

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme		1. Health and Safety		
Measure		1.1 Effective management of workforce health and safety		
Scope of measure		The Service Provider is managing the health and safety of the workforce and is completing RSAs within the required timeframe with resultant actions being completed.		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	1.1b) The number of Joint Safety tours or audits undertaken and actions raised are effectively actioned	The number of joint safety tours or audits that are undertaken and completed, along with the resolution of actions raised.	None undertaken / No Data	0
AD - M&R			1-3 per year but no resulting actions, that are due in quarter, effectively addressed	2
AD - Design			1-3 per year with some resulting actions, that are due in quarter, effectively addressed	4
AD - CWF			1 per quarter and all resulting actions, that are due in quarter, effectively addressed	6
AD - SG&S			2 per quarter and all resulting actions, that are due in quarter, effectively addressed	8
			3 per quarter or more and all resulting actions, that are due in quarter, effectively addressed	10
Methodology		Suppliers and contractors are to report and record their participation at joint site safety tours or site audits. The joint site tours or site audits must be with at least one other community member or a Highways England Representative with the visit being formally recorded on the day by the hosting supplier. Records, of who the visiting parties were, outcomes and subsequent actions, if any, are to be made available for auditing by Highways England if requested. Should the visiting supplier, or Highways England representative, be unable to attend and participate in a prearranged joint safety tour or audit it is expected that this would be formalised by a communication to the hosting supplier outlining the reason for non-attendance. This may be a consideration on the local area finalisation of the supplier quarterly score. The scoring will be on a quarterly rolling basis. The measure supports community collaboration and learning together with the sharing of good health and safety practice.		
Data Source		Supplier Data		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Quarterly		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	1.1c) Effective site access inductions.	The percentage of operatives sent to the Principal Contractors induction, passes the induction and fulfils the criteria to permit entry to site.	No data	0
AD - M&R			< 95% of operatives pass induction & are permitted site entry	2
AD - Design			≥ 95% and < 100% of operatives pass induction & are permitted site entry	4
AD - CWF			100% of operatives pass induction & are permitted site entry	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard sustained for 3 consecutive months.	8
			Achieve Blue (8) score and can evidence that no AirtWeb H&S submissions have been raised in relation to all inductees within 6 months of completing induction.	10
Methodology		The effective achievement of a successful induction for CWF Contractors when attending site. The reasons for failures could include the lack of CSCS card, D&A test failure or turning up unannounced and not being booked onto the induction session. The measure combines a mixture of the operatives' competence, their ability to complete the site induction and the supplier's administrative processes. Scoring is presented as a percentage.		
Data Source		Supplier Data The CWF suppliers are to provide the data on the number of site inductions undertaken by their staff, the number sent, the number successful passing the induction and providing the correct documentation to be allowed onto site, the number of not being allowed onto the site after the induction has been completed, the reason for any failure and subsequently not being allowed on site.		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Monthly		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	1.1d) Effective and timely completion of H&S files to support delivery projects.	The completion and timeliness of the supply of the H&S files on completion of the project or scheme	No data	0
AD - M&R			>5 working days later than deadline as described in methodology.	2
AD - Design			Up to 5 working days later than deadline as described in methodology.	4
AD - CWF			Met deadline as described in methodology.	6
AD - SG&S			Up to 3 working days ahead of deadline as described in methodology.	8
			>3 working days ahead of deadline as described in methodology.	10
Methodology		The metric measures the timing of the submission of the project/scheme Health and Safety files on completion of the project/scheme in order to ensure supplier collaboration, compliance and good practice. The Construction Works Framework partners, subcontractors and suppliers are to provide the Principal Contractor with the relevant information for the health and safety file to ensure timely submission. The Principal Contractor is to provide their own information and supply information from CWF partners, subcontractors and suppliers to the Principal Designer in order that the health & safety file can be continually updated via the as-built records. The Principal Designer then compiles final health & safety file to include as-built records, design information, operation and maintenance manuals and other related as-built information required for the successful completion of the health & safety file. Health and Safety File deadlines (deadlines include testing) • The Construction Works Framework partners, subcontractors and suppliers to provide the Principal Contractor with all relevant information within two weeks of completion of the project or scheme. • The Principal Contractor to provide all relevant information to the Principal Designer within two weeks of receipt of all information from The Construction Works Framework partners and suppliers . • The Principal Designer to provide all relevant information to Highways England within four weeks of receipt of all information from the Principle contractor . The health and safety file is defined as a file appropriate to the characteristics of the project, containing relevant health and safety information to be taken into account during any subsequent project. The file must contain information about the current project likely to be needed to ensure health and safety during any subsequent work, such as maintenance, cleaning, refurbishment or demolition.		
Data Source		Supplier Data The Principal Contractor and Principal Design Contractor will supply data on the timing of the delivery of the health and safety file		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Monthly		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	1.1e) Percentage of scheduled Road Safety Audits (RSAs) with all outstanding actions completed to programme	The percentage of scheduled and outstanding RSAs completed to programme along with outstanding actions due in the period.	No Data	0
AD - M&R			Less than 90% of scheduled and outstanding RSAs completed AND less than 90% actions completed (OR Less than 90% outstanding RSA actions completed to the required time if there are no audits required in month).	2
AD - Design			90% to <100% of scheduled and outstanding RSAs completed AND <90% actions completed to the required time.	4
AD - CWF			100% of scheduled and outstanding RSAs completed AND <90% actions completed to the required time (or no actions due in period).	6
AD - SG&S			100% of scheduled and outstanding RSAs completed AND 90 - <100% of outstanding RSA actions also completed to the required time.	8
			100% of scheduled and outstanding RSAs completed AND 100% of outstanding RSA actions also completed to the required time.	10
Methodology		Service Provider provides number of scheduled RSAs, and the percentage of RSAs completed to programme for RAG scores. Additionally, the proportion of resulting actions that have been completed on time is required to satisfy Blue (8) and Blue+ (10). This relates to all resulting actions – ones that were due in the period and the backlog. The Service Provider submits evidence of a backlog plan being in place to deal with any outstanding actions. Where no audits are required in month enter -999999 against the 'Percentage of scheduled RSAs' completed row. Similarly, if there are no actions due to be completed in month then enter -999999 against the 'Percentage of actions from scheduled RSAs completed' row.		
Data Source		Service Provider's RSA records		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard		
Data input frequency		RSAs: reported each calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	1. Health and Safety
-------	----------------------

Measure	1.2 Minimise accidents
Scope of measure	The Service Provider is measuring the frequency of accidents and incidents.

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	1.2a) RIDDOR Accident Frequency Rate (AFR)	The current RIDDOR accident frequency for the Service Provider's organisation	No Data	0
AD - M&R			AFR > 0.13	2
AD - Design			AFR 0.13 ≤ and > 0.08	4
AD - CWF			AFR 0.08 ≤ and > 0.03	6
AD - SG&S			AFR 0 > and ≤ 0.03	8
			AFR = 0	10
Methodology		AFR information is supplied as stated in IAN 128/15/Ar via AIRSWeb. AFR is calculated as all accidents reportable under RIDDOR in the rolling 12 month period, divided by the total number of hours worked in that period by the Service Provider's organisation, multiplied by 100,000. Reporting incidents under RIDDOR are: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reportable deaths and major injuries• Reportable over-seven-day injuries• Reportable disease		
Data Source		AIRSWeb records		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		RIDDOR: this measure reflects performance on a rolling 12 month basis ending in the last month of the reporting period. The metrics are continuous across contract renewals, where the supplier remains the same.		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	1.2b) Severity-weighted Accident Frequency Rate (SWAFR) of the supply chain.	The severity-weighted accident frequency rate over a 12 month rolling average per 100,000 hours worked that includes non-RIDDOR minor injuries. SWAFR focuses on the outcome of accidents in terms of the severity of injury.	No Data	0
AD - M&R			SWAFR > 1.71	2
AD - Design			SWAFR 1.71 ≤ and > 1.37	4
AD - CWF			SWAFR 1.37 ≤ and > 1.00	6
AD - SG&S			SWAFR 1.00 ≤ and > 0	8
			SWAFR = 0	10
Methodology		<p>Severity Weighted Accident Frequency Rate is a broader measure of safety performance by also incorporating non-RIDDOR (Minor) reported accidents and numerating them in order of magnitude and impact; whereby:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Fatality (RIDDOR-reportable) = 200• Specified (RIDDOR-reportable) = 20• Lost Time > 7 days (RIDDOR-reportable) = 1• Minor Injuries (Non-RIDDOR) = 0.2 Lost Time ≥1day and ≤ 7 days <p>The implication of this scale is that the measure considers a major injury as the equivalent of 20 over seven-day reportable injuries. A fatality will be considered as the equivalent of 10 major injuries and 200 over seven-day reportable injuries. The relative scale used for the SWAFR is determined by the (societal) costs of injuries provided in the Department for Transport's (DfT's) Transport analysis Guidance (WebTAG). The benchmark figure for green is based on the national rolling 12 month average of 1.37 in January 2018 and red is based on 2011-12 of 1.71.</p>		
Data Source		AIRSWeb records		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		SWAFR: this measure reflects performance on a rolling 12 month basis ending in the last month of the reporting period. The metrics are continuous across contract renewals, where the supplier remains the same.		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	3. Customer Service
-------	---------------------

Measure	3.1 Minimise Customer Delay
Scope of measure	To optimise journey times for customers by providing good information to road-users thus enabling effective decision-making. When incidents do occur, react promptly and return network to use as soon as practicably possible to reduce the impact upon the travelling public.

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.1a) Incident response/clearance: HE-led	Incidents - Achieving the performance requirement levels in Table 3.1 for all Service Provider attended Highways England led incidents, duration from lane closure through to lane opening (Performance Metric 2)	No data	0
AD - M&R			less than 80%	2
AD - Design			80 to <100%	4
AD - CWF			100%	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved AND incidents cleared, on average, 50% ahead of target time.	8
			Green standard achieved AND incidents cleared, on average, 60% ahead of target time.	10
Methodology		Incident response & clearance: AMOR Part 3, Table 3.1, outlines the different combinations of the fields Road Type/Emergency Services Present/Time of Day/Road Traffic Levels against which Incidents are cleared rapidly can be scored. All combinations may not occur during the qualifying period, in which case those combinations not occurring should be excluded from calculations. Each of the combinations is assessed to determine if the Service Provider has met the relevant target, and an overall score of the targets met as a percentage of the total applicable combinations is calculated Performance Metric 2 For each combination (maximum 9, does not apply to incidents where Emergency Services present) the mean of (Lane Opening) – (Lane Closure) for incidents in the qualifying period is compared to the target time and a pass or fail is awarded *Note: ASC to refer to the Asset Support Contract (ASC) Incident table and AD to refer to the Asset Delivery Incident table see Incident Data Standard(IDSA)		
Data Source		Incident logs and performance reports		
Data Standard		Incident Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.1b) Incident response/clearance: Emergency Services-led	Incidents - Achieving the performance requirement levels in Table 3.1 from incident command handover from the Emergency Services to Highways England, through to lane opening (Performance Metric 3)	No data	0
AD - M&R			less than 80%	2
AD - Design			80 to <100%	4
AD - CWF			100%	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved AND incidents cleared, on average, 50% ahead of target time.	8
			Green standard achieved AND incidents cleared, on average, 60% ahead of target time.	10
Methodology		Incident response & clearance: AMOR Part 3, Table 3.1, outlines the different combinations of the fields Road Type/Emergency Services Present/Time of Day/Road Traffic Levels against which Incidents are cleared rapidly can be scored. All combinations may not occur during the qualifying period, in which case those combinations not occurring should be excluded from calculations. Each of the combinations is assessed to determine if the Service Provider has met the relevant target, and an overall score of the targets met as a percentage of the total applicable combinations is calculated Performance metric 3 For each combination (maximum 9, applies to incidents where Emergency Services present only) the mean of (Lane Opening) – (CMD_HANDOVER_DATE_TIME) for incidents in the qualifying period is compared to the target time and a pass or fail is awarded *Note: ASC to refer to the Asset Support Contract (ASC) Incident table and AD to refer to the Asset Delivery Incident table see Incident Data Standard(IDSA)		
Data Source		Incident logs and performance reports		
Data Standard		Incident Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	3. Customer Service
-------	---------------------

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.1c) NOMs: Measured management of Network Occupancy	Consolidated' measure summarising performance against the six operational level indicators:	No data	0
AD - M&R		KPI 1: Real time updating of Network Event Manager (NEM) for Starts	< 85%	2
AD - Design		KPI 2: Real time updating of Network Event Manager (NEM) for Stops	85% to < 95%	4
AD - CWF		KPI 3: Overruns	95% to < 97%	6
AD - SG&S		KPI 4: Postponements	97% to < 99%	8
		KPI 5: Cancellations	99% to 100%	10
			KPI 6: Network Event Manager (NEM) not updated	
Methodology		Measures the supplier's cumulative performance of a series of six KPI levers that individually indicate effective management of the key components for co-ordinating the NOMs system and therefore managing occupancy on the network. The 'umbrella' performance metric is an average of the discrete operational indicators, which are detailed in the supporting guidance: <i>Basic scoping of the 24/7 and non-24/7 KPI reports</i> [linked] sets out criteria:		
		KPI 1 - measures the timeliness of capturing the recorded actual start time of a scheduled item(s) in a network event. * NOMs to be updated with actual start time within a period between 20min before / 5min after recorded start time.		
		KPI 2 - measures the timeliness of capturing the recorded actual stop time of a scheduled item(s) in a network event. * NOMs to be updated with actual stop time within a period between 5min before / 20min after recorded stop time.		
		KPI 3 - measures that the system is updated with a revised Schedule Item Stop Time when the latest Planned Schedule Stop Time is known to be going to overrun . * Planned Schedule Stop time to be updated prior to, or up to 5mins after the Planned Schedule Stop time.		
		KPI 4 - measures the timeliness of capturing a postponement of any Scheduled Item (s) in a network event. * NOMs to be updated with a revised planned start time no later than 20mins after the latest planned start time.		
		KPI 5 - measures the timeliness of capturing a cancellation of any Scheduled Item(s) in a network event. * Cancel schedule action to be executed no later than 20mins after the latest planned start time.		
		KPI 6 - measures the number of instances where Network Event Manager (NEM) should have been updated for any of the above KPIs, but was not updated (excluding any update required which resulted in a failure of KPIs 3, 4 and 5). * Refers to a Planned Schedule Start and/or Planned Schedule Stop that is more than 20mins in the past and does not have an Actual Start, Actual Stop or Cancel date/time associated with it.		
		AD: Joint delivery of the NOMs metric between HE and suppliers will be recognised through the RAG score therefore responsibility is then not solely with the supplier, and will aid with representing the end to end customer experience to which all parties may contribute towards.		
		The metric will be measured at area level not by individual supplier, therefore, M&R and CWF within Asset Delivery will share their overall performance score.		
		For this metric, where scores represent an Area score, rather than a score which is attributed purely to an individual supplier, then QMPs and NCRs should not be raised for Asset Delivery contracts (only).		
		*Note: Network Event Manager (NEM) is a component of the Network Occupancy Management (NOMs) system and is measured at area level. NOMs has superseded Schedule of Roadworks (SRW).		
Data Source		Network Occupancy Management (NOMs)		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	3. Customer Service
-------	---------------------

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.1g) Severe Weather: Appropriate precautionary salting provided	The percentage of precautionary treatments for each route (including turnaround where applicable) delivered within the precautionary treatment and turnaround time as stated within the Severe Weather Plan	No data	0
AD - M&R			<98% treatments within target time	2
AD - Design			98% to <100% treatments within target time	4
AD - CWF			100% treatments within target time	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved for two consecutive months. Awarded on the second instance onwards.	8
			Green standard is achieved for four consecutive months. Awarded on the fourth instance onwards.	10
Methodology		In the Winter Period these metrics should always be scored. To achieve a green a salting run must have been carried out. Outside of the Winter Period it should be scored N/S unless severe winter weather conditions were experienced in which case it should be scored as per the RAG guidance. All occurrences of routes not treated within target time must be included. If it is felt that the occurrence was outside of the Service Provider's control, this should be reflected in the scoring and the associated comments. To achieve blue or blue+, 2 or 4 months consecutive performance at the green standard is required. Blue and blue+ will be reset over the summer period; any green standard scored in the preceding winter will not contribute to the blue or blue+ scoring in the following winter.		
Data Source		Service Provider records		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.1h) Severe Weather: Instances of running lanes being available in accordance with the Severe Weather Plan	Percentage of instances where running lanes were available in accordance with the Severe Weather Plan as provided by the Service Provider	No data	0
AD - M&R			<98% availability of running lanes	2
AD - Design			98% to <100% availability of running lanes	4
AD - CWF			100% availability of running lanes	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved for three consecutive months. Awarded on the third instance onwards.	8
			Green standard is achieved for six consecutive months. Awarded on the sixth instance onwards.	10
Methodology		In the Winter Period these metrics should always be scored. Outside of the Winter Period it should be scored N/S unless severe weather conditions were experienced in which case it should be scored as per the RAG guidance All incidences of running lane unavailability must be included - if it is felt that the incident was outside of the Service Provider's control, this should be reflected in the scoring and the associated comments. Highways England regions should check reported instances against known issues.		
Data Source		Service Provider records		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Measure	3.3 Driving customer satisfaction
Scope of measure	Ensuring that aspects of maintenance and management on the network that have been highlighted in surveys as being significant influences on customer satisfaction are effectively managed. Driving good correspondence with our customers when they engage with Highways England.

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.3a) Litter clearance is undertaken in accordance with AMOR requirements (ASC) or the accepted programme set out in CRMDP (AD)	Percentage of planned litter clearance activities that were actually completed as required by AMOR / CRMDP	No data	0
AD - M&R			less than 95%	2
AD - Design			95 to <100%	4
AD - CWF			100% litter clearance as per AMOR requirements	6
AD - SG&S			6 criteria met AND supplier can provide evidence of one or more litter management activities (in line with the litter management strategy, and as approved by the National Litter Working Group) which have been accepted as notable best practice by Highways England.	8
			6 AND 8 criteria met and supplier can evidence that best practice identified and accepted within the definition of the 8 scoring criteria has been either (i) deployed on a contract delivered by another Supplier or (ii) led to Highways England processes being changed and improved	10
Methodology		ASC refer to AMOR Part 15 to understand what elements of sweeping and cleaning are in and out of scope. This requirement is defined as delivering full litter clearance of motorway hard shoulders, verges, paved areas and amenity areas to Grade A of EPA Code of Practice on Litter and Refuse. Compliance with this standard of cleanliness on the network is determined by the Maintenance Requirements Plan (MRP). AD to refer to the Cyclic and Reactive Maintenance Delivery Plan and the Required Level of Service (CRMDP).		
Data Source		Service Provider's inspection, sweeping and cleaning records. Evidence of approval from the National Litter Working Group is required for blue and blue+ scores. One piece of approved best practice applies for 3 months of scoring. After the three month duration, a new piece of evidence is required to maintain blue or blue+ scores.		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.3h) Percentage of sampled correspondence that meets HE quality assessment criteria	Percentage of randomly sampled customer correspondence that satisfies the Correspondence Quality Scorecard requirements	No data	0
AD - M&R			<70% quality target achieved	2
AD - Design			70 to <90% quality target achieved	4
AD - CWF			90 to <95% quality target achieved	6
AD - SG&S			95 to <98% quality target achieved	8
			98 to 100% quality target achieved	10
Methodology		As per the Highways England writing reactive customer correspondence guidance document. Percentage of randomly sampled customer correspondence that satisfies the Correspondence Quality Scorecard requirements.		
Data Source		Highways England customer development team		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	3. Customer Service
-------	---------------------

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.3i) Workforce Understanding of Customer Service	Percentage of workforce completing customer service survey	No data	0
AD - M&R			Survey completed by <10% of the workforce	2
AD - Design			Survey completed by ≥10% of the workforce and <25%	4
AD - CWF			Survey completed by ≥ 25% of the workforce and <50%	6
AD - SG&S			Survey completed by ≥ 50% of the workforce and <75%	8
			Survey completed by ≥ 75% of the workforce (including Tier 2s)	10
Methodology	<p>3.3i) "Customer service is intrinsically linked to customer satisfaction - it's important that our entire workforce are aware of who our customers are, their needs, and how to address those needs"</p> <p>The supplier workforce will complete a short online customer service survey, comprising of a series of multiple-choice questions. The survey is expected to take around 15 minutes to complete, and supplier staff and workers will complete the test once-a-year.</p> <p>Highways England will collate and communicate the number of surveys completed each quarter, and the supplier is expected to demonstrate the total size of its workforce - the number of staff and workers associated with HE works for over one month within the preceding 12 months - and to provide evidence if requested (which may be audited by HE).</p> <p>The supplier will be recognised for the proportion of staff/workers who have completed the survey to date at the time of scoring (not the score achieved). The green standard will be attained by those who have a quarter of their workforce complete it, with a view that 100% would complete within 12 months (personnel will not be required to complete the test more than once every 12 months). Higher scores will be attained for exceeding this threshold and including Tier 2 workforce (where applicable).</p> <p>*Note: Link to the survey is as follows: https://www.surveymonkey.co.uk/r/R7V5DY7.</p>			
Data Source	HE customer survey data			
Data Standard	Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Rolling quarterly, the same score applies for 3 months.			

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.3j) Customer satisfaction - Litter	Customer litter contact score, based on customer compliments and complaints through the Customer Contact Centre divided by traffic volume	No data	0
AD - M&R			Total contact score is less than -30	2
AD - Design			Total contact score is less than -10 and ≥ -30	4
AD - CWF			Total contact score is -10 or greater	6
AD - SG&S			Total contact score is -10 or greater, and improves by 25% or more	8
			Total contact score is -10 or greater, and improves by 75% or more	10
Methodology		<p>3.3j) "Litter management is a high profile issue that has a significant impact on customer satisfaction, which is reflected in the interactions that HE has with our customers through the Customer Contact Centre"</p> <p>The volume of litter-related customer compliments and (stage one) complaints handled by the Highways England Customer Contact Centre will be tracked per Area. Points will be assigned to each type of customer contact, in accordance with the impact and significance (compliment = 5 points, complaint = -3 points).</p> <p>HE will calculate a weighted customer litter contact score by aggregating the total points for the preceding 12 months (in order to account for seasonal variations) and dividing this by the traffic volume for the area (for comparability); this score (per billion vehicles) will be communicated with suppliers on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>The supplier will be recognised for increasing the customer litter contact score, with an emphasis on delivering positive customer outcomes - keeping down the number of complaints while maximising the number of compliments - and the highest scores will be attained where the score has been significantly improved quarter-on-quarter.</p> <p>*Note: Traffic volume will be based on 12 months traffic volume to account for seasonal variation.</p>		
Data Source		3.3j) Customer Call Centre log		
Data Standard		3.3i-l) Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		3.3i-l) Rolling quarterly, the same score applies for 3 months.		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.3k) Customer satisfaction - Personal injury and vehicle damage	Number of customer claims (cumulative 12-month total) passed on to the supplier divided by area traffic volume	No data	0
AD - M&R			Claims score of more than 6	2
AD - Design			Claims score of > 2 and ≤ 6	4
AD - CWF			Claims score of ≤ 2	6
AD - SG&S			Claims score of ≤ 2, and improves by 25% or more	8
			Claims score of ≤ 2, and improves by 50% or more	10
Methodology	3.3k) "Significant customer dissatisfaction results from personal injury, damage caused to vehicles and property, which can be alleviated by addressing the root cause of the damage, and will result in fewer 'red claims'" The number of claims made by our customers and passed on to the supplier (the point at which the handling of the claim is taken on by the supplier to deal with, having not provided adequate evidence to refute the claim) is tracked HE will calculate a red claim score by aggregating this data for the preceding 12 months and dividing it by traffic volume for the given area, and will be communicated on a periodic basis The supplier will be recognised for keeping the number of red claims, to a minimum, and for substantial improvements over that period. *Note: Traffic volume will be based on 12 months traffic volume to account for seasonal variation.			
Data Source	Red claims data			
Data Standard	Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Rolling quarterly, the same score applies for 3 months.			

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme		3. Customer Service		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	3.3I) Customer Feedback	Customer feedback score based on cumulative 12-month weighted total of customer compliments and complaints through the CCC divided by traffic volume	No data	0
AD - M&R			Total feedback score is less than -200	2
AD - Design			Total contact score is less than -100	4
AD - CWF			Total contact score is -100 or greater	6
AD - SG&S			Total contact score is -100 or greater, and improves by 25% or more	8
			Total contact score is -100 or greater, and improves by 50% or more	10
Methodology		<p>3.3I) "Customer feedback is a clear indicator of satisfaction (or dissatisfaction) - with the root cause of a compliment or complaint often not limited to the customer responsible– and there is an opportunity to address this"</p> <p>The volume of customer compliments and (stage one) complaints handled by the Highways England Customer Contact Centre will be tracked per area. Points will be assigned to each in accordance with the impact and significance of the feedback - with 5 points for each compliment and -3 points for a complaint.</p> <p>The CPF will calculate a weighted customer feedback score by aggregating the total points for the preceding 12 months (in order to account for seasonal variations) and dividing it by the traffic volume for the area (for comparability); this score (points per billion vehicles) will be communicated to suppliers on a quarterly basis.</p> <p>The supplier will be recognised for the total customer feedback score, with an emphasis on delivering positive customer outcomes - keeping number of complaints down to a minimum, and maximising compliments - and the highest scores will be attained where the score has been significantly improved quarter-on-quarter.</p> <p>AD - Joint delivery of the customer feedback metric between suppliers will be recognised through the RAG score therefore responsibility is then not solely with individual suppliers, and will aid with representing the end to end customer experience to which all parties may contribute towards.</p> <p>The metric will be measured at area level not by individual supplier, therefore, M&R and CWF within Asset Delivery will share their overall performance score.</p> <p>For this metric, where scores represent an Area score, rather than a score which is attributed purely to an individual supplier, then QMPs and NCRs should not be raised for Asset Delivery contracts (only).</p> <p>*Note: Traffic volume will be based on 12 months traffic volume to account for seasonal variation.</p>		
Data Source		Customer Call Centre log		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Rolling quarterly, the same score applies for 3 months.		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme		4. Sustainability		
Measure		4.1 Manage environmental sustainability		
Scope of measure		To measure the use of natural resources and the amount of waste that is generated.		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	4.1a) Measure carbon emissions	Quantity of carbon emissions per £million of contract spend	No Data	0
AD - M&R			More than 200t/£m	2
AD - Design			More than 150t/£m and up to 200t/£m	4
AD - CWF			100t/£m to 150t/£m	6
AD - SG&S			Less than 100t/£m	8
			Achieve blue (8) & reduce the 12 month rolling average of carbon emissions by more than or equal to 10% (alternatively carbon emissions are zero)	10
Methodology		Use Highways England's Carbon Calculation Tool (CCT) to assess the carbon emissions that have been generated in the delivery of the Services during the period. Divide the total carbon emissions by the contract spend in the period to calculate the tonnes of carbon per million spend. For blue+ scores, the rolling 12 month result is the prior four quarters carbon per million spend, not inclusive of the current quarter.		
Data Source		Service Provider's information submitted in the HE Carbon Calculation Tool (CCT), Oracle Fusion WD6 report (for ASC contract spend, for AD use the spend figure entered into the Carbon Calculation Toolkit) For ASC Carbon Capture Tool returns should be submitted to the Highways England Sustainability inbox by the 20th calendar date of the month directly following each quarter: sustainability@highwaysengland.co.uk . For AD submit the Carbon Calculation Toolkit into your local Highways England Area team. Carbon Calculation Toolkits will be aggregated into a single toolkit for the area for submission to the sustainability team.		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard & Oracle Fusion (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Rolling quarterly, the same score applies for 3 months. New scores entered in the following reporting periods:YYYY04, YYYY07, YYYY10, YYYY01		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	4. Sustainability
-------	-------------------

Measure		4.2 Manage social sustainability		
Scope of measure		Measure the performance of the Service Provider in attracting, retaining and enabling a diverse workforce and in delivering an inclusive service to diverse customers and communities.		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	4.2a) Throughout the life of the contract employment intelligence is gathered and analysed and acted upon to identify opportunities to improve the inclusiveness of the working culture and diversity of the workforce.	Opportunities to improve diversity and inclusion across the contract workforce as a whole are identified through analysis of employment intelligence. Inclusion Action Plan based on analysis of intelligence is being delivered and making a difference	No employment intelligence gathered and no intelligence based plan	0
AD - M&R			Employment Intelligence has not been used to identify opportunities to improve and no actions or plan in place to address	2
AD - Design			Employment Intelligence has not been used to identify opportunities to improve but actions and plan are in place to address this	4
AD - CWF			Basic employment intelligence is gathered and analysed to identify opportunities and an Intelligence based plan is in place which is being fully implemented.	6
AD - SG&S			Good intelligence gathered and used to develop the IAP. The plan is in place and being fully implemented and can show the difference being made.	8
			Robust Intelligence is gathered and used to develop the IAP. The plan is in place and is being fully implemented. Evidence provided that the tangible benefit/ difference made has led to a case study and good practice being shared widely.	10
Methodology		<p>The Road Investment Strategy, Construction 2025 and Highways England's Public Sector Equality Duty Objectives set out requirements to drive improved programme outcomes through a focus on diversity and inclusion. The three priority performance areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To develop an inclusive working culture across all organisations involved in the contract• To attract, retain and develop a greater diversity of people from a wider talent pool to meet the resourcing needs of the sector• To deliver a more socially sensitive Strategic Road Network (SRN) that is a better neighbour to communities impacted by the contract - including delivery of the Accessibility Strategy. <p>This metric requires the delivery of an intelligence-based Inclusion Action Plan that makes a difference, taking manageable but stretch steps to improve performance in these areas.</p> <p>Throughout the contract, employment intelligence on all tiers and organisations working on the contract is sought and analysed to identify opportunities and an intelligence based inclusion action plan is developed to improve the inclusiveness of the working culture and the diversity of the workforce across pay quartiles & occupational groups. The dataset in the initial reporting period is used as a baseline. Data is shared with Highways England on request.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Basic intelligence includes data on levels of inclusion experienced (evidenced through cultural/engagement/behavioural surveys including HE's collaborative behavioural measurement)• Good intelligence also includes data on changes in workforce profile (recruitment, promotion, exits)• Robust intelligence also includes disaggregation of the above by age, gender, disability and race		
Data Source		Supply chain employment, service delivery intelligence and Inclusion Action Plan		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Rolling quarterly. Blue and Blue+ scores require approval from the social sustainability team.		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	4.2b) Throughout the life of the contract customer and community intelligence is gathered, analysed and acted upon to deliver a more socially sensitive SRN and be a better neighbour to communities impacted by the contract	Opportunities to address diversity and inclusion needs of customers and communities impacted by the contract are identified through analysis of intelligence. Inclusion Action Plan based on analysis of intelligence is being delivered and making a difference	No customer and communities intelligence gathered	0
AD - M&R			Intelligence gathered has not been used to identify opportunities to improve and no actions or plan are in place to address this	2
AD - Design			Intelligence gathered has not been used to identify opportunities to improve but actions and plan are in place to address this	4
AD - CWF			Basic customer and communities intelligence is gathered and analysed to identify opportunities and an Intelligence based plan is in place which is being fully implemented.	6
AD - SG&S			Good intelligence gathered and used to develop the IAP. The plan is in place and being fully implemented and can show the difference being made.	8
			Robust Intelligence is gathered and used to develop the IAP. The plan is in place and is being fully implemented. Evidence provided that the tangible benefit/ difference made has led to a case study and good practice being shared widely.	10
Methodology		<p>The Road Investment Strategy, Construction 2025 and Highways England's Public Sector Equality Duty Objectives set out requirements to drive improved programme outcomes through a focus on diversity and inclusion. The three priority performance areas are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To develop an inclusive working culture across all organisations involved in the contract• To attract, retain and develop a greater diversity of people from a wider talent pool to meet the resourcing needs of the sector• To deliver a more socially sensitive Strategic Road Network (SRN) that is a better neighbour to communities impacted by the contract - including delivery of the Accessibility Strategy. <p>This metric requires the delivery of an intelligence-based Inclusion Action Plan that makes a difference, taking manageable but stretch steps to improve performance in these areas.</p> <p>Throughout the contract, intelligence on customer and communities is gathered and analysed to identify opportunities and an intelligence based inclusion action plan is developed to deliver a more socially sensitive SRN and be a better neighbour to communities impacted by the contract - particularly those who are vulnerable as a result of a protected characteristic. The dataset in the initial reporting period is used as a baseline. Data is shared with Highways England on request.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Basic intelligence includes data on:<ul style="list-style-type: none">- demographic composition of those affected by the contract- the specific needs of particular groups (including those with protected characteristics) affected by the contract- the specific locations on the stretch of SRN covered by the contract where inclusive design and accessibility are a relevant consideration. <p>Highways England's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Tool (EDIT) has been designed to support contracts with the community aspects of the above</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Good intelligence also incorporates the outputs from direct liaison with groups identified above.• Robust intelligence also incorporates learning from relationships built with groups identified above. <p>Where it is agreed that a specific contract does not provide an opportunity to influence this area, it will be marked not applicable.</p> <p>The appropriate Highways England department will validate the Opportunities identified.</p> <p>*Note - Equality impact assessments and Highways England's Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Tool (EDIT) have been designed to support contracts with the community aspects of the above.</p>		
Data Source		Supply chain employment, service delivery intelligence and Inclusion Action Plan		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Rolling quarterly. Blue and Blue+ scores require approval from the social sustainability team.		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	4. Sustainability
Measure	4.3 Manage economic sustainability
Scope of measure	Improved sustainability of the supply chain; promoting economic growth through small and medium enterprises (SMEs) timeliness and security of payment for Tier 2+ supply chain.

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	4.3a) Pay via the project bank account	The percentage of the supply chain, by value, paid directly via the Project Bank Account	No data OR no supply chain spend going through the PBA OR average of four parts of metric in PBA Tracker <2	0
AD - M&R			Average of four parts of metric in PBA Tracker ≥2 and <4	2
AD - Design			Average of four parts of metric in PBA Tracker ≥4 and <6	4
AD - SG&S			Average of four parts of metric in PBA Tracker ≥6 and <8	6
			Average of four parts of metric in PBA Tracker ≥8 and <10	8
			Average of four parts of metric in PBA Tracker = 10	10
Methodology		<p>Project Bank Accounts are a Cabinet Office and contractual requirement with significant effects on sustainability through Supplier cash flow. RIS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitors the proportion of the supply chain by value that are being paid via the PBA within one calendar month of the application for payment being submitted to Highways England. The value of work performed by Tier 2+ Suppliers that have declined to join the PBA (having been offered the opportunity) is excluded from the calculation and written evidence needs to be provided to HE on why they do not want to sign up to be paid via the PBA. Highways England will at anytime contact that tier 2/3 directly to improve their knowledge and understanding of PBAs so they understand the benefits of getting paid directly via the PBA. Additional scores will be awarded to tier 1 to get tier 3 to sign Joining Deed. The Tier 2 can demonstrated the prompt payment going out from their account to their Tier 3 once tier 1 pays them. This information/evidence is to be submitted directly to Commercial at Highways England by Tier 2. Monitors the length of time in calendar days that it takes for the Supplier to pay its supply chain (including Tier 2 and Tier 3+) joined to the PBA, following Highways England deposit of funding into the PBA. Commercial Intelligence calculates the score by when a majority of the funds have been deposited into the PBA by Highways England. Payments outside the PBA are made in accordance with the Fair Payment target: 26 calendar days (7 from Assessment Date + 19 from due date) for tier 2, and 30 calendar days (7 from Assessment Date + 23 from due date) for tier 3. The Assessment/application/invoice date is as specified in Tier 2/3 contract produced by the Tier 1. SMEs are defined by the European Commission as having <250 FTE staff and either an annual turnover of ≤€50m or an annual balance sheet total of ≤€43m. The Government target cited in the Delivery Plan is 25%. Ramboll can be excluded from the calculation where their deployment is directly instructed by Highways England. No other supplier at this stage will be excluded, however other similar examples should be highlighted Commercial Intelligence calculates the SME percentage from the full application amount (not from Tier 2/3 only). <p>*Note: An aggregated score of all of the above is calculated through the use of PBA Tracker by the Ops Supply Chain Performance Team. The score is an average of the CPF score results, shown in the PBA tracker, for the following four aspects: Average % of supply chain, by value paid directly via the PBA, Payment Days to PBA Suppliers, Payment Days to Non-PBA Suppliers (Tier 2, Tier 3 and Material Suppliers), Percentage of spend to SME's.</p>		
Data Source		<p>PBA Tracker and additional evidence as below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monthly management reports from the Provider (PBA Tracker)/Tier 2 reporting data Project Bank Account records (PBA trackers and bank statement) Main bank account statements / BACs receipt / Remittance receipts Signed prompt payment charter Joining Deeds Documented process to encourage SME procurement and to make SMEs appropriate amendments to the subcontracts. 		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard		
Data input frequency		<p>Calendar month.</p> <p>Score is calculated from monthly submission of the Project Bank Account Tracker</p>		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	5. Quality
--------------	-------------------

Measure	5.2 Effectiveness of quality management system
Scope of measure	To measure the effectiveness and collaborative nature of the Service Provider's Quality Management System

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	5.2a) The number of Quality Management Points or valid Quality Warning Notice.	The total number of Quality Management Points not cleared at the time of reporting OR Quality warning Notice was issued or in effect during the period.	No data	0
AD - M&R			30 or more QMPs <u>OR</u> quality warning notice was issued or in effect within the period	2
AD - Design			20-25 QMPs	4
AD - CWF			15 QMPs	6
AD - SG&S			10 to 5 QMPs	8
			0 QMPs	10
Methodology	If the Service Provider fails to comply with the Quality Management System (including the failure to correct non-conformities in the agreed timescales), the Service Provider accrues Quality Management Points in line with the Quality Table in Contract Data Section 4			
	*Note: When QMPs are submitted in more than one reporting period the following aspects should be kept consistent in all data sheet submissions of that QMP: -QMP reference number, -Award type, -Awarded against, -Sub-process, -Awarded in date.			
	Additionally, each new QMP that is raised should be given a unique QMP reference number – reference numbers of resolved QMPs should not be re-used.			
	i) The total number of Quality Management Points not cleared at the time of reporting In the event that any QMPs have been cleared in the month, you should also be submitting a new line item that indicates that the area has 0 QMPs with no clear date. Any month thereafter where QMPs are awarded you will clear the previous active 0 and replace it with the newly awarded QMP value			
	ii) Quality Warning Notice issued or in effect during the period. In the event of any quality warning notice being issued the data standard should state an award type of "WARNING" resulting in quality management points being awarded, therefore, leave QMP value blank as points are awarded via CPF.			
Data Source	Service Provider / Supplier records, QMP register			
Data Standard	QMP Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Monthly			

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	5.2c) Establishing Collaboration Principles, Processes and Plans	Robust business practices enabling collaborative behaviours to underpin a fully integrated project team are evident	No data	0
AD - M&R			Collaboration values and principles are in place.	2
AD - Design			A behavioural improvement plan is in place, actions may be outstanding beyond planned dates. The project board have been inducted into the collaborative approach.	4
AD - CWF			The full integrated project team have been inducted into the collaborative approach and are included in the scope of behavioural maturity assessment. Behavioural improvement plan actions are progressed in line with planned dates.	6
AD - SG&S			The extended delivery team has been inducted into the collaborative approach and a behavioural maturity assessment has been carried out and findings are integrated into improvement plans. A collaborative project has demonstrated the generation of a tangible benefit which is accepted by the appropriate review team.	8
			Supplier can evidence that the benefit demonstrated within the definition of the 8 scoring criteria has been either (i) deployed on a contract delivered by another supplier on another programme or (ii) led to Industry processes being changed and improved.	10
Methodology		The expectations are that both suppliers and clients will: • Agree the scope of the collaborative relationship. • Set out the core principles, values, beliefs and behaviours which will contribute to a collaborative culture to enable leaders to communicate a consistent and clear message about how business will be conducted (e.g. on conflict resolution and decision making). • Agree how collaborative capability and behaviours will be developed and supported. This will ensure that training on the nature of collaboration, and the relationships and behaviours necessary to achieve it, is delivered to relevant people. This will require deliberate efforts and continuing commitment from the leadership of all the organisations involved, which must be reaffirmed when new partners join, and reviewed at the start of each project Phase. • A Collaborative Behavioural Improvement Plan is essential to help the team understand how behaviours impact delivery and drive improvements in performance. The plan will initially scope the delivery of, and subsequently be derived from the outputs from, a Collaborative behavioural maturity assessment, such as the 'Behavioural Maturity Framework' (BMF). That must then be undertaken by all parties within the delivery team on a regular basis to ensure collaboration behaviours develop. The assessment should identify the extent to which collaboration behaviours are being demonstrated, and collaboration principles and values are being adopted. • Engagement on collaborative projects which will pursue and generate tangible benefits, which are likely to cover an innovation, product or service that was not in scope • The 'appropriate team' for validating benefits in this metric (for higher scores) can vary depending on the nature of the example being cited. In some cases it would be the HE Project Team in others it may be a peer review. It is the responsibility of the supplier to obtain written confirmation of this team's agreement/concurrence and submit this with the CPF submission.		
Data Source		Service Provider / Supplier Data and Evidence		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Rolling quarterly, Blue or Blue + scores require a piece of evidence or case study from the past six months.		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	5. Quality
Measure	5.4 Maintenance and operational service is delivered to the required quality
Scope of measure	To monitor maintenance and operational services and ensure delivery is in accordance with Highways England quality requirements

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	5.4f) Planned work is defect-free or service is fit for purpose	Percentage of schemes/Task Orders reported with defects requiring remedial work during the defects period	No Data	0
AD - M&R			One or more defects have been reported on more than 10% of schemes/Task Orders in their defects period during the month	2
AD - Design			One or more defects have been reported on 1-10% of schemes/Task Orders in their defects period during the month	4
AD - CWF			No defects have been reported on any schemes/Task Orders in their defects period during the month	6
AD - SG&S			There have been no reported defects on any schemes/Task Orders in their defects period in the last 3 months	8
			There have been no reported defects on any schemes/Task Orders in their defects period in the last 6 months	10
Methodology		The metric is concerned with defects that arise, or are still outstanding, at completion of works, up until the defects date. Supplier submits total number of task orders that require defect rectification out of the total number of task orders that are in their defects period (i.e. between completion of works and the defects date) during the reporting period as a percentage. If there is only one supplier for the scheme then the defect period starts at the end of the scheme (CWF). Where there are multiple CWF suppliers on a scheme the defect period, for the purposes of CPF, will start at the end of that suppliers part of the works (i.e. task order). The defect period initiates directly after the work has been completed.		
Data Source		Supplier Data		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme		6. Time		
Measure		6.1 Forecast timescales accurately		
Scope of measure		6.1a) To measure the accuracy of time predictions on all live Capital Schemes which have reached <i>Actual Completion of Construction (Milestone 6)</i> . The measure is designed to reflect the impact on customers and Highways England of changes to programme for the delivery of schemes. 6.1b) To measure programme delivery in terms of the forecasted scheme completion against the actual.		
Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	6.1a) Variance in construction duration from baseline	Average variance in days, for all eligible schemes, in the period between Milestones 5 to 6 as predicted at Milestone 4, compared to the actual period between Milestones 5 to 6.	No data	0
AD - M&R			Variance is greater than ± 10 days	2
AD - Design			Variance is ± 10 days or less	4
AD - CWF			Variance is ± 5 days or less	6
AD - SG&S			Variance is ± 3 days or less	8
			Variance is ± 1 day or less	10
Methodology	<p>Valid for all live Capital schemes</p> <p>The Service Provider provides milestone dates for entry into Oracle Fusion. The CPF+ database will score each of the metrics only once for each PIN, at the month the milestone concerned is entered into Oracle Fusion. The baseline design dates for a scheme raised in-year are those initially entered into Oracle Fusion for the scheme.</p> <p>Oracle Fusion will be used on a monthly basis to extract planned dates. HOWEVER, changes (re-baselines) will only be taken into account if accompanied by an 'authorised change' entry within the Scheme data standard for re-baseline type of 'TIME' (or 'BOTH' where the Scheme has also been re-baselined for cost). A metric that has already been scored is not revised when data is re-baselined. Where unauthorised changes are made a data quality flag is raised and the re-baseline rejected. On any Scheme the variance between the actual and predicted dates for each metric is negative if an actual date is earlier than predicted and positive if an actual date is later than predicted. The variance between actual and predicted durations is negative if the actual duration is shorter than predicted and positive if the actual duration is longer than predicted.</p> <p>Where schemes may be entirely outside of Service Provider control the Regional Team may provide a list of PINs to Operations Supply Chain Performance to be removed from calculations. Reasons for exclusion are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. No Service Provider involvement at any stage e.g. contract-dependent schemes which are delivered through PSF/ASF/CDF2. No Service Provider involvement at any stage e.g. schemes delivered by Major Projects (SMART Motorways)3. No Service Provider involvement at all e.g. routine maintenance/resource PINs that are managed and forecast by Highways England such as local authority payments etc.4. When a scheme is designed by the Service Provider but handed over to SMART Motorways (or other contractor) to deliver the construction element and no supervision or other duties are being carried out by the Service Provider during construction. <p>*Note: these schemes may only be excluded after hand over from the Service Provider. Any exclusions from this metric must have been approved by the Service Manager</p> <p>The baseline may be updated for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• An instructed change of scope• Very extreme weather (not simply heavy snow in winter). A Red Alert from the Met Office is required to qualify• Instructions by the Service Manager, e.g. politically sensitive Schemes being bought forward and therefore delaying other works• Emergency works taking priority and delaying other works• Highways England failure to respond to key governance, e.g. ROB approvals. The Service Provider must demonstrate they have done everything possible to proceed and not simply waited for Highways England response• Delay due to interaction with others, such as local authority/Major Projects, which is totally out of the Service Provider's control• Agreement of predicted construction dates at milestone 4. <p>AND All of these changes have been documented and then approved by the Service Manager.</p> <p>The Service Provider is to report the re-baseline</p>			
Data Source	Scheme programme data - Oracle Fusion			
Data Standard	Oracle Fusion Data Standard, Scheme Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Calendar month			

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	6.1b) Variance in scheme or task delivery duration	Average variance in days, for all eligible schemes or programmes of work, between forecast and actual date duration.	No data	0
AD - M&R			Variance is greater than +5 days	2
AD - Design			Variance is >0 and ≤+5 days	4
AD - CWF			Variance is > -3 and ≤ 0 days	6
AD - SG&S			Variance is ≤ -3 and ≥ -5 days	8
			Variance is <-5	10
Methodology	Capture the differential between actual delivery date durations against the original forecast to determine the variance and present as an average across the reporting period. The scoring range encourages more efficient delivery. CWF & SG&S suppliers are measured against the Principal Contractor's schedule, which defines what programme / activity each supplier worked on in-month and the planned timeframe for delivery. Design suppliers are measured against the Principal Designer's schedule.			
Data Source	Local scheme schedule data (Principal Contractor / Designer)			
Data Standard	AD Scorecard Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Calendar month			

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	6.1c) Third party claims - substantiated estimates are accurate and final costs are submitted to HE on time	Percentage of claims where the final cost is submitted late to Highways England or they are inaccurate.	No Data	0
AD - M&R			>20% of claims are late or have a deviation of > 20% between substantiated estimate and final cost	2
AD - Design			10 to 20% of claims are late or have a deviation of > 20% between substantiated estimate and final cost	4
AD - CWF			<10% of claims are late or have a deviation of > 20% between substantiated estimate and final cost	6
AD - SG&S			<5% of claims are late or have a deviation of > 20% between substantiated estimate and final cost	8
			Blue standard achieved for three consecutive months. Awarded on the third instance onwards.	10
Methodology	Percentage of final claim costs for which the deviation between substantiated costs and final costs is greater than 20% OR where claims are late (where the difference between the works completion date and final account date is greater than 13 weeks).			
	*Note: This metric will only be scored where there is at least one eligible claim (within the scope of the measure) during the reporting period. Months that are not scored will not impact on the ability to score Blue (8) or Blue+(10), where this relies on good performance demonstrated over 3 or 6 months; the 'not scored' month will be disregarded from the calculation.			
Data Source	Third Party Claims or TR430 and evidence checklist			
Data Standard	DCP Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Calendar month			

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	6. Time
-------	---------

Measure	6.4 Delivery of milestones
Scope of measure	Activities completed within required timescales

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	6.4a) All asset rectification activities are completed within the required timescales.	Percentage of asset activities undertaken to rectify asset defects on the network that are completed within the required timescales.	No data	0
AD - M&R			<90% of activities completed within required timescale	2
AD - Design			90% to <95% of activities completed within required timescale	4
AD - CWF			95% to <98% of activities completed within required timescale	6
AD - SG&S			98% to <100% of activities completed within required timescale	8
			100% of activities completed within required timescale	10
Methodology		Capture all deployments against the relevant asset type / activity. Score the differential (as a percentage) between the actual delivery time against the required timescale defined in AMOR (ASC) and CRMDP (AD).		
Data Source		Service Provider Data (ASC), Confirm or supplier records where Confirm data is not available (AD)		
Data Standard		Provider Data Standard (ASC), AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	6.4b) All Cyclic activities are completed within the required timescales.	Percentage of Cyclic works that are completed within the required timescales.	No data	0
AD - M&R			<98% of activities completed within required timescale	2
AD - Design			≥98% and <100% of activities completed within required timescale	4
AD - CWF			100% of activities completed within required timescale	6
AD - SG&S			100% of activities completed within required timescale and more than one activity conducted per closure.	8
			100% of activities completed within required timescale and more than two activities conducted per closure.	10
Methodology	<p>Capture all <u>cyclic</u> activities against the relevant asset type / task. Score the differential (as a percentage) between the actual delivery time against the planned cyclic programme.</p> <p>For scores for 8 and 10: To optimise journey times for customers by providing information to road users thus enabling effective decision making, where practically possible, to reduce the impact on the customer. The measure demonstrates the effective use of programme tools across the M&R network to maximise the working activities (outputs) per closure whilst not compromising Health and Safety. The measure will take into consideration if there is little or no local area opportunity to conduct working activities (outputs) and occurrences outside the providers' control. This should be reflected in the scoring range and supported by associated commentary.</p> <p>Where an activity (output) per closure is defined as conducting and completing work on an asset.</p>			
Data Source	Confirm or supplier records where Confirm data is not available			
Data Standard	AD Scorecard Data Standard			
Data input frequency	Calendar month			

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
MAC	6.4d) Average Response Time to Technical/Design Queries	Amount of time taken in days to respond to Technical/Design Queries	No Data	
ASC			More than 7 calendar days	2
AD - M&R			2 - 7 calendar days	4
AD - Design			less than 2 calendar days	6
AD - CWF			Green standard achieved for three consecutive months. Awarded on the third instance onwards.	8
AD - SG&S			Blue standard achieved ensuring that over the preceding quarter that more than 95% of technical queries are resolved, subject to HE sample checks.	10
Methodology		The service provider provides data on the average response time to technical/design queries. The measure is designed to ensure a prompt response to all technical/design queries. In this instance a technical/design query is defined as a request made by a supplier/contractor working on the scheme to the design team for information or clarification on design related issues that were not resolved prior to starting works. All technical/design queries will be registered on the designers queries log but are subject to HE sample checks/verification and will inform of the lessons learnt.		
Data Source		Supplier Data		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Monthly, but technical/design queries received three days before submission should be forwarded to the following monthly scoring		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	7. Cost
-------	---------

Measure	7.1 Manage schemes to budget
Scope of measure	To measure the predictability of the Service Provider's budget profile with respect to the monthly actuals. The measure monitors how closely actual spend reflects the budget profile spend year to date.

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	7.1a) Alignment with budget profile in terms of a cumulative indicator (YTD)	The percentage difference between each month's financial outturn compared with the forecast made at the start of the financial year for Capital Renewals only.	No Data	0
AD - M&R			>10% variance from budget profile	2
AD - Design			≤10% and >5% variance from budget profile	4
AD - CWF			≤5% and >3% variance from budget profile	6
AD - SG&S			≤3% variance from budget profile	8
			Blue standard achieved for three consecutive months. Awarded on the third instance onwards.	10
Methodology		A simple percentage of the degree of alignment between each month's financial outturn compared with the forecast made at the start of the financial year for Capital Renewals only.		
		*Note: Advise Ops Supply Chain Performance Team of instances where HE are responsible for the budget changing, in order that the relevant variance is removed from consideration and does not adversely skew the metric. This <u>does not</u> get added to the Scheme Exclusion Sheet.		
Data Source		Oracle Fusion		
Data Standard		Oracle Fusion Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	7.1d) Design of schemes to the agreed design costs	Average variance between initial design cost estimates and outturn design costs	No Data	0
AD - M&R			Sums of Total Time Charges plus expenses is ≥5% above sums of design costs agreed prior to commencement of the design	2
AD - Design			Sums of Total Time Charges plus expenses is >0% to <5% above sums of design costs agreed prior to commencement of the design	4
AD - CWF			Sums of Total Time Charges plus expenses is no more than the sums of design costs agreed prior to commencement of the design	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved AND no individual final price is greater than or equal to 10% than the final total.	8
			Green standard achieved AND no individual final price is greater than or equal to 5% than the final total.	10
Methodology		The report includes all Operations Supply Chain Performance data for all cost centres but deletes S278 schemes as these should net off against the income (but income is not captured against the PINs). This includes changes in scope, additional task orders and compensation events.		
Data Source		Supplier's scheme records (AD)		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	7.1e) Delivery of schemes within the target cost	Variance between the target costs and the final accounts	No Data	0
AD - M&R			Sum of Final Prices for Work Done to Date is ≥5% above sum of final totals of the Prices	2
AD - Design			Sum of Final Prices for Work Done to Date is >0%-5% above sum of final totals of the Prices	4
AD - CWF			Sum of Final Prices for Work Done to Date is no more than the sum of final totals of the Prices	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved AND no individual final price is greater than or equal to 10% than the final total.	8
			Green standard achieved AND no individual final price is greater than or equal to 5% than the final total.	10
Methodology		As all data is present this will also include Managed Works. However, this is still expenditure under the Service Provider's control. This includes changes in scope, additional task orders and compensation events.		
Data Source		Supplier's scheme records (AD)		
Data Standard		AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	7. Cost
Measure	7.4 Ensure well-costed key financial and commercial information
Scope of measure	To demonstrate the timeliness and accuracy of the Service Provider's invoices and cost capture data

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	7.4a) Invoices - variance between the invoice amount and the total from the timely back-up information provided.	Provision of invoices on time, in the correct format and with accurate back-up information	No Data	0
AD - M&R			Invoice or back-up information is late OR in wrong format OR > 1.00% variance between back-up and invoice totals	2
AD - Design			Invoice and back-up information is on time AND in correct format AND with ≤1.00% variance between back-up and invoice totals	4
AD - CWF			Invoice and back-up information is on time AND in correct format AND with ≤ 0.01% variance between back-up and invoice totals	6
AD - SG&S			Invoice and back-up information is on time AND in correct format AND with 0% variance between back-up and invoice totals	8
			Blue standard achieved for six consecutive months. Awarded on the sixth instance onwards.	10
Methodology		Use the Invoice Checking Tool to assess the timeliness and the accuracy of invoices and the back-up information that is submitted and ensure they are submitted in the correct format and on time. Where the Service Provider does not have access to the Tool (for reasons outside the Service Provider's control), this may be scored by the Regional Team providing Operations Supply Chain Performance with information by email.		
Data Source		Service Provider Invoices via the Invoice Checking Tool		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month Scores will be based on one month in arrears of the current reporting period		

Contract	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
ASC	7.4b) Cost capture data - timely submission and resolution of issues	Provision of cost capture data on time and timely resolution of issues	No Data	0
AD - M&R			A submission is outstanding OR more than 1 issue is not resolved by the agreed date	2
AD - Design			There are no overdue issues AND a submission is late AND/OR there is 1 or more Work in Progress issue	4
AD - CWF			The submission was on time AND there are no overdue issues AND there are no Work in Progress issues	6
AD - SG&S			Green standard achieved AND data supplied ≤1 week ahead of deadline	8
			Green standard achieved AND data supplied >1 week ahead of deadline and ≤2 weeks ahead of deadline.	10
Methodology		From the Service Providers Work Cost (PWC) report, the commercial team will analyse the forms, log them, log if the submission was late, log any issues including agreed date for resolution, log any issues which are overdue and log completed issues (by comparing to last month's report). Where the Service Providers request for clarification confirms the issue to be an error then the cost capture data needs to be corrected. These are known as work in progress issues. Cost capture reports are to be submitted by the last working day of the month following the report month. For example, a report for January's data would be required to be submitted by the end of February. Blue and blue+ scores will be achievable if data is submitted ahead of this deadline with all other green standard criteria met. Blue (8) is achieved by submitting data more than two weeks, up to three weeks after the reporting month. I.e. -1 week ahead of deadline. Blue+ is achieved by submitting data up to two weeks after the reporting month. I.e. -2 weeks ahead of deadline.		
Data Source		Highways England QS Commercial Team assessments of PWC report submitted by Service Provider / Supplier		
Data Standard		Highways Data Standard, AD Scorecard Data Standard		
Data input frequency		Calendar month		

Collaborative Performance Framework (CPF) – Scoring Guidance

Theme	8) Client Feedback
-------	--------------------

Measure	Client feedback
Scope of measure	Mechanism to identify issues, opportunities and trends to help focus improvement efforts across Highways England.

Methodology	Measures Highways England's performance as a client. (i) This feedback is for Highways England as a whole, including other directly procured Suppliers (ii) Where specific scoring criteria is not included in a client metric, generic scoring criteria should be used; as shown below. *Note: Suppliers must provide a comment based on their assessed score; whatever the score maybe	
	Score	Criteria
	0 - Totally Dissatisfied	At least one aspect is unacceptable to the extent that major improvement is required by the client. The Supplier has escalated this concern in writing to the Highways England Divisional Director on more than one occasion
	2 - Very dissatisfied	At least one aspect is unacceptable to the extent that the Supplier considers significant improvement is required from the client. The Supplier has escalated this concern in writing to the SRO.
	4 - Slightly dissatisfied	At least one minor aspect is unacceptable to the extent that the Supplier seeks improvement from the client. This concern has been raised with the Highways England project team
	6 - Satisfied	Client performance is generally satisfactory.
	8 - Highly satisfied	Some aspects of client performance are exceeding expectation. Client is proactively supporting the Supplier and working beyond their expected duties and responsibilities.
	10 - Exceptionally satisfied	All aspects of client performance considerably exceed expectation. Innovation and best practice is being fully supported and championed for mutual benefit.
	Data Source	Provider Data
	Data Standard	Provider Data Standard
Data input frequency		Quarterly

Imperative	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
Health & Safety	8.1) Driving of Health and Safety improvement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisational commitment from Highways England to ensure H&S is the top priority in all its activities. Explicit dedication to safe working practices (e.g. inductions) and the safety of the public. Supportive of supply chain H&S initiatives and facilitates best practice sharing. Undertakes and encourages preventative activities, responding to H&S incidents and learning lessons. 	Totally dissatisfied	0
			Very dissatisfied	2
			Slightly dissatisfied	4
			Satisfied	6
			Highly satisfied	8
			Exceptionally satisfied	10

Imperative	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
Customer	8.2) Improvement of Customer Experience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Organisational commitment from Highways England to ensure Customer satisfaction is a priority in all its activities. Supportive of supply chain Customer improvement initiatives and facilitates best practice sharing. Highways England creates an enabling environment to encourage Customer focused activities. 	Totally dissatisfied	0
			Very dissatisfied	2
			Slightly dissatisfied	4
			Satisfied	6
			Highly satisfied	8
			Exceptionally satisfied	10

Imperative	Metric Title	Metric Description	Scoring Range	Score
Delivery	8.3) Timely payment	Supplier to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Highways England meets requirements for main Supplier and facilitates prompt and correct payment across the wider supply chain. Score is the average number of working days it took from receiving an agreed certificate/invoice to payment being made. Allowance needs to be made for receipt of invoices. 	20 or more days	0
			15-19 days	2
			11-14 days	4
			7-10 days	6
			5-6 days	8
			<4 days	10