be appropriate for the management levels of both the entity managing the contract and the contractor to attend the meeting.
- an appropriate officer², who must be a departmental employee, must approve the performance report to certify that the report is objective and accurate, and can therefore be relied upon by the Department of Housing and Public Works when making accountable decisions regarding a contractor's registration on the PQC System and by departments when considering a contractor for possible inclusion on, or exclusion from, select tender lists
- in accordance with the principles of natural justice, the contractor must be given reasonable opportunity to comment on the assessment of their performance.

The procedure for completing a contractor performance report (including required sign off points) is outlined in **Attachment 1**.

Once completed, a performance report must be forwarded to the PQC Registrar so that details of the performance report can be entered in the PQC Database.

The latest version of the [performance report template](#) must be used when assessing a contractor's performance under a contract.

¹ Natural justice is defined in *The Australian Policy Handbook* as the 'legal rules requiring decision-makers to act fairly and in good faith, without bias (pre-judgement or interest in a matter), to provide details of any matters affecting individuals, and to ensure a fair hearing'. Natural justice is also referred to as 'procedural fairness'.

² Superintendent and Superintendent's management (as applicable – refer Attachment 1) or equivalent roles.

A contractor is to be assessed against specific evaluation criteria (as outlined in the performance report template at **Attachment 3**) in relation to:

- project delivery
- compliance with relevant government policies
- compliance with non-price criteria (if included in tender documentation).

The adequacy of the contractor's performance against these evaluation criteria is to be assessed using one of the following five gradings:

- unsatisfactory
- poor
- satisfactory
- good
- superior.

Reporting officers are to use the table of performance metrics (refer Attachment 2) to determine the appropriate grading (as above) and mark the corresponding check box on the performance report template.

An “unsatisfactory” or “superior” grading recorded on a performance report must be accompanied by comments and should also include relevant documentation to support such grading being given by the reporting officer. This could include:

- a WHS report
- key items of correspondence
- site minutes
- requests for information
- claims
- site directions
- variation orders
- show cause notices
- written statements
- photographs
- responses from the contractor associated with any of the above.

3.0 Performance scoring methodology

Upon receipt of a completed performance report, the PQC Registrar records details of the report, including performance gradings provided by the reporting officer, in the PQC Database. A performance scoring methodology is incorporated in the PQC Database to assess the overall performance of a contractor on a project.

The scoring methodology applies a rating scale to performance gradings and fixed weightings to evaluation criteria to determine an overall percentage score. This score is automatically calculated in the PQC Database. The scoring methodology is illustrated in the following tables.

3.1 Performance gradings and associated ratings

Performance grading	Rating
Unsatisfactory	1
Poor	3
Satisfactory	5
Good	7
Superior	10

3.2 Evaluation criteria weightings

Each evaluation criterion is assigned a fixed weighting, based on the typical risk to a project.

Evaluation criteria	Weighting (based on risk level) high = 5; medium = 4; low = 3
Quality – contractor’s work	high
Quality – contractor’s contract documentation (e.g. submissions and construction program)	medium
Time – adherence to contract timeframes	high
Time – rectification of <u>major</u> non-conformances and defects	high
Time – rectification of <u>minor</u> non-conformances and defects	low
Time – delivery of submissions / other documentation required under the contract	low
Communication	low
Environmental management	low
Subcontractor management	medium
Industrial relations management	medium
Workplace health and safety management	high
Compliance with <i>Building and Construction Training Policy</i>	medium
Compliance with <i>Queensland Charter for Local Content</i>	medium
Compliance with non-price criteria	low

3.3 Example of a contractor’s overall performance score

The reporting officer does not calculate these scores – this is done automatically within the PQC Database based on the gradings (i.e. unsatisfactory, poor, satisfactory, good, superior) recorded by the reporting officer in the performance report template.

Evaluation criteria	Weighting (fixed) (a)
Quality – contractor’s work	5 - high
Quality – contractor’s contract documentation (e.g. submissions and construction program)	4 - medium
Time – adherence to contract timeframes	5 - high
Time – rectification of <u>major</u> non-conformances and defects	5 - high
Time – rectification of <u>minor</u> non-conformances and defects	3 - low
Time – delivery of submissions / other documentation required under the contract	3 - low
Communication	3 - low
Environmental management	3 - low
Subcontractor management	4 - medium
Industrial relations management	4 - medium
Workplace health and safety management	5 - high
Compliance with <i>Building and Construction Training Policy</i>	4 - medium
*Compliance with <i>Queensland Charter for Local Content</i>	4 - medium
*Compliance with non-price criteria	3 - low

* May not be applicable to all contracts. In such cases, N/A should be recorded on the performance report template.

Grading	Rating (b)	Weighted rating (a) x (b)	Max. possible weighted rating (a) x 10
Superior	10	50	50
Good	7	28	40
Superior	10	50	50
Superior	10	50	50
Superior	10	30	30
Good	7	21	30
Superior	10	30	30
Satisfactory	5	15	15 (highest grading permitted is “Satisfactory”)
Satisfactory	5	20	20 (highest grading permitted is “Satisfactory”)
Satisfactory	5	20	20 (highest grading permitted is “Satisfactory”)
Superior	10	50	50
Satisfactory	5	20	20 (highest grading permitted is “Satisfactory”)
Satisfactory	5	20	20 (highest grading permitted is “Satisfactory”)
Satisfactory	5	15	30
Totals		419(c)	455 (d)

$$\text{Score} = 100 \times (c)/(d) = 100 \times (419/455) = \mathbf{92.08\%}$$

3.4 Determining a contractor’s performance ranking

The percentage score calculated from a performance report is used to determine and assign a performance ranking to a contractor’s registration details in the PQC Database. A “star” based approach is used to clearly display the performance ranking of a contractor, ranging from 5 stars (highest ranking) to 1 star (lowest ranking) as illustrated below.

Percentage Score	Performance Ranking	
84% and above	Best	★ ★ ★ ★ ★
70% and above	 (satisfactory)	★ ★ ★ ★
50% and above		★ ★ ★
30% and above		★ ★
Below 30%	Worst	★

The performance star ranking assigned to a contractor will be recorded in the PQC Database and be displayed on a PQC eligible tenderer list³ (amongst other things) to inform departments of the best performing contractors (i.e. which have been assigned 5 stars).

3.5 Performance ranking and select tender opportunities

In the development of select tender lists, performance ranking will differentiate higher performing contractors from those with lesser performance or those with no recent performance history.

A 5 star performance ranking will visually represent a contractor’s performance for consideration of increased future select tender opportunities, while a contractor with a 1 star or 2 star performance ranking will generally result in having reduced or no future select tender opportunities.

3.6 Retaining a 5 star performance ranking

Once awarded, a contractor will retain its 5 star performance ranking for a period of two years, provided that in subsequent performance reports completed during this period:

- a “**superior**” grading has been awarded for the evaluation criteria: Quality – contractor’s work; Time – adherence to contract timeframes; and Time - rectification of non-conformances and defects (both major and minor); and
- no gradings against other evaluation criteria (e.g. Workplace Health and Safety Management; Industrial Relations Management; Compliance with Building and Construction Training Policy) are less than “**satisfactory**”; and
- there are no other pending issues relating to the contractor in the PQC System.

³ Departments generate an eligible tenderer list from the PQC Database to source appropriately prequalified contractors for a specific project.

At the end of this two-year period, the contractor's performance ranking will revert to the number of stars associated with the most recent performance report, unless the contractor achieves a further performance report assessment with a score of at least 84% during the two-year period.

In that case the contractor will retain its 5 star performance ranking and the two year time period will commence again from the date of that performance report assessment.

3.7 1 star performance ranking

Once awarded, a 1 star performance ranking will remain in place for a contractor until the period of any sanction that may have been applied following a review of the contractor's registration status (see section 4) has expired, and:

- the contractor achieves an overall performance score of at least 30% in a performance report (completed after the 1 star performance ranking was initiated) for a government building project.

In such case, the contractor's star performance ranking in the PQC Database will be changed to reflect the result of the relevant performance report.

4.0 Actions arising from completed performance reports

4.1 PQC System

In the case where the overall performance ranking of a contractor has been determined as 1 star, the PQC Registrar will undertake a review of the contractor's registration status. The *Prequalification (PQC) System – review and sanctions process* guideline outlines the approach to be used in these circumstances.

The PQC Registrar may also undertake a review of a contractor's registration status where the overall performance of the contractor has been determined as 2 stars, dependent on the factors that led to this performance ranking.

Such review may result in a sanction (e.g. downgrade or suspension of registration for a specified period of time, or cancellation of registration) being applied to the contractor in terms of their eligibility to tender on future government building contracts procured through the PQC System.

Where the overall performance of a contractor has been determined to be 3 stars or higher, no further action will be required by the PQC Registrar.

4.2 Ethical Supplier Mandate

In the case where a contractor's performance on any of the below evaluation criteria has been graded as unsatisfactory or poor in a performance report, the approving officer or approving officer's management (whichever is applicable) is to send a copy of the performance report to the department procuring the project:

- industrial relations management
- workplace health and safety management
- compliance with *Building and Construction Training Policy*
- compliance with *Queensland Charter for Local Content*.

(Note: these evaluation criteria relate to the "Best practice principles: Quality, safe workplaces" guide).

The department procuring the project will then review the performance report and determine if any investigation/action is necessary under the Ethical Supplier Mandate.

Refer [Ethical Supplier Mandate](#) for further information.

5.0 Privacy of information

All personal information held by the Department of Housing and Public Works is subject to the *Information Privacy Act 2009* which aims to provide safeguards for the handling of personal information in the public-sector environment, and to allow access to and amendment of personal information.

The Department of Housing and Public Works may share information relating to a contractor's performance with other relevant government and industry entities for the purpose of reviewing or monitoring the contractor's performance.

The Department of Housing and Public Works manages prequalification information on a whole-of-Government basis. Under the Conditions of Prequalification, it is deemed that the contractor has given consent for their name, title and work contact information to be collected and used for reporting activities without specific authorisation.

Attachment 1: Procedure for completing a performance report

Step 1 – reporting process

The latest version of the [performance report template](#) must be used.

The reporting officer (e.g. Superintendent’s Representative; site representative) is to consider the contractor’s performance under the contract and grade each of the evaluation criteria listed on the performance report template as either “unsatisfactory”, “poor”, “satisfactory”, “good” or “superior” in line with the performance metrics outlined in **Attachment 2**.

Note: An “unsatisfactory” or “superior” grading recorded on a performance report should be accompanied by relevant documentation to support such grading being given by the reporting officer.

The reporting officer is to complete section 1 and provide a copy of the report to the contractor’s representative, who is to complete section 2 of the report and return it to the reporting officer. In some cases, it may be beneficial for the reporting officer and contractor’s representative to meet and discuss the assessment, particularly in the case where poor performance has been identified on the report.

Where a performance report reflects issues with a contractor, the reporting officer is to also forward a copy of the report to the PQC Registrar. The PQC Registrar will advise the contractor in writing that a performance report has been received with issues raised, which requires the contractor to promptly respond to the reporting officer.

The reporting officer is to then forward the report and any relevant documents to the approving officer (e.g. Superintendent; principal’s representative) for review and approval.

Step 2 – approval process

The approving officer is to consider the contents of the report (including any attachments) and complete section 3. If the approving officer supports the comments previously made, they can forward the report to the PQC Registrar (pqcregistrar@hpw.qld.gov.au).

However, if the approving officer makes additional comments that could be considered to be “unfavourable toward the contractor”, then the contractor’s representative/management is to be provided with a right of reply under the provisions of natural justice. In such case, the approving officer is to forward the report to the contractor’s representative/management to complete section 4, with the report to be returned to the approving officer.

Where there is significant challenge by any party, the approving officer is to forward the report to the approving officer’s management for consideration and addressing as appropriate with the contractor’s management.

The approving officer’s management is to complete section 5 of the report and forward it to the PQC Registrar (pqcregistrar@hpw.qld.gov.au).

Notes:

1. The department procuring the project may be required to review the performance report and determine if any investigation/action is necessary under the Ethical Supplier Mandate (refer section 4.2 for further information).
2. There is also provision for final sign off by a Client Representative (to provide an opportunity for the client department to view the performance report before it is submitted to the PQC Registrar) at step 6, if required. This may be necessary if a client department:

- wishes to provide feedback on the contractor's performance in addition to that provided by the reporting officer and approving officer
- has engaged Building and Asset Services, Department of Housing and Public Works to manage the contract on its behalf and wishes to be involved in the performance reporting process.

Step 3 – recording process

Upon receipt of a performance report, the PQC Registrar is to review the report and any attachments (for completeness) and:

- a) request (if necessary) that the reporting officer, approving officer and/or approving officer's management provide further information in relation to any assessed criteria or clarification of any issues
- b) record the results of the performance report against the contractor's registration in the PQC Database.

Attachment 2: Evaluation criteria and performance metrics

The following metrics are to be used by the reporting officer (e.g. Superintendent’s Representative) when assessing and grading a contractor’s performance against the specified evaluation criteria on the performance report template.

An “unsatisfactory” or “superior” grading recorded on a performance report should be accompanied by relevant documentation to support such grading being given by the reporting officer.

	Quality – the standard of the contractor’s work				
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
	Number of defects/non-conformances identified during construction or when the project was offered for Practical Completion is considered <u>excessive</u> and unsatisfactory for a contract of this value/complexity	Number of defects/non-conformances identified during construction or when the project was offered for Practical Completion is considered <u>high</u> for a contract of this value/complexity	Number of defects/non-conformances identified during construction or when the project was offered for Practical Completion is considered <u>average</u> for a contract of this value/complexity	Number of defects/non-conformances identified during construction or when the project was offered for Practical Completion is considered <u>low</u> for a contract of this value/complexity	Number of defects/non-conformances identified during construction or when the project was offered for Practical Completion is considered <u>very low</u> for a contract of this value/complexity
	Quality – the standard of the contractor’s contract documentation (e.g. submissions and construction program)				
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
	Less than 70% of documentation provided is accurate and complete	70% or more of documentation provided is accurate and complete	80% or more of documentation provided is accurate and complete	90% or more of documentation provided is accurate and complete	100% of documentation provided is accurate and complete

Time – the extent to which the contractor adhered to contract timeframes					
Project Duration	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
Up to 6 months	More than 10% late	4 to 10% late	On time or up to 4% late	Up to 4% early	More than 4% early
6 months to 18 months	More than 7% late	3 to 7% late	On time or up to 3% late	Up to 3% early	More than 3% early
More than 18 months	More than 5% late	2 to 5% late	On time or up to 2% late	Up to 2% early	More than 2% early
Time – the contractor’s responsiveness in the rectification of <u>major</u> non-conformances and defects					
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
	Less than 75% of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	75% or more of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	85% or more of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	95% or more of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	100% of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days
Time – the contractor’s responsiveness in the rectification of <u>minor</u> non-conformances and defects					
	Less than 75% of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	75% or more of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	85% or more of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	95% or more of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days	100% of defects/non-conformances rectified within the specified number of working days

Time – the contractor’s timeliness in delivering submissions / other documentation required under the contract					
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
	Contractor has been requested five or more times by the Superintendent’s Representative (SR) to provide documentation required under the contract	Contractor has been requested more than twice by the SR to provide documentation required under the contract	Contractor has been requested twice by the SR to provide documentation required under the contract	Contractor has been requested once by the SR to provide documentation required under the contract	Contractor has provided all documentation required under the contract within the timeframe specified without request from the SR
Communication – the contractor’s level of communication with the client/project participants					
	Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
	The contractor has failed to effectively communicate during the project e.g. evidenced by the contractor repeatedly: demonstrating an uncooperative approach; not returning phone calls or emails to project team members; missing or arriving late for project meetings without notice; not responding in a timely manner to requests by the Superintendent’s Representative (SR) to provide information	The contractor has on a number of occasions been unwilling to cooperate or communicate openly	The contractor has on most occasions effectively communicated and generally demonstrated a cooperative approach	The contractor cooperated and communicated well in all matters relating to the contract	The contractor has excelled in communicating and cooperating with the SR, Project Manager and the client

Environmental Management – <i>the contractor’s level of compliance with legislative requirements and management of environmental matters</i>				
Unsatisfactory (any of the below applied)	Poor	Satisfactory (all of the below applied)	Good	Superior
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor failed to comply with legislative requirements • Minor non-conformances were identified, which were actioned poorly • A notifiable environmental incident occurred which could have been avoided if the contractor had appropriate environmental controls in place 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor complied with legislative requirements • Minor non-conformances were identified, which were always actioned promptly and effectively • No notifiable environmental incidents occurred 	N/A	N/A
Subcontractor Management – <i>the head contractor’s management of subcontractors</i>				
Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
Head contractor has not met all contractual requirements in relation to engagement of subcontractors	N/A	Head contractor has met all contractual requirements in relation to engagement of subcontractors	N/A	N/A

Industrial Relations Management – <i>the contractor’s management of industrial relations matters</i>					
	Unsatisfactory (any of the below applied)		Satisfactory (all of the below applied)	Good	Superior
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor did not maintain a cooperative workplace environment • An IR incident occurred (other than unprotected industrial action), which could have been avoided if the contractor had taken reasonable and timely action 	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor maintained a cooperative workplace environment • Contractor identified and resolved any IR issues within the contractor’s control 	N/A	N/A

Workplace Health and Safety Management – <i>the contractor’s level of compliance with contract / legislative requirements and management of health and safety matters</i>				
Unsatisfactory (any of the below applied)	Poor (any of the below applied)	Satisfactory (all of the below applied)	Good (all of the below applied)	Superior (all of the below applied)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A major non-conformance (PQC category 1) was identified during a site inspection • Contractor failed a site inspection and failed to rectify identified non-conformances in a timely manner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor failed to comply with contract and legislative requirements • Contractor failed a site inspection (due to accumulation of 25 or more demerit points relating to PQC category 2 and 3 non-conformances) • Non-conformances (PQC category 2 and 3) were identified during a site inspection, which were not rectified promptly by the contractor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor complied with all contract and legislative requirements • Non-conformances (PQC category 2 and 3) were identified during a site inspection, which were rectified promptly by the contractor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor complied with all contract and legislative requirements • Only minor non-conformances (PQC category 3) were identified during a site inspection, which were rectified promptly by the contractor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor complied with all contract and legislative requirements • No non-conformances (PQC Category 1-3) were identified

Compliance with Queensland Government Building and Construction Training Policy – the contractor’s level of compliance with the policy				
Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	
Contractor failed to comply with contract or policy requirements	N/A	Contractor has met the compliance hours required and submitted the appropriate documentation in the Training Policy Administration System - TPAS (i.e. compliance plan, compliance hours, practical completion report including Indigenous Economic Opportunities Plan with outcomes where applicable) as per contract conditions	N/A	N/A
Compliance with Queensland Charter for Local Content – the contractor’s level of compliance with the policy				
Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior
Contractor failed to comply with contract or policy requirements	N/A	Contractor complied with contract and policy requirements	N/A	N/A

Compliance with non-price criteria – <i>the contractor's level of compliance with its non-price tender responses</i>				
Unsatisfactory	Poor	Satisfactory	Good (all of the below applied)	Superior (all of the below applied)
Contractor failed to comply with its non-price tender responses	Contractor complied with some of its non-price tender responses	Contractor complied with all its non-price tender responses.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor complied with all its non-price tender responses • Exceeded expectations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contractor complied with all its non-price tender responses • Exceeded expectations • Added unexpected value/improvement/innovative approach

Note: Evaluation criteria such as “Compliance with Queensland Charter for Local Content” and “Compliance with Non-Price Criteria” may not be applicable to all contracts. In such cases, “Not Applicable” is to be recorded on the performance report template.

Attachment 3: Contractor performance report template

Date:		Contractor:				
Project Name:		Project Number:				
Contract start date:		Percentage complete:				
Date for practical completion:		Date of practical completion:				
Contractor's representative	Name:	Position:			Email:	
	Phone:					
<p>Assessing a contractor's performance – reporting officers are to use the table of performance metrics in the <u>Prequalification (PQC) System – contractor performance reporting guideline</u> to determine the appropriate grading to be used below. Please check one box only.</p> <p>Ethical Supplier Mandate (ESM) - where a contractor's performance on any evaluation criteria marked with an * has been graded as <u>unsatisfactory or poor</u>, the approving officer or approving officer's management (whichever is applicable) is to send a copy of the performance report to the <u>department procuring the project</u> (for possible investigation/action in accordance with the ESM).</p>						
Evaluation criteria		Unsatisfactory (comments and supporting documentation to be provided)	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior (comments and supporting documentation to be provided)
Quality – contractor's work <i>Comments:</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Quality – contractor's contract documentation (e.g. submissions and construction program) <i>Comments:</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation criteria	Unsatisfactory (comments and supporting documentation to be provided)	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior (comments and supporting documentation to be provided)
Time – adherence to contract timeframes <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Time – rectification of <u>major</u> non-conformances and defects <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Time – rectification of <u>minor</u> non-conformances and defects <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Time – delivery of submissions / other documentation required under the contract <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Evaluation criteria	Unsatisfactory (comments and supporting documentation to be provided)	Poor	Satisfactory	Good	Superior (comments and supporting documentation to be provided)
Environmental management <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A
Subcontractor management <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A
* Industrial relations management <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A
* Workplace health and safety management <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
* Compliance with Building and Construction Training Policy <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A
* Compliance with Queensland Charter for Local Content <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A	N/A
Compliance with non-price criteria <input type="checkbox"/> N/A <i>Comments:</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments and Sign Off	
1	Reporting officer - comments and sign off (e.g. Superintendent’s representative; site representative)
	Name: Position: Signature: Date: In my opinion:
2	Contractor’s representative - comments and sign off (complete and return to reporting officer)
	Name: Position: Signature: Date: In my opinion: <u>Feedback on performance of project team</u> Did members of the project team (e.g. Principal, Superintendent’s representative, project manager) adequately fulfil their functions and obligations under the contract e.g. meeting timeframes, quality of Principal’s contract documentation? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Please provide comments below, including supporting documentation (e.g. as recorded through relevant contract conditions) In my opinion:

3 Approving officer - comments and sign off (e.g. superintendent; principal's representative) Note: Must be a departmental employee
Name: Position: Signature: Date: In my opinion:
If comments at 3 are unfavourable toward the contractor go to 4 . If not, forward completed report to pqceregistrar@hpw.qld.gov.au (refer note 3 below)
4 Contractor's representative / management – comments and sign off (complete and return to approving officer)
Name: Position: Signature: Date: In my opinion:
Where the comments provided in the report are significantly challenged by any of the parties above, this report is to be forwarded to the approving officer's management – go to 5
5 Approving officer's management - comments and sign off. Note: Must be a departmental employee
Name: Position: Signature: Date: In my opinion:
Forward completed report to pqceregistrar@hpw.qld.gov.au (refer note 3 below)

6 Optional (see note 3 below) Client representative sign off
Name: Position: Signature: Date: Comments:
Complete and return to the approving officer / approving officer's management (whichever is applicable) for onforwarding to the PQC Registrar

Notes:

- 1. As a minimum, the report must be completed and signed at sign-off points 1, 2 and 3 if the report has been agreed with the contractor's representative and there is nothing at sign-off point 3 which could be considered detrimental to the contractor.**
- 2. Where comments and opinions are unfavourable towards the contractor, an opportunity to review and comment must be provided to the contractor's representative / contractor's management as required under the provision of natural justice (i.e. sign-off point 4).**
- 3. If required, there is provision on the performance report template at step 6 for final sign off by a Client Representative (to provide an opportunity for a client department to view the completed performance report before it is submitted to the PQC Registrar). This may be necessary if a client department has engaged Building and Asset Services, Department of Housing and Public Works to manage the contract on its behalf.**

Privacy Notice

The Department of Housing and Public Works is collecting the information on this form for the purpose of reviewing the contractor's technical and management performance, and compliance with contractual, statutory, government policy and prequalification requirements. In accordance with the Queensland Government's Prequalification (PQC) System, contractors engaged through the PQC System are required to contribute to the completion of performance reports on the service they provide.

The Department of Housing and Public Works may share this information with other relevant government and industry entities for the purpose of reviewing or monitoring the contractor's performance.

This information will not otherwise be disclosed to any other third party without the contractor's consent, unless authorised or required by law.