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1 – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Major road infrastructure development is critical to the Australian society and its economy. In a car-loving island nation, with extensive road networks and vast amounts of land for transporting goods, it is crucial for the procurement process of road infrastructure projects be conducted in the most cost-effective way possible and to ensure roads are built according to quality standards with minimal disruption.

This report is in response to Stage 1 of the Roads Australia (RA) Request for Service (RFS). The primary objective of the RFS is to understand how to investigate the efficiency of the tender process, and to examine how reasonable the cost of bidding for major transport infrastructure projects is in Australia. The RFS is split into two parts, Stage 1 and Stage 2. This report will provide adequate guidance and direction to the implementation of Stage 2 and provides a comprehensive framework for the simple transition from Stage 1 to Stage 2.

The deliverables of Stage 1 include a full outline of the fundamental data that is to be collated, analysed and maintained for Stage 2. Relevant organisations and respected industry contacts are identified and interviews and surveys were conducted to extract industry opinion and insight to recognise key themes, issues, challenges across the tender process. These insights are used to support preliminary recommendations on how to proceed to Stage 2 implementation.

THE CURRENT LANDSCAPE

There are several models used in the procurement process for large roads infrastructure projects in Australia. While the models themselves differ substantially, they all share a common set of goals. The first of the two key models relevant to the RFS is Design and Construct (D&C). D&C projects require the contractor to both design and construct the project and encourage the development and delivery of innovative solutions. The second model, Public Private Partnership (PPP), is where the successful tenderer is given responsibility for all aspects of a major piece of public infrastructure for a specified period (the concession period), including for design, construction, maintenance and operations.

RESEARCH METHOD

The research was gathered through industry stakeholders and professional research. The project sponsor, RA, its members and participants in the roads infrastructure sector hold valuable knowledge and experience, and provided important insights in response to the issues surrounding the tendering processes. During Stage 1, the team sought feedback from key stakeholders, including RA members, to review and confirm key themes for the further investigation that will be conducted by Stage 2. The Stage 1 Team also conducted various industry research reports and analysis. These reports have provided useful information to complement the views derived from stakeholders, and are relevant to both Stages 1 and 2.

Technology is crucial for team collaboration and meeting with stakeholders. The Stage 1 Team utilised technology efficiently, and used Google Drive, WhatsApp and join.me predominantly to communicate across Australia and internationally. This report provides analysis and recommendations of the collaboration technology tools utilised for the Stage 2 project, as well as highly proficient questionnaire tools to capture insights, feedback and knowledge more effectively. After an extensive review of all platforms analysed, it is recommended that GroupQuality is used for the Stage 2 project. GroupQuality includes a range of features to ensure success for the Stage 2 investigation. The key advantage of the GroupQuality tool is that it provides a facility to record all interviews and creates an online discussion group conference, alongside the standard questionnaire capabilities.
DATA SECURITY AND STAKEHOLDER CONFIDENCE

The success of Stage 2 will be strongly dependent on the confidence of RA members and their level of engagement in the research process. The success of the engagement will influence the quality of information they are willing to contribute. Stage 1 outlines potential risks and mitigations, including proposed confidentiality measures, agreements and data security measures. The Stakeholder Engagement Toolkit provides a framework, suggested tasks and recommended actions for each phase of stakeholder engagement. The toolkit is aimed to guide and support Stage 2 to produce key findings and recommendations as well as to ensure care and due diligence is maintained while engaging with RA stakeholders.

KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

High level results suggest the following areas contain pain points for tenderers in the current landscape; and are critical for Stage 2 to conduct deeper investigation into:

- Risks / governance – risk averse clients
- Planning – uncertainty of initiatives, lack of investment in initial design
- Process – lack of design information available and lack of government contribution to costs
- Time – tender process too long
- Different requirements from the different road authorities – inconsistent by State and Territory
- Tender detail and presentation information required – inconsistent and different requirements for every client
- Duplication of work – each contractor bidding for the project is completing the same job at a high cost.
- Lack of engagement with stakeholders – mandated documentation is not enough to understand requirement, there is a lack of interactivity and engagement across all parties.
- The imbalance in risk that exists between project owners and contractors with contractors being required to accept to much of the project risk.

Based on our research, methodology and governance framework we are confident the requirements of the RFS will be finalised and a professional, complete insight will be obtained by Stage 2. Whilst Stage 1 were charged with the responsibility to produce a framework for Stage 2, it would be impossible to do this effectively, if we were naive to the industry issues. Hence, this report is a bespoke toolkit, based on acquired industry knowledge. The Stage 1 Team believe that all significant issues have been identified to ensure Stage 2 can proceed seamlessly with the investigation providing a clear understanding of the efficiency and cost of the tender process both in Australia and abroad, drawing useful conclusions and recommendations.
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2 – INTRODUCTION

Roads infrastructure projects play a critical role in shaping both Australian society and its economy. The nature of these large-scale projects requires that the project contract is awarded to the most suitable companies, selected following a comprehensive tendering process. Roads Australia (RA), in representing the needs of its member constituents, identified key issues in the tendering process, including the high cost of tendering by the tenderer, and the inefficiency (duplication and repetition) familiar to all players.

RA, in collaboration with Dūcere and the University of Canberra, commissioned a study into the industry utilising MBA candidates to perform foundational work to identify the root problems and identify possible solutions. This Tendering Process Review (TPR) project consists of two parts: Stage 1 is responsible for the scoping study which seeks to develop the framework and strategy for information gathering; and Stage 2 is responsible for conducting the industry deep dives and developing proposed recommendations.

This report provides the detail in the development of the Stage 1 Scoping Study, which includes commentary and assessment of the current tendering landscape, as well as procedures and processes around information collection from relevant stakeholders. The primary purpose of this report is to aid the Stage 2 Team in their execution of the industry research and proposals.

2.1 PROJECT PLAN & TIMELINE

A project plan and timeline with key project milestones were established prior to the creation of this report to outline project objectives, scope, key stakeholders, risks and success measures. The full Stage 1 Project Plan & Timeline can be viewed in Appendix 1.

3 – SCOPE OF WORK

3.1 STAGE 1

The scope of work for Stage 1 includes:

1. Process map of how data and information will be collated, analysed, managed and maintained.
2. List of organisations and contacts the investigation will need access to.
3. List of survey/interview questions to extract industry opinion/insight.
4. Detail key themes/issues/challenges across the tender process for investigation.
5. Advice on how to proceed to implement the investigation, and expected outcomes.

3.2 STAGE 2

Stage 2 will proceed by undertaking the TPR, which involves the execution of a thorough industry deep dive into the focus areas identified. The Stage 2 proposal aims to include

1. A summary of key insights found during the interview process with RA members
2. An analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of current tender processes in Australia.
3. Reveal whether the cost of tendering in Australia is higher or lower than overseas
4. Key recommendations to improve cost and time efficiency in each jurisdiction
5. Suggested best practice processes for tendering for major transport infrastructure in Australia.

The research outcomes, tools and processes detailed in this report will assist and advise the Stage 2 Team in delivering these objectives.
4 – GOVERNANCE

4.1 RISKS AND MITIGATION PLAN

The below table outlines identified risks pertaining to the project and the mitigation plans to prevent or reduce these risks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risks</th>
<th>Mitigation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Team disruptions including missed meetings, miscommunication and unclear tasks and activities | • Multi-communication processes  
• Weekly team meetings  
• Clear processes |
| Key person dependency                                               | • Shared roles  
• Tasks and activities documented |
| Confidentiality breaches                                           | • Signing of RA Confidentiality Agreements and Additional Team Confidentiality Assurance |
| Stakeholder issues (inconsistent expectations, unavailability of essential resources, delays in receipt of information) | • Stakeholder engagement processes and protocols  
• Clear meeting outcomes  
• Clear communications and follow-through  
• Knowledge management plan |
| Deviation from project scope                                        | • Regular meetings with the client  
• Regular monitoring of the project deliverables against the project plan |

4.2 SECURITY MEASURES

Tendering processes are highly sensitive due to the competitive nature of proposals. Industry stakeholders regard their intellectual property as key advantages and critical to successful proposals. To that end, the discussion and disclosure of issues surrounding tendering processes and associated issues when the project teams engage with industry representatives must be structured around robust information security procedures as outlined below.

4.2.1 TEAM CONFIDENTIALITY ASSURANCES

The Stage 1 Team have provided the below Confidentiality Assurances in how information is managed securely, which supplements the individual RA Confidentiality Agreements signed by each team member, received and acknowledged by RA.

1. The team will maintain a Record of Information Received document, which will detail the information received, how it was received, and list the names of individuals who have/had access to such information. It will also specify where the information is stored or recorded, and indicate a date of deletion/destruction (typically the information use end-date or project end-date – whichever is earlier), which all team
members will confirm as completed. This document will be stored in our Private Google Shared Drive, with a link supplied to RA for complete, unrestricted access at any time.

2. All documents and information received will be stored exclusively in our Private Google Drive Shared Folder, which is accessible only by team members. Documents and information will not be downloaded or stored in secondary locations. External access to this folder will not be permitted under any circumstance and the general security of this folder is governed by Google’s strict privacy policies. Under no circumstances will project information or material be copied, saved elsewhere, retained separately, carried around or externally distributed.

3. All documents and information stored will be prefixed with ‘Roads Australia Confidential document name’ to ensure clear separation and identification of such materials. If shared by email, such prefix will be in the subject line.

4. Any immediate breach of confidentiality to anyone outside the team will be reported directly to RA by the team representative, who together with RA will form an action of recourse. Such an incident will take priority over all other project work and dealt with the highest importance and diligence. The Dūcere head office will also be informed of such breach with RA cc’d, as an accountability measure for the team.

5. At the conclusion of the project, all documents and information received and saved to the protected hard drive will be deleted.

4.2.2 ROADS AUSTRALIA PROJECT SECURE DRIVE

Roads Australia has agreed to provide the team with access to an RA server-hosted secure drive* to store all received data and information. Each Stage 2 Team member will have access to this drive for the duration of the project. The security of this drive is under 100 per cent control and administration by RA. This ownership by RA naturally implies that all risks in relation to data and information saved in this drive are borne solely by RA and any breaches of this system will be managed by RA’s internal contingency plans.

The project teams will adhere to the Confidentiality Agreements and Assurances at all times in the handling of all data and information in and out of this secure drive.

*To be set up by RA for Stage 2 Team.

RA SECURE DRIVE SPECIFICATIONS

• RA uses a Synology NAS with DSM 5.2 (latest stable version) for file storage.
• The system allows for the creation of independent users, groups, and shares. Users can have read/write or read only access.
• Synology NASs are based on Linux with a proprietary interface and function set giving the security benefits of open and closed source codebases. Security updates install each night automatically.
• Minimum password standards are enforced. Users must change their password on initial login. Two-step authentication is also possible.
• The system has some anti-intrusion measures. IP addresses that attempt to crack passwords with brute force attacks are automatically banned.
• Shares can be encrypted to prevent unauthorised physical/direct access. When the system is backed up, the data on the backup is also encrypted.
• While publicly accessible, the system is not advertised anywhere and a particular URL is required to access it. It is less likely to be targeted by hackers than most online services.
4.3 DATA, INSIGHTS & TOOLS

4.3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The parameters by which both stages of this project are to be accomplished are dictated by the following factors:

- Time-constraints of project teams – each stage has approximately 16 weeks for completion
- Time-poor participants – most of the industry stakeholders are time-poor, therefore acquiring quality information in an efficient and smart manner is important
- Varied interests of industry participants will provide several categories of information that need to be compiled coherently and made useful.

To achieve efficiency and effectiveness in the project deliverables, we recommend leveraging technology solutions and industry best practices to achieve the level of research depth required within this project framework.

Research will be achieved via two key methods:

1. Industry stakeholders – The stakeholders covering the roads infrastructure sector hold valuable experience and insights to inform the issues surrounding the tendering processes. During Stage 1, the team sought key focus areas from these stakeholders that require review. During Stage 2, the project team will undertake more comprehensive research within these focus areas.
2. Professional research – Various industry research reports and analysis are available from other tendering process reviews domestically and internationally. These reports will provide useful information to compliment those derived from stakeholders.

4.3.2 DATA MANAGEMENT

To facilitate the gathering of in-depth data, we recommend a sophisticated platform be utilised to conduct surveys and analysis. This allows the research process to be tracked, analysed and reported professionally.

Please see Appendix 4 for a summary and example of reports from selected research software and questionnaire tools – useful as reference. We expected that a professional and easy-to-use questionnaire would generate strong response rates.

The best software would enable Stage 2 to analyse and report on the results professionally. In our research, we have identified GroupQuality as the recommended platform to adopt due to its diverse functionalities and ease of use. Please review below for further details.

GROUPQUALITY – RECOMMENDED

We recommend using GroupQuality, an Australian-owned agile platform for performing industry research with the principle features to capture insights, feedback and knowledge. It features community discussions, online focus groups, online surveys and online interviews. The meetings, group sessions or individual interviews can be recorded and the transcripts can be searched for particular themes at any time post-interview.
As most of the interviewees will be time-poor, this is a fantastic tool to use for interviewing and recording the conversation. The platform allows for more members to join in at any given time which creates an ideal platform for ideas sharing, debate or information gathering.

The Stage 1 project team has analysed the platform in response to RA’s cyber security concerns and the protection of information. We believe there are no significant issues as per the following GroupQuality security measures:

1. All GroupQuality applications, media and database servers operate under a 256-bit Secure Socket Layer (SSL). They are all hosted in Sydney.

2. Complete separation of applications, databases, media and backup servers.


5. Data centres are staffed 24×7 by trained security guards, and access is authorised strictly on a least privileged basis.

6. All data generated by GroupQuality tools belongs to the user, and GroupQuality operates under Australian privacy laws.

7. The data belongs to the user and can be deleted at the end of the project.

Any concerns raised regarding the breach of confidential data can be directly sent to RA or a Stage 2 Team member responsible for security measurement.

GroupQuality has offered full and unrestricted use at no cost for this MBA industry project

(To activate, see Appendix 3 for email correspondence)

Features summary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Discussion Boards</td>
<td>Customisable discussion boards to create and manage discussion plans with participating stakeholders. It has a privacy mode, as well as personal or anonymous discussions. It captures chat or video responses and provides immediate reports. It is adapted for both website and mobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Chat or Video Focus Groups</td>
<td>Invite participants, observers and moderators to conduct strategic focus groups. Allows using images, text, videos and websites to facilitate group interactions. Create discussion guides and topics,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SurveyGizmo</td>
<td>GroupQuality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website and Mobile Ready Surveys</td>
<td>Produce unlimited surveys and questions using simple or conditioning questions. Allows for survey branching and advance logic. Ability to use images and video questions. Provides custom page redirects on completion. Website and mobile ready with real-time reporting and data sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Chat and Video Interviews</td>
<td>Feature-rich platform to facilitate unlimited online interviews. It has webcam and microphone detection, create pages and share media, and video and audio recording. It has a point and click moderator panel and ability to search chat transcripts immediately.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Appendix 3 and the shared drive for more information on GroupQuality or visit [http://groupquality.com](http://groupquality.com).

To proceed with GroupQuality, please contact Steven and reference this project at admin@groupquality.com.au.

---

**SURVEYGIZMO — ONLINE SURVEYS ONLY**

**surveygizmo.**

For a simpler survey tool, we recommend SurveyGizmo as an alternative. It is an easy-to-use and powerful online questionnaire and reporting tool used by leading global brands. Key features include fully customisable survey design, and insightful reporting and data analysis such as real-time updates, one-click advanced reports and easy exporting.

There are different pricing options, including a free option with limited features. Please note SurveyGizmo is a questionnaire tool and does not have other features that GroupQuality contains as listed previously.

See [https://www.surveygizmo.com](https://www.surveygizmo.com).
4.33 BENEFITS AND INSIGHTS DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of the tools suggested above is for the efficient and fast production of insights useful for the research project. The platform provides a toolbox for capturing insight and engaging with stakeholders that are time-poor. The benefit of such online tools, versus traditional ‘manual’ research methods is the speed of testing of concepts and the better management and flow of ideas. It also allows precise audience targeting and control, and provides integrated security features.

Of even greater benefit is the platform’s ability to generate insights using the power of computing and platform algorithms. This allows for early and quick identification of opportunities, risks and actionable insights. The platform’s ability to collate and mine data and convert into smart outputs and reports will save the Stage 2 Team considerable time and effort, especially within a tight project timeframe. The platform isn’t the ends but the means, as the outputs can become elements of further research methods and tools. For example, data generated by early surveys can later be used to conduct intensive focus groups or design-thinking workshops.

It is recommended that once a platform is identified for use, it is quickly learnt by project team members and a plan is generated early in how best to leverage the platform, then implement with purposefully and efficiently.

4.34 OTHER RESOURCES

Other resources are available to aid the research and design process for Stage 2. This is especially important where multiple external stakeholders are engaged and efficient tools provide the means for meaningful engagement and output.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six Thinking Hats</td>
<td>Simple but powerful facilitation tool that focuses group conversations around specific goals at any given time. It helps to manage counter-productive or ill-timed feedback to ensure conversation outputs are maximised and efficient. Can be used at any time and ad hoc, including within group teleconferences.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.debonogroup.com/six_thinking_hats.php">http://www.debonogroup.com/six_thinking_hats.php</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategyzer Value</td>
<td>Practical tools to help design better value propositions and right business models. Used by over 5 million people, including high impact businesses and start-ups.</td>
<td><a href="https://strategyzer.com">https://strategyzer.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propositions and Business Models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.35 PROJECT, COMMUNICATION AND PRESENTATION TOOLS

The diverse range of participants in this project, including the project team and RA stakeholders, requires considered use and management of communication and presentations tools to facilitate conversations and deliver outcomes.

If the stakeholders cannot be interviewed, RA has offered assistance by advising they will strategically place members of Stage 2 next to the stakeholders in their meetings or workshops.

### PROJECT TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TeamUp Calendar</td>
<td>Easy to use online shared calendar to help organise, schedule and share meetings and events. Especially useful for group-view of project activities which can get lost in individual calendars.</td>
<td><a href="https://teamup.com">https://teamup.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google Drive / Dropbox</td>
<td>Secure online storage solutions for project files. Useful to centralise files and information, control access and manage collaborators. Google Drive has an added benefit of document creation (documents, spreadsheets, slides) and shareable/interactive access. <em>Note: RA will provide a secure drive for project use and may override the need to use alternative platforms.</em></td>
<td><a href="https://drive.google.com">https://drive.google.com</a> <a href="https://www.dropbox.com">https://www.dropbox.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project hub</td>
<td>A project hub ensures that stakeholders can easily access and view project progress and updates. It is a one place source for communicating project information. It can include updates, Gantt charts, project plans, calendars, tools, etc. The hub can be produced using free online tools such as WordPress.</td>
<td><a href="https://wordpress.com">https://wordpress.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wordpress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online project management tools</td>
<td>Online project management tools provide feature-rich capabilities to manage projects. Features may include planning, Gantt charts, seamless collaboration, time tracking, reporting and easy mobile access. Zoho offers a Facebook-like interface with unrestricted access at no cost, provided it manages only one project and limited to 10MB document. Asana is one of the most popular project management tools available, created by the co-founder of Facebook. It has simple aesthetics and simplicity but rich in features and capabilities. It is especially useful for real-time interaction,</td>
<td><a href="https://www.zoho.com/projects/">https://www.zoho.com/projects/</a> <a href="https://asana.com">https://asana.com</a> <a href="https://trello.com">https://trello.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
visualising goals, and assigning priorities. It is free for up to 15 users.

Trello is another popular, highly effective and free tool that uses a task-based project management system that is easy to use and has built-in intuitive features such as checklists, calendar functions, and task-fading to provoke action.

COMMUNICATION TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>join.me teleconferencing</td>
<td>Free web and phone enabled virtual teleconference platform, with the ability to include international participants at no extra cost. Provides high-definition voice and video quality, screen sharing capability and online text chat features. Teleconference details are easy to share with one-click sharing. Available on desktop (Mac and Windows) and mobile (all platforms). Paid version provides additional features such as white boarding, presenter swap and specific window sharing.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.join.me">https://www.join.me</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slack</td>
<td>Smart team messaging app that provides channel-based communication features. Team conversations can be organised by ‘channels’ such as projects, topics or teams, and provides collaborators and moderator controls. Files can also be easily shared and integrated with API services such as Google Drive and Dropbox.</td>
<td><a href="https://slack.com">https://slack.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email and messaging apps</td>
<td>Email provides traditional communications, especially with external stakeholders. It is recommended that the project team utilise a messaging app such as WhatsApp, Viber or Skype for easy communications on the go. WhatsApp has a desktop capability for added convenience.</td>
<td><a href="https://web.whatsapp.com">https://web.whatsapp.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PRESENTATION TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prezi</td>
<td>Visual and conversational presenting tool that goes beyond traditional slide presentations. It helps to focus on specific topics in a fun and engaging way. Content</td>
<td><a href="https://prezi.com">https://prezi.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is easy to add using templates and is available on all platforms and devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tool</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Website</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canva</td>
<td>An all-online presentation design tool with dozens of templates and built in design components, including millions of images. Easy to use and highly aesthetic, it can be used for multiple purposes including cover pages, presentations and social media presets.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.canva.com">https://www.canva.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blrt</td>
<td>Mobile collaboration and presentation app which allows for recording, pointing, zooming, and drawing over images, document or web pages. Allows for the use of voice, gestures and files to create a video-like presenting experience, and includes a group chat tool. Conversations are also easy to find via keywords or tags.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.blrt.com">http://www.blrt.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emaze</td>
<td>Online presentation software with unique features such as redesigning PowerPoint presentations, 3D zoom and video backgrounds. Easy to use templates and feature-rich content aids easy presentation design. More suited to polished presentations.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.emaze.com">https://www.emaze.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haikudeck</td>
<td>An alternative to PowerPoint, key propositions include simplicity in messages, use of images to amplify emotional impact, and keep formatting clean and consistent. It provides access to over 40 million Creative Commons images and allows access to presentations in the cloud on any device.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.haikudeck.com">https://www.haikudeck.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infographic tools</td>
<td>Several online tools are available for high visual representation of data and information. These tools are especially useful where numbers and statistics are included for smart and aesthetically beneficial presentation.</td>
<td><a href="https://www.canva.com/create/infographics/">https://www.canva.com/create/infographics/</a> <a href="http://www.visme.co">http://www.visme.co</a> <a href="https://infogr.am">https://infogr.am</a> <a href="https://piktochart.com">https://piktochart.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGEMENT

4.41 INDUSTRY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

The research phase completed by the Stage 1 Team identified several issues within the tendering process that were reported as cumbersome and inefficient. Following on from this, the team, in consultation with RA, determined the next phase would be to survey RA members and seek their responses to a series of questions about the areas highlighted in the research. The survey served several purposes, key among them were the following:

- Comparing the industry issues identified in the survey results with the research findings to highlight issues common to both.
- Confirmation that the project was aligned with those issues that RA members considered priority areas for Stage 2 to conduct further investigation.
- Provide RA members with an understanding of the project and give them an opportunity to provide input and feedback.
- Confirm for the team and RA that the project brief was aligned with the needs of members and was focusing the Stage 1 and 2 teams’ efforts on the areas of most importance and relevance.

RA provided the team with a list of 39 members to contact and seek survey responses. The team developed a survey questionnaire containing 14 questions and commenced distribution to RA members in mid-April 2016. Following up of stakeholders has continued from this date through to 13 May 2016, providing respondents several weeks in which to respond.

*The stakeholder list below and full contact list can be found at the following path in the RA Secure Drive:*

\Stakeholders\Stakeholder Engagement Tool Kit\List of Stakeholders

4.42 RA BOARD MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ray</td>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td>Ray Fisher &amp; Associates Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Dodds</td>
<td>Broadpectrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marko</td>
<td>Misko</td>
<td>Clayton Utz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Cliche</td>
<td>Sydney Motorway Corporation (WestConnex)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Steele</td>
<td>Arcadis Australia Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>Fajardo</td>
<td>Acciona Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Transurban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Troughton</td>
<td>Main Roads WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Stuart-Watt</td>
<td>WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craig</td>
<td>Laslet</td>
<td>Lendlease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neil</td>
<td>Scales</td>
<td>QLD Department of Transport and Main Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>Merritt</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>John Holland Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>Bushby</td>
<td>Ventia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RA MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nicholas</td>
<td>Wall</td>
<td>Acciona Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando</td>
<td>Fajardo</td>
<td>Acciona Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xabier</td>
<td>Campo</td>
<td>Acciona Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Doyle</td>
<td>Advisian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damian</td>
<td>Seabrook</td>
<td>Altus Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Amey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Monaghan</td>
<td>Aquenta Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Kajewski</td>
<td>Arcadis Australia Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Schnitzerling</td>
<td>Arup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Mackay</td>
<td>Bechtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew</td>
<td>Patterson</td>
<td>Bechtel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ian</td>
<td>Gunter</td>
<td>Bouyges Construction Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marko</td>
<td>Misko</td>
<td>Clayton Utz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen</td>
<td>Durkin</td>
<td>Engineers Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collette</td>
<td>Burke</td>
<td>Exner Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javier</td>
<td>Lopez</td>
<td>Ferrovial Agroman (Australia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>Kinniburgh</td>
<td>GHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Olsen</td>
<td>John Holland Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Gidley</td>
<td>Laing O’Rourke Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashley</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>Lendlease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Cummins</td>
<td>McConnell Dowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norm</td>
<td>McIlftrick</td>
<td>Previous Secretary Tasmanian Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name</td>
<td>Last name</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miles</td>
<td>Vass</td>
<td>QTMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>Pitacco</td>
<td>Rizzani de Eccher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Duncan AM</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Higgins</td>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudio</td>
<td>Taglietti</td>
<td>Salini Impregilo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Leeper</td>
<td>Samsung C&amp;T Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosu</td>
<td>Zubizarretta</td>
<td>SICE Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Reeve</td>
<td>SMEC Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Cliché</td>
<td>Sydney Motorway Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Boyd</td>
<td>Tonkin &amp; Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Charlton</td>
<td>Transurban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>VicRoads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>Ryan</td>
<td>WBHO Infrastructure Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER RELEVANT CONTACTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
<th>Company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining and L&amp;G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip</td>
<td>Cave</td>
<td>Clough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat</td>
<td>Tallon</td>
<td>Civmec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**International Road Federation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th>Last name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Méline</td>
<td>Huynh</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.43 STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT TOOLKIT

PURPOSE

This Stakeholder Engagement Toolkit is designed to support the success of the Stage 2 project, as outlined in the Request for Service.

The toolkit provides a robust framework for the Stage 2 Team, as well as recommended planning, management and implementation strategies for successful stakeholder engagement in this project.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT – AN OVERVIEW

Meaningful stakeholder engagement is not just an end in itself, nice to have, or a good way to manage relationships. It is an essential and mutually beneficial strategic function that results in better-informed and more effective outputs to gain project success.

It may start as an activity to help solve a problem but as the continuous loop of engagement develops and matures over time. Stakeholder engagement becomes an essential and mutually beneficial strategic function that results in better informed teams and stakeholders, as well as more effective project focus and outcome.

WHO IS A STAKEHOLDER?

A stakeholder is any individual or group who has a vested interest in the outcome of an organisation’s actions. Internal stakeholders are people who are already committed to serving an organisation as staff, volunteers, executive leadership and board members.

A key stakeholder is any stakeholder who is significantly affected by an organisation’s actions and/or has considerable influence on those actions. For example, specific individuals, groups and organisations may play a pivotal role in helping planning efforts succeed or fail because they have access to required information and other important resources. External stakeholders are people who are impacted by an organisation’s work as service recipients, community members, partners from the public and private sectors, funders, advocacy/interest groups, and others.

Stakeholder engagement is critical to this project as it requires careful consideration and stakeholder management to ensure valuable information is received and managed with strong care and due diligence by the project team. This project requires a commitment to engage actively with the stakeholders, listen carefully and build a respectful relationships, responding to any concerns.

The ultimate goal of this project’s engagement is to create and sustain an environment of trust and respect that results in sharing of crucial information to maximise the benefit to all parties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits for Stage 2 Team</th>
<th>Benefits for Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved communication between the Stage 2 Team and key stakeholders such as RA, industry bodies and members)</td>
<td>• Confidence in the Stage 2 Team and its ability to provide results required, particularly the key stakeholder, RA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to critical information regarding the bidding process and procurement information of</td>
<td>• Greater opportunities to contribute directly to the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to have their views heard and give back to the industry for which they serve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
major infrastructure in Australia and internationally

- Ensuring the Request for Service is delivered in collaboration with stakeholders and demonstrate outcomes which address RA’s needs
- Successful risk management practice – allowing risks and implications to be identified and considered as early as possible
- Enhanced confidence in the Stage 2 Team from key stakeholders
- Enhanced capacity to provide most informed outcome possible and successful outcomes for the benefit of RA and the industry

- Opportunity to participate in discussion and propose solutions
- More open and transparent lines of communication
- Increased accountability of the Stage 2 Team to honour commitments
- Increased understanding of the Request for Service and expected outcomes and parameters

[Flowchart diagram showing Seven Phases of Successful Engagement]

**PHASE ONE:** Plan and Design

**PHASE SEVEN:** Present and Complete

**PHASE SIX:** Evaluate and Improve

**PHASE FIVE:** Adopt and Launch

**PHASE FOUR:** Reflect and Affirm

**PHASE THREE:** Listen and Engage

**PHASE TWO:** Contact and Consult
PHASE ONE: PLAN AND DESIGN

Phase One: Plan and Design strategically define concrete objectives for the stakeholder engagement activity, creates a preliminary work plan, and determines the most effective methods for engaging the right mix of stakeholders for the intended purpose of the activity. When guided by a well-defined purpose and sound plan of action, all stakeholders are more likely to invest their time, input, and energy toward contributing to the desired outcomes. Specifically defined results also facilitate effective collaboration and knowledge sharing, which lead to better results and outcomes. Conversely, a poorly conceived engagement effort can undermine the potential to successfully achieve project goals, create mistrust, waste stakeholders’ time, and lead to ‘engagement fatigue’ – a reluctance to participate in future activities.

The Stage 2 Team members should avail themselves of the following questions to help define results:

- What do you want to achieve overall at the end of this process (i.e. anticipated results)?
- What changes and/or tangible products do you want to create as a result of this stakeholder engagement process?
- How will those changes and/or products benefit the operation of the infrastructure industry?
- How will they benefit those being served by RA?
- What tool will be used for the questionnaire and to collect the data

During this phase, creating conditions for success requires taking action from the beginning to promote shared ownership and support of the engagement effort among key stakeholders.

Tasks:

- Define required results from project as a team – document this
- Become familiar with research within this report (and any of your own)
- Investigate and agree on the data management tool to be used (see 4.3.2 Data Management above, and recommended tool GroupQuality) as this may be used immediately to capture and record any stakeholder engagement
- Engage with the project sponsor at RA
- Nominate one member of the team to be the primary contact
  - Communicate with the project sponsor via email and / or phone
  - Organise initial kick-off meeting with RA and other key stakeholders.
  - Confirm and clarify Request for Service
  - Confirm stakeholder strategy (see Phase Two: Contact and Consultation below)
- Using information above, create work plan for remainder of project
- Document process as you go

PHASE TWO: CONTACT AND CONSULT

Phase Two: Contact and Consult – the purpose of this phase is for the team to make contact with the key stakeholders. This first step will be to engage with RA, and then using this report, identify and engage RA members and other relevant parties (consultants, lawyers, industry experts, etc). When preparing to engage
stakeholders, the ability to understand their opinions, expectations, and contributions is critical to developing effective strategies for gaining their support and commitment to future action.

Throughout this process of initial engagement emails, minutes, phone calls and notes should be securely stored and documented accordingly. The Stage 1 Team have stored all relevant documentation for stakeholder engagement activities at the following location \Google Drive\Důcere MBA - Roads Australia - Team 1\Stakeholders\Důcere_RA Shared Files\Stakeholder Engagement Tool.

We recommend the Stage 2 Team execute the following task list to ensure the approach stage is successful.

Tasks:

- Contact the RA project sponsor and confirm RA is comfortable with the timing to commence stakeholder engagement.
- Confirm with the project sponsor their preferred way of communication to be kept informed of the engagement process.
  - Ensure RA has access to the secure drive.
  - Provide RA with a weekly update report to ensure RA are across all levels of engagement with key stakeholders including dates, who spoke to whom, brief comments on what was said in any project team meetings, who from the team is responsible for communicating with which stakeholder and next appropriate action.
- Kick off the engagement process with RA, preparing stakeholders for engagement.
  - Organise with project sponsor to send out a notification to all stakeholders involved with a brief of the project and a note to prepare stakeholders to be contacted by the Stage 1 project team. This may include an introduction of the team with names and relevant contact details. This will avoid ambiguity and or concerns when the team approach stakeholders initially. We suggest this is included in RA’s newsletter “RA Insider”.
  - Confirm if any stakeholders require a personal email either from the project sponsor or the RA CEO to encourage participation. A draft email will be prepared and sent to RA to execute.
- Using the stakeholder list provided, commence engagement with members and other relevant parties.
  - Approach members with an initial email with project context and copy of questions.
  - Use a standardised email format across all stakeholders including a personal email signature which states: Name, MBA Student, Důcere/University Canberra, mobile number. A logo of the University of Canberra and RA, as project sponsor, may be used. Do not use other business logos or email signatures, such as your current employer.
  - The key stakeholders are generally at the executive level and are critically time-poor. Therefore, it is recommended that the approach phase provides a full value proposition for the stakeholder to ensure prompt engagement. For example: What will the stakeholder get from the interaction and the report? How will their contribution make a difference to the industry they represent?
  - Make note of stakeholders with a personal or executive assistant. It is recommended they are contacted first, or cc’d into initial email engagement to support interview appointments.
  - Highlight confidentiality measures and that all concerns will be addressed, if any.
  - Organise interview times with stakeholders. It is recommended that a suitable electronic diary such as Microsoft Outlook Calendar is used and the appropriate details are recorded in the appointment item. For example: Who will call who and on what number? How long will the interview go for? Add all relevant invitees and use appropriate subject lines. Attach questionnaire if this has not already been sent to the stakeholder. Have the stakeholders accept meeting invites to ensure confirmation of appointment.
  - Conduct interviews with the stakeholders
    - Introduce yourself to the stakeholder.
• Provide a clear synopsis of the objective of your interview.
• State the confidentiality terms of the information gathered (i.e. the information gathered will be used only for the purpose of the project sponsor and all information will be stored as per the security guidelines included in this report).
• Use the questionnaire as a guide and allow the stakeholder to share their view organically.
• Ask the stakeholder if they wish to be kept informed as the project progresses. If so, communicate this to Project Sponsor to manage.

**Note:** Tone of the interview and key messaging – remind interviewees of the opportunity this project provides to have a voice and be recognised in the industry as a leader of change. Stress how vital the stakeholder is to the results of this project and the invaluable contribution they can provide to the industry.
- Remember to let interviewees know what the next steps are and what they can expect

- **Document process**
- Record responses and save to secure drive
- Provide relevant updates to the project sponsor using the update report.
- Summarise responses and collate to include in final research report.

**PHASE THREE: LISTEN AND ENGAGE**

Successfully engaging identified stakeholders in a respectful process allows for mutual trust and understanding to grow. This is the foundation for mutual learning, problem solving and ongoing partnership. This section describes considerations for planning and conducting successful stakeholder meetings, tips for respectful engagement, and guidance for effective follow-up communication.

### Guiding a Strategy Review Discussion with Stakeholders

- Present the information in a clear and compelling way.
- Ensure stakeholders understand what you are presenting; including allowing ample time for clarifying questions.

- **Consider asking the following questions:**
  - **Clarifications:**
    - Do you have any questions about the strategy, including its purpose, specific recommendations, or intended outcomes? What needs to be clarified?
  - **Affirmations:**
    - What do you like about the proposed strategy?
  - **Modifications:**
    - What additional changes would you recommend?

- **What’s Missing:**
  - What other factors or issues need to be considered before the strategy is finalized?

- **Next Steps:**
  - What should the follow up process look like? Who should be involved? How extensive should the process be? How should information about progress and outcomes be shared?

- Consider building in time for small group reflection, so that stakeholders can process the information being shared with them.

**Role of Guiding Bodies**

During the Reflect and Affirm phase, guiding bodies continue to play the role of both maintaining engagement and implementing the action plan that results from the engagement process. The guiding body can play an important role in:

- Developing guidelines and plans for communicating and reviewing proposed strategies with many stakeholders.
- Facilitating review processes, including in-person meetings or the use of data collection tools such as surveys.
- Overseeing resulting decision making, including the integration of additional stakeholder feedback as part of continued strategy development.


### Tasks

- Continue to follow up with any stakeholders who are yet to participate and reiterate the value proposition to strengthen stakeholder engagement.
- Communicate with project sponsor regularly to avoid concerns with stakeholder engagement. As an example, the RA Member Services Team liaise with members on a daily basis and need to be
kept informed of conversations/communications with members in case enquiries are made regarding the project.

- Seek support from project sponsor if stakeholders are not engaging and challenges arise.

**PHASE FOUR: REFLECT AND AFFIRM**

Once initial stakeholder input has been gathered and analysed during the development of proposed strategies in the project, those who participated in the engagement process can provide valuable feedback regarding resulting findings and decisions. By creating space for reflection and continued discussion all participants can take part in an honest assessment that allows everyone to understand clearly what is happening and why and. In contrast, the failure to communicate and discuss results of the stakeholder engagement process can prompt more questions and feelings of uncertainty around whether agreements or requests are being honoured. It can also lessen the motivation of stakeholders to contribute further when called upon. This will be particularly crucial in this project as you will be dealing with highly sensitive and confidential information and retaining trust throughout the entire process will be the success or failure in receiving what you need.

**Tasks**

- Collect findings and assess themes
- Store information in secured drive
  - Stakeholder interview recordings and notes
  - Copies of emails sent to stakeholders
- Share results with RA, identifying priorities and critical information using the weekly update report
- Assess for any gaps and plan and execute any necessary follow-ups with stakeholders.

**PHASE FIVE: ADOPT AND LAUNCH**

Once information from the stakeholders is gathered, it is important to conduct the stakeholder analysis. Stakeholder analysis helps to identify and assess the importance of key people who will provide significant impact to project strategy, organisations that may influence the success of your project and the key themes highlighted from the information gathered.

A stakeholder analysis:

- Improves the chances for the success by identifying the interests of relevant stakeholders and the appropriate type of participation for different stakeholders.
- Ensures that engagement efforts promote a range of diverse participants and perspectives (e.g. cultural, geographic, gender, economic) vs. relying on the ‘usual suspects’. It opens the door for engaging groups that may be marginalized or overlooked to contribute.
- Helps the engagement processes avoid being blindsided by concerns or conflicts that might not be considered without this analysis.
- Allows for the identification of key themes and areas to be documented for project strategy.
- Results are used to validate research obtained from industry literature, reports and relevant articles.
- Responses can be analysed for feedback and the purpose of refining project scope.
- Results are used to support recommendations applicable to Stage 2 Project

**ARTICULATING THE STRATEGY**

When documenting the chosen strategy for the next phase of work in an action plan, the description begins to lay out more than just what the strategy is. As importantly, it begins to message why it is important to both the project sponsor and its stakeholders and what changes it represents. The following questions can be used
to capture key themes of context and process that will be important to explain the plan of action, in addition to the description of the strategy itself:

- What was the stakeholder reaction to the initial feedback? Based on this most recent opportunity for feedback, which actions will be formalised?
- What will be modified? Include the key evidence, feedback, and major assumptions that informed your choice.
- What short-and long-term results can we anticipate?
- How will we measure success? How will the next steps be integrated with other complementary strands of the organisation’s work? For example, how can our actions and/or anticipated results be leveraged by others to support their goals?

**Task**

- Finalise the strategy through creating an action plan, with input and conversation from stakeholders once again. The action can be used as a tool to ensure changes are actioned and aligned with project objectives
- Use the action plan periodically to ensure changes are actioned promptly with the relevant Team Member and Stakeholder
- Use the action to clearly define each task for each team member until accurate results are obtained and collated to ensure expected projects outcomes are achieved.

---

**PHASE SIX: EVALUATE AND IMPROVE**

An effective, well thought out evaluation process at the end of the stakeholder engagement activity helps everyone to understand better the success and impact of the stakeholder engagement effort and how it could be improved. It provides objective information to identify what did and did not work well, and points the way toward effective changes that will sustain the relationships and ongoing work. There are sure to be valuable learning points from the development and implementation of the process that should be captured and documented for the use of future stakeholder efforts.

**Tasks**

- Identify any risks and provide mitigation in resolution to stakeholder management; for example:
  - Identify whether activities within external parties such as government departments impact the level of engagement with stakeholders. E.g. Change in government leaders and policies, the Federal budget announcement
  - Identify any key industry events held by the Project Sponsor that may cause delays in project sponsor responses and meetings

**ANALYSIS OF STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT EXPERIENCE**

Roads Australia is a very active and busy organisation, responsible for conducting multiple industry events every month across the country. It fulfils this important function of industry convener, while also serving as the peak body for the road transport industry. Roads Australia members are multinational organisations and all are predominantly focussed on their core business of building Australia’s road infrastructure.

With this in mind, the process of the stakeholder engagement for Stage 1 at the outset proved to be challenging as suitable practices were not yet identified and therefore not implemented. It should also be noted that the Project Sponsor team are spread across different states in Australia and milestone meetings can be delayed if suitable participants cannot attend pre-scheduled meetings.
For Stage 2 to overcome these challenges, it is recommended that the Stakeholder Engagement Toolkit is utilised throughout all suggested phases and the project sponsor is well informed of milestone meetings and deliverable dates well ahead of schedule. A high level of communication with Project Sponsor is recommended.

PHASE SEVEN: PRESENT AND COMPLETE

The present and complete phase require the Stage 2 Team to present the findings to the project sponsor Roads Australia, and any other key stakeholders who wish to participate. This phase facilitates a format where findings in the report are presented formally as a result of the stakeholder engagement process.

- Speak to RA about findings and gain advice on what RA most wants to get out of presentation
- Set up presentation / meeting time with RA, and gain advice on any other key stakeholder attendance

**TIP:** Be prepared and provide more than one suggested meeting time for the final presentation.

- Communicate findings to stakeholders via a formal presentation (tools are listed above in 4.35 Section)
- Document process.

4.44 COMMUNICATION PLAN

Below is a recommended timeline of when to undertake each of the stakeholder phases above. It will be crucial to the success of the project to have constant communication with the project sponsor and RA, as key stakeholder, throughout the entire life of the project.

4.45 CHANGE MANAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS

Any major change programs such as those to be proposed by the outcomes of Stages 1 and 2 of this Tendering Process Review should consider the implementation of a change management framework. This framework provides leadership and processes in assisting impacted organisational groups and participants understand and adapt to change. This process will reduce potential impacts of resistance, misunderstanding, poor adoption and low morale. We suggest that RA guides RA members, and it will be the responsibility of each individual institution to initiate and implement change / transformation programs internally.

The below 9-C model of change management can assist in the thinking and design of a change management program (source in References).
**THE 9 - C MODEL OF CHANGE MANAGEMENT**

**Capacity building:** Capacity building provides the ‘conditions, opportunities and experiences for collaboration and mutual learning’. To build capacity, policies, strategies, resources and actions must be designed to increase people’s collective power to ‘accomplish greater achievement through new knowledge, skills and dispositions, enhanced resources, and increased motivation and commitment’. Building staff capability is one example.

**Champions of change:** Champions of change are people who actively promote the innovation, build support, overcome resistance and ensure that the innovation is implemented.

**Collaboration:** Collaboration occurs when a group of people has a shared goal that cannot be reached by any group member alone. Collaboration is critically important for capacity building.

**Communication:** Communicating the need for and the logic of change is an effective way of dealing with resistance when there is a good relationship between initiators and resisters. Communication during implementation is far more important than communication before implementation because communication in the abstract, in the absence of action, means almost nothing.

**Coherence-making:** Coherence-making helps groups gain shared clarity and shared commitment. Increasing collective capacity is a coherence-maker; when people become better at something they become clearer and more committed. Good leadership requires the process of making meaning out of the change; once people start to make meaning of the change and it has coherence, new patterns may emerge.

**Communities:** One of the powerful drivers of change involves learning from peers. Community builds and preserves new knowledge. The more employees gain understandings and skills in embracing the change, the less they resist it.

**Culture for learning and evaluation:** ‘A culture of learning involves a set of strategies designed for people to learn from each other and become collectively committed to improvement’. Evaluation helps leaders to monitor the implementation processes, to gauge their success and, to identify and resolve issues in a timely fashion. ‘When schools increase their collective capacity to engage in ongoing assessment for learning they achieve significant improvements’.

**Curriculum development:** Constructivism’s perspectives on the role of the individual, on the importance of meaning making, and on the active role of the learner have had great impact on instruction and curriculum design.

**Continuous improvement:** Continuous improvement is the key to creating effective and lasting change; it helps people to understand the change process.
5 – RESEARCH

Since the ultimate goal of the project is to establish whether or not the cost of bidding for major roads infrastructure project is higher in Australia than in other international markets, we researched the tendering process both in the domestic and international markets.

5.1 DOMESTIC

5.1.1 SUMMARY & ISSUES OF CURRENT AUSTRALIAN TENDERING MODELS

TENDERING MODELS

There are several models used in the procurement process for large roads infrastructure projects in Australia. While the models themselves differ substantially, they all share a common set of goals. Specifically, they all aim to:

- Provide value for money
- Clarify the project objectives and deliverables
- Ensure regulatory compliance is achieved
- Demonstrate the transparency and integrity of the tendering process, where it applies

Models are chosen based on their suitability to the environment and the political, societal and economic circumstances in which the project is to be delivered (Casey & Bamford, 2014).

Sometimes features from one model are integrated with those of another, creating a hybridized arrangement. RA requested us to focus on the following main two models:

1. **Design and Construct (D&C)** – This model requires the contractor to both design and construct the project, based on a brief provided by the project owner. Sub variants of D&C include Design, Construct and Maintain (DCM), Design, Construct and Operate (DCO) and Design, Construct, Maintain and Operate (DCMO). In these sub-variants, upon completion of construction, constructors are required to maintain or maintain and operate the infrastructure for a period and to an agreed price. D&C projects encourage the development and delivery of innovative solutions and are well-suited to project owner briefs that are well defined and concise. D&C projects are also efficient in that experts who have a thorough understanding of construction techniques can work closely with the design team, resulting in the close integration of these two project phases.

2. **Public Private Partnership (PPP)** – Using this model, a private provider, selected as the successful tenderer, is given responsibility for all aspects of a major piece of public infrastructure, including for design, construction, maintenance and operation, for a specified period (the concession period). After this period, the infrastructure is returned to public ownership. For the duration of the concession agreement, the contractor is permitted to operate the infrastructure and impose usage charges on users. The concession period, which may be as much as 25 to 30 years, is designed to allow time for the contractor to recover its investment and obtain a reasonable return. This model encourages innovative solutions and is well-suited to large and complex projects, utilising the efficiencies that private providers can offer.
From the literature review, in particular Deloitte (2015), Roads Australia (2015), KPMG (2010), Davenport (2012) and Hayford (2013), the main issues we identified which may impact the efficiency and costs of the bidding process are:

1. **Publication of pipeline projects**
   Tenderer companies argue that knowing road projects that are in the pipeline would help them to be prepared well ahead of time and make better bid submissions. This would even allow them to go ahead and make unsolicited bid submissions, where they are welcome. It is believed that these unsolicited bid submissions foster innovations in the tender process and may even relieve road agencies/governments of budget pressures as some tenderers may offer to finance the project through PPP model. The lack of publication of pipeline projects hinders the capacity of the client’s procurement departments to attract competition and obtain good bid submissions, thus reducing efficiencies and effectiveness, and resulting in higher cost of bidding.

2. **Unclear project objectives**
   In any public infrastructure project, clarity around project objectives is critical to ensure that it is carried out in a way that cost-effectively achieves those goals. However, research indicates that tenderers encounter unclear project objectives for 37 per cent of public sector Request for Proposals (RFPs). Unclear project definition and scope leads to duplication of effort by tenderers in verifying brief information which leads to unnecessary costs. Many potential tenderers opt out of the competition, thus reducing the likelihood of getting better offer both in quality and cost.

   The Deloitte Report (2015) outlines that businesses frequently respond to the scope risk caused by unclear objectives by increasing prices or deciding not to bid. It is estimated that unclear project objectives lead to higher prices, due to both direct premiums charged by firms and reduced competition (Deloitte 2015). Unclear project objectives are the largest driver of direct price premiums identified in the study conducted by Deloitte (2015).

   **2.1 Project delays and project quality**
   It has also been suggested in discussions with industry (Deloitte 2015) that other causes of delays attributable to poor procurement practice include inappropriate consultant selection by lowest cost, rather than taking into account quality aspects of value for money, or simply where the good or service sought by the government is not suitable for their underlying requirements.

   **2.2 Project quality**
   Poor procurement practices also have an impact on the quality of project deliverables. This flows through regarding the value for money achieved from procurement of professional services from the private sector. Unclear project objectives, duplication of effort in verifying brief information, inappropriate risk allocation and onerous contract terms each affects the capacity of firms to explore and propose innovative ways of delivering on Australia’s infrastructure requirements.

3. **Effectiveness of pre-qualification methods and number of bidders**
   An ineffective pre-qualification method leads to a higher number of bidders and duplication of efforts, thus the inefficiency and high cost of bidding. In Roads Australia (2015), industry members surveyed
proposed several measures to deal with this issue, notably – streamlining the pre-qualification process by improving the clarity of criteria, rating and scoring past performance, etc.

4. Issues with tender frameworks and delivery models

Delivery models play a role in contracting problems. Industry consultation conducted by Deloitte (2015) reported that the delivery model as a significant factor in the inclusion of the contract terms. It is estimated that the choice of delivery model accounts for around 22 per cent of the price increases in public sector built environment projects caused by risk allocation and other contract terms (Deloitte 2015).

5. Risk and insurances

Insurance is not available for contract clauses such as fitness for purpose, the expert standard of care and novation provisions. While firms can increase the limit of their professional indemnity insurance policies in response to unlimited liability clauses, there will always be a gap between their level of cover and the unlimited damages that they are potentially exposed to (Deloitte, 2015).

High Risk/Significant (HRS) building projects are those that contain high risk components that impact cost and overall efficiency. HRS building projects are those where:

• failure to meet project objectives of time, cost and quality would critically affect the delivery of services to the community; and/or
• the lack of clear and transparent processes in the procurement of high value projects may impact on government as a whole in terms of industry development and consistency of approach.

To achieve efficient management of risk at the lowest cost, consistent with best practice, contract clauses must ensure that risks are borne by the party to the contract that is best placed to manage them. As noted by Infrastructure Australia, this may involve various risks being retained by the government, transferred to the private sector, or shared by the parties (Deloitte, 2015).

6. Contract terms and conditions

Contracts with the private sector are an important tool for the government to manage the risks involved in public infrastructure projects. However, to achieve efficient management of risk at the lowest cost, consistent with best practice, contract clauses must ensure that risks are borne by the party to the contract that is best placed to manage them. As noted by Infrastructure Australia (2008, p. 29), this may involve various risks being retained by the government, transferred to the private sector, or shared by the parties. The Infrastructure Australia report has considered the extent to which contracting is used by the government to shift risk onto the private sector in procurement for built environment projects in circumstances where this risk allocation may not optimal, focusing on the clauses presented in the table below.

Professional services firms often also face additional contract clauses when negotiating to undertake work for public sector built environment projects that can be inconsistent with the notion of efficient risk management. The most common clauses include unlimited liability, specific insurance requirements, fitness for purpose, the expert standard of care, termination for convenience, novation provisions, and significant liquidated liabilities or abatement regimes (Deloitte, 2015).
7. Lack of Support during tender process

7.1 Skills of procurement managers

Opportunities for improvement in the skills of public sector procurement managers – over one-third of firms identified skills issues in traditional procurement models, and almost two-thirds of firms about privately financed procurement models (Deloitte, 2015).

7.2 Incentives for innovation

Research shows that 45 per cent of professional services firms find public sector clients to be non-responsive to innovative suggestions during tender processes. Practices for the early market sounding process, during the bidding process, or unsolicited proposals exist but could be more widespread both in being offered and being used.

8. Costs

Where a tender price (or a key element of a tender price) is considered well below the median price and the project’s estimated value, further investigations should be undertaken before selecting this tender as

Source: Business liaisons; AGS (2009); Consult Australia (2012); Planned Cover (2013), cited in Deloitte

Table 1: Common contract clauses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unlimited liability (52% of RFPS)</td>
<td>Unlimited liability clauses ensure that the liability of professional services firms to the public sector client is not capped. As ‘unlimited’ professional indemnity insurance is not provided in any insurance policies taken out by firms, the private sector is unable to fully insure against risks under contracts with unlimited liability clauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific insurance requirements (51% of RFPS)</td>
<td>Specific insurance requirements may include liability cap specifications that are higher than the optimal level necessary for a project, explicit naming of public sector clients in professional indemnity insurance (which is not technically feasible) and reductions in excess thresholds, among other terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness for purpose (41% of RFPS)</td>
<td>This clause requires professional services firms to guarantee that the services provided achieve the intended result, and assume liability irrespective of negligence or fault. Liabilities assumed under a fitness for purpose clause are uninsured under standard professional indemnity policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminating for convenience (38% of RFPS)</td>
<td>This clause allows public sector clients to terminate the contract for professional services at any time, for any reason. It will sometimes be accompanied by subclauses that reduce its risks for suppliers. Nevertheless these clauses can create labour cost risks for suppliers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert standard of care (27% of RFPS)</td>
<td>Expert standard of care clauses increase the liability of professional services firms beyond that required by common law and under statute – greater than care, skill and diligence as would be accepted by peer professional opinion as competent practice. These liabilities are also generally uninsured under standard professional indemnity policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significant liquidated liabilities or abatement regimes (27% of RFPS)</td>
<td>These clauses impose penalties on professional services firms at the occurrence of particular events, such as delays, without the need for consideration of the causes of the event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Contracting out of proportionate liability (26% of RFPS) | This clause allows for substitution of one party for another without changing the rights and obligations under the original contract. In the context of this report, novation provisions allow public sector clients to designate a third party with which professional services firms must deal with under the terms of the existing contract. Sometimes there are subclauses that reduce its...
the winning bid. It is good practice to request that the tenderer reviews the bid and respond to questions regarding particular aspects of the tender. The tenderer should also be asked to provide written confirmation that the scope of work and contractual obligations are fully understood.

5.1.2 COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH PPP AND D&C

We believe the results of the Stage 2 questionnaire for this project will enable an in-depth analysis and ability to compare costs across contracts, the industry and internationally. The statistics below were produced in an internal report to investigate the economic benefits of better procurement practice for Deloitte Access Economics in 2015. There is limited research regarding the costs of the individual tendering models.

- $43 billion is invested in public infrastructure per annum of which $18.7 billion is from private sector construction and $4.4 billion from professional services work (architects, engineers and surveyors).
- Poor procurement practices equate to approximately $239 million p.a. borne by the government and its costs approximately $41k per firm per proposal.
- It is estimated that approximately $87 million can be saved by better procurement practices.
- The total price impact of poor procurement practices is approximately 5.4 per cent of total revenue obtained by professional services firms in the public sector built environment projects.
- The NPV of the potential cost savings for government, assuming a five-year phase in period, is $2.5 billion over the period 2015 to 2030.

(Economic benefits of better procurement practice, 2015, pg. 34)

Better procurement can deliver around $5.1 billion in additional GDP between 2015 and 2030. The Deloitte Access Economics report (2015) states that there are some elements of current government procurement policy and practice that increase the cost of infrastructure and are inefficient being where government clients:

- have unclear project objectives
- select inappropriate project delivery models
- fail to guarantee the accuracy of information in project briefs and
- use contract clauses to transfer responsibility for risks that firms are not best placed to manage.

In the bidding phase, the above practices usually result in businesses increasing their prices to recoup the cost of bidding, accepting uninsurable risks which result in reduced competition and innovation. There are considerable risks involved which have significant long term economic impacts such as constraining economic activity through a higher cost of infrastructure. Implications of risk exposure, delays and reduced quality.

(Economic benefits of better procurement practice, 2015, pg. 34).

In another report, Jagger (2012) argued the PPP model is the best value for money and that “PPPs provide an excellent model for sufficient funding of infrastructure projects, harnessing the efficiency and resources of the private sector to achieve quality public policy outcomes” (p. 2).

This is argued by Jin, Zui Xia & Ke (2015) in their paper on reducing tendering costs in the procurement of public infrastructure projects which state that bidding in Australia is expensive due to:

- The cost of design. In Australia there is the uncommon practice to impose the nomination of one or more ‘local’ Design Consultants as early as at the expression of interest stage. This results in the designers being able to dictate their price. Internationally, the contract works only on success fee basis.
- Poorly developed projects by the government agencies. Internationally, most of the design is developed by the employer before tender, leaving verification and assessment of possible improvement to the tender stage, which is far less expensive for the bidders.
• **The cost of consultants.** Project plans can be 20 to 30 pages, which are generally outsourced to local consultants. These consultants work for both the client and the contractors which result in an increase the cost of tenders, and indirectly contributing to limit the number of bidders and so reducing competition.

• **The quality of the submission considered acceptable** by government departments is so high that the submissions always require the support of graphic designers and very expensive hardware.

• **Bid assessment.** The tenders are so complex and demanding from any point of view that their assessment is a mammoth task for the client itself, and most engage consultants which increase the cost and complexities.

• **The sophistication of various management systems in Australia has grown exponentially with the aim of controlling risks and limiting liabilities, but it has not been kept in check by financial constraints** due to a booming economy. The main large Australian companies have not resisted because it has created a significant barrier to market entry by international companies facing significant hurdles, including these high tendering costs and excessive, unfamiliar and intimidating requirements.

Effective competition is not about getting the lowest price through squeezing reasonable NOP profit or margins but through better design solutions, construction methods, high-capability team members, etc. Simple squeezing of profit and margins is seen to be counterproductive to optimising actual outturn cost outcomes (National Guidelines for Infrastructure Project Delivery, 2015, p. 84).

### 5.2 INTERNATIONAL

Research conducted on international models provides some insight into how overseas sectors have approached similar tendering and procurement inefficiencies. This research is not specific to roads infrastructure or civic works, and some provide unique insights into the management of procurement supply chains in general to improve costs and efficiency.

**Europe (PwC 2011)**

Four award procedures are provided for under the regulations. These are: open procedure, restricted procedure, competitive dialogue and negotiated procedure. Public authorities have a free choice between the open and restricted procedures.

Open procedures constitute the lion’s share of public procurement at about 73 percent of all tender announcements in the Official Journal. Open procedures are also used disproportionately more for smaller contract values. Restricted and Negotiated procedures account for about nine percent of total procurements each. The UK exhibits unique patterns because of its great reliance on restricted procedures. The UK is in fact the only country where open procedures do not make up more than half of all procurement. The smaller countries such as Cyprus, Lichtenstein, Malta and Iceland use almost exclusively the open procedure.

**Framework Agreements (etenders.gov.ie 2016)**

Framework agreements definition: “agreement between one or more contracting authorities and one or more economic operators, the purpose of which is to establish the terms governing contracts to be awarded during a given period, in particular about price and, where appropriate, the quantity.”

The use of framework agreements has been increasing rapidly at an average eighteen percent per year since 2006. Most of this growth occurred in large procurers such as France and Spain. Norway, Sweden and Denmark have traditionally made the most use of framework agreements. Conversely, frameworks are used
the least in Southern Europe and the smaller EEA countries. The use of joint purchasing has also been increasing very rapidly as well as more consistently across all countries.

Framework agreements are used in eleven percent of the contract award cases overall, but used more frequently with the negotiated and restricted procedures. Framework agreements are less used with the accelerated and negotiated without publication procedures. When joint purchasing is used, the competitive dialogue is applied more frequently than when there is no joint purchasing. The same goes for the accelerated versions. The numbers involved are small for these three procedures. The use of the open procedure is applied with about the same frequency as when there is no joint purchasing. Negotiated procedure without publication stands out as less frequently used.

In effect, framework agreements are agreements with supplier or service providers which set out terms and conditions under which specific purchases can be made during the term of the agreement.

Framework agreements, based on competitive tendering, represented good practice and achieved economic savings. These frameworks were used to ‘draw down’ commonly procured supplies or services as needs arose in a given period.

Advantages of frameworks:

- Transparent and competitive mechanism where contracting authorities can place contracts with suppliers in the framework without undertaking onerous tendering procedures for individual requirements covered by the framework
- Reduced administrative cost of tendering within or across tendering authorities
- Encourage competition, improving costs, service and quality

Framework agreements can be set up by:

- Individual contracting authorities
- Contracting authority acting on behalf of some other contracting authorities
- Central purchasing authority acting on behalf of a sector or a group of contracting authorities

Rwanda Framework Agreements (Nirere 2015)

The Rwanda Public Procurement Authority (RPPA) implemented Framework Agreements approach to tackling long procurement processes in the public sector. Cumbersome processes, at times taking over six months, had led to delays in executing key projects and inhibiting service delivery across the country.

Framework contracting was one of the mechanisms adopted to solve this issue. This approach provides an ‘umbrella agreement’ that sets out the terms and conditions under which individual contracts can be made through the period of the agreement. It saves public contractors a significant amount of money as it means a comprehensive tendering process and its associated costs are avoided every time a new supplier or services is required. Contracting authorities can simply select from the potential suppliers and service providers listed in the contractor’s framework agreement.

The benefits of framework agreements include competition leading to competitive pricing and excellence in workmanship by eliminating any monopoly players.

Negotiated procedure is used significantly more within the natural monopolies and is the standard procedure under the utility directive. A very clear pattern emerges; most of their procurements are by the negotiated procedure. This is the primary procedure used by most of these types of activities including transport, gas/heat, postal and electricity. The same picture is confirmed when looking at values. Also, economic and
financial affairs have a higher than average share of the procedure in value terms. It was also found that railways, water and urban transport account for nearly 40 percent of the total procurement spending using the procedure.

**Ireland e-tenders and Framework Agreements (PwC 2011)**

The Irish Government has established an e-tendering platform (etenders.gov.ie) designed to act as a central facility for all public sector contracting authorities to advertise procurement opportunities and award notices. The site is managed by The Office of Government Procurement (OGP). The site offers the opportunity to increase the number of potential suppliers available to the Irish Public Sector and the platform is accessible to anyone at no cost. The functionalities of the platform include:

- List of current contracts won
- Registration function for suppliers
- Buyer search
- Supplier search
- Guides and Legislation
- News and links related to procurement

**Italy (PwC 2011)**

Only contractors holding a certificate called SOA are admitted to tender. It dictates pre-qualifications that must be met, demonstrating that contractors comply with criteria related to finances, experience and capabilities. Once the certification is granted, it guarantees free access to all tender procedures without being subject to any further shortlisting.

---

**6 – PROPOSED INITIAL QUESTIONS AND STAKEHOLDERS**

Following the literature review we undertook to interview some roads infrastructure agencies (State and local government) and private construction companies operating in Australia and internationally to validate what we obtained from the research.

From the industry feedback and the literature review we were able to formulate a list of proposed questions that Stage 2 will use in investigating the issues identified as affecting the efficiency and cost of bidding.

**6.1 INDUSTRY FEEDBACK**

**6.1.1 QUESTIONS FIELDED**

A core objective of Stage 1 was to seek industry participant feedback on a range of questions relevant to the Tendering Process Review. This includes an opportunity for stakeholders to provide their view on the following key insights which will provide a deep dive into the industry issues investigated in Stage 2:

- what key themes are to be further investigated in the Stage 2 process
- what key questions are they seeking answers for, and,
- what information would provide significant value to the project objective.

The full set of fielded questions for Stage 1 can be viewed in Appendix 2.
6.1.2 STAKEHOLDER RESULTS – KEY THEMES

Below is interviewee feedback from Stage 1, grouped into themes of where the interviewees found the major issues and challenges with the current procurement process.

DOMESTIC CHALLENGES

1 Risks / Governance
   a. Government is very risks adverse.
   b. Government / client pushes risks onto contractor.
   c. Contractors required to include risk contingency as a dollar amount – this being calculated wrong results in lost money.
   d. If contractor inexperienced in the model, for example, PPP, efficiency likely to suffer.

2 Planning
   a. Uncertain nature of policy initiatives.
   b. Lack of investment in initial concept design.
   c. Lack of action in response to industry feedback when tendering.

3 Process
   a. Lack of design information available for a contractor in the appropriate format.
   b. Lower price selection methods, rather than value for money.
   c. Lack of government contributions to bid costs.
   d. Government asks for too much information, unnecessary level of detail.
   e. Is the right level of design asked for at the right time of tender?
   f. The traditional structure of the process typically asks to price the scope and risk without necessarily being able to refine it fully.
   g. The tender process is primarily on completing the documentation rather than providing a sufficient interaction and engagement process, for example, interactive meetings, workshops and relationship management.
   h. Big issue is not having standard terms that are accepted within industry.

4 Time
   a. Tender process takes too long – can take up to 12 months, resulting in major costs as teams are on ‘standby’ waiting for a decision.
   b. The lawyers are making big money on the big projects as they are taking too long to negotiate.

5 Different requirements from the different road authorities
   a. Same models have different requirements in in every State.
   b. Inconsistency between States (the more risk adverse a State is the more detail they need).
   c. Lawyer always required in every case to go through contract – this could be removed if consistent requirements.
   d. Costs to industry of doing business different in every state, including maintaining registrations for procurement, health and safety regulation, working agreements, taxation, fees and levies.
   e. Highly dependent on the agencies, for example, the project at CFI within the defence are very efficient because they don’t negotiate their contracts, they use the standard terms that are required (no room for negotiation).
   f. The multitudes of State departments – and the process of managing these relationships with several different partners – how will they be managed more effectively?
   g. Lots of overlay with local councils, interest groups and utility companies – there is an enormous impact on upstream stakeholder management. Then there is another layer of internal issues within the stakeholder organisations.
6 Tender detail and presentation information required
   a. Inconsistent between clients.
   b. Too much detail needed up front.

7 Duplication of work
   a. Three contractors or consortiums (or more) may be bidding for one project, and each party is required to engage designers, not just price the project. Only one contractor will win so the rest of the designs are a waste of money and resources.

QUALITATIVE FEEDBACK RELATED TO THE KEY THEMES

Below is suggested areas to explore for solutions to the current procurement landscape, as recommended by the interviewees.

POLICY

- Consistent regulations nationally, across all States.
- Less restrictive tendering guidelines – more room for innovation.
- Explore different ways on how the company / consortium can cover the costs of the tender (the higher bidding costs equal higher construction costs).
- The government / client pay for designs up front (which is not preferred practice currently) – government then owns this IP and can pass it on as part of the tender. Contractors are then more likely to spend more on the bid and win it if they don’t have to pay all the design costs.
- Increased investment in initial concept design, although providing opportunities for tenderers to contest key standards of the design.
- Government’s contributions to bid costs in return for ownership of the design, allowing them to utilise innovation ideas from unsuccessful tenderers.
- Align annual budget cycle with requirement for longer term infrastructure planning
- Australian national prequalification scheme and legislation – will reduce bid costs and cost of doing business in each State.
- Improved guidance on selecting appropriate delivery strategy to achieve the best value.
- Currently, unsolicited projects aren’t competitive if it is good enough, hence, take that thinking and apply it to a government proposal.
- Change the Commonwealth level procurement rules so that they are not required to be competitive.
- Bring a commercial view and better understanding of risk, more ground information, more due diligence. The design is better quality when you are more aware of risks and conditions in the right regions.
- Access to better sourced data, for example, governments to support D&C process.
- State tenders are antiquated in their approach and doesn’t work in 2016, doesn’t allow for a good outcome, sometimes the simple process (e.g. documentation process) can be the most difficult.
- A better understanding for all is needed, with equal opportunity for all parties.
- The government will not often have sessions of collaboration and will only accept written applications.
- Seek to have interactive sessions for all tenders, do it properly and wisely.
- Have strict rules to facilitate equal opportunity and more interactive workshops, but do not go overboard, like having meetings for meetings sake which provide no value.
- Urban freeways are always very low risk jobs and are mandated by the state. Has any analysis been done on the operation of different States – who is doing well? Set a standard for all States?
- Are standards over-engineered?
- The high costs of bidding primarily come from the standards – scope and specifications, both come from the State standards.
• Use D&C market testing in all instances and innovate to save money.

**PROCESS**

• Less detail required up front (more opportunity to provide more once bid won).
• The government considers taking on more risk themselves rather than pushing it to the contractor.
• Government / client to look at the Alliance Principles and merge these with D&C and PPP – particularly the principles of sharing risk.
• A KPI ‘incentive’ process, drawn from the Alliance principles – place a pool of money into a D&C and reward contractor (for example, if contractor finishes early, they receive $1 million, if there are no complaints from community – may receive $1 million).
• Change the length of time – if agreed time is not kept to, then contractors to be compensated.
• Move to ‘preferred provider’ status more promptly and let the other bidders out of the race. Then can negotiate with a preferred provider at this point.
• Consistency and formal exchange of planning priorities between government levels, developing a more consistent long-term infrastructure policy and finding a framework.
• Explore the early contractor involvement models of tendering – they have broad industry support.
• Short list criteria which differentiate tenderers, not replicating criteria already addressed through pre-qualification, for example, “experience”.
• Improved project governance.
• Transparency of weightings and selection criteria.
• Improved upfront planning and scoping of projects.
• Scoring of Expressions of Interest focus on expertise and not overly local experience to ensure lower cost international suppliers are not ruled out.
• Client provides concept designs in Building Information Modelling format when project sufficiently complex.
• The big costs are reflected in the overhead. If the tender process was more streamlined it would bring down the cost and result in better value for money.
• Create a new process, not only the cost of bidding will decrease, but the result of winning is higher, for example, one out of four bidders is higher risk and more cost than one out of two bidders.
• Greater interactivity and engagement.
• Concise information on objectives, scopes and risk.
• Streamline tender deliverables – work out what is necessary and what isn’t.
• Reconsider the whole competitive tendering process, create the perfect procurement process from scratch.
• Why do proposals need to be competitive? Fundamentally reconsider the entire competitive structure.
• The trend at the moment is towards staff having greater interactive and engagement with all parties. This has started with interactions on PPPs – alliances and partner delivery models. The increasing trend has resulted in the better tender evaluation and is highly effective.
• Significantly streamlined tender processes.
• Fundamental reconsideration of whether the traditional competitive tendering process is the best procurement process. People just accept the norm but is it right? Is there a better way to maximise the procurement value for money?
• Greater emphasis on interactive and engagement processes.
• Greater use of standard contract terms and reduce the scope for contract departures and negotiations.
• The key to success is good relationships and good communication practices.
• ‘Private entity – more efficient – more innovative – more value’ (private sector backs itself and are quicker to market than the State entity, which results in better value for the public.
INTERNATIONAL INFORMATION

Below is some of the interviewees’ knowledge of the international market, and their hypotheses as to why the procurement landscape is so different overseas.

• Europe
  - Have a reference design provided by client developed to a higher standard.
  - Less stringent guidelines – only required to include enough detail for pricing and in summary format.
  - More money put into contingency.
  - Clients generally less risk adverse and willing to gamble slightly more on what finished product may look like.
  - Interviewees indicated this appeared to work well, to their knowledge, in England, Spain and other parts of Europe, and the Middle East.
The literature research and the feedback from industry survey have allowed us to identify the main issues which might affect the efficiency and cost of the tendering process for major roads infrastructure projects. Stage 2 will conduct a deeper investigation into these issues. We have formulated some broad interview questions to be fielded by stage 2. They may need some refinement on the basis of RA's observations to our final report and the requirements for their use in Group Quality platform.

Stage 2 Questionnaire

As one of the leaders in road infrastructure industry in Australia and abroad, we would like to ask you a few questions to help us get a deeper understanding of the issues affecting the efficiency and cost of bidding for major road infrastructure in Australia and where possible in international markets:

In your opinion and from your practical experience, what types of problems do you encounter in the following three main phases of the tender process? How do these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of the bidding process? What are the main causes of these problems? How do you think these problems could be addressed?

a. Tender preparation phase

i. How does the publication of pipeline projects or lack of it, impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? Does this facilitate innovation in tender submission? What is the impact innovation on tender process efficiency and cost?

ii. What are the problems (if any) associated with project definition and scoping (e.g. expenses for clarification; opting out of the completion because of unclear definition, etc.)? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

iii. What are the problems (if any) surrounding project risks and mitigations and how does this affect the tender preparation costs? What is the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

iv. What are the problems (if any) associated with the selection process for tenderers, especially the pre-qualification? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?
v. What are the problems (if any) associated with tender documentation? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

vi. What are the problems (if any) associated with criteria for selection? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

b. Tender phase

i. What are the problems (if any) associated with the call for tenders (e.g. amount of details required, inadequate design information)? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

ii. What are the problems (if any) associated with responding to the invitation and developing a commercial offer? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

iii. What are the problems (if any) associated with tender meetings and inquiries (e.g. lack of timely and clear feedback from the client)? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

iv. What are the problems (if any) associated with amendment to tender documents and submission? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

v. What are (if any) the problems associated with the closing of tenders? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

c. Tender evaluation and award phase

i. What are the problems (if any) associated with tender analysis (e.g. long waiting time for the outcome, unclear marking, etc.)? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?
ii. What are the problems (if any) associated with tender clarifications? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

iii. What are the problems (if any) associated with the tender selection and award, as well as contract negotiation and signing (e.g. contract clauses which are sources of cost or inefficiency of the bidding process)? How would these problems impact on the efficiency and the cost of bidding? How often do these problems occur? What would be the cause of such problems? How could they be addressed?

d. Other questions

i. Do you find procurement officers in the roads agencies possessing the need skills? How does lack of skilled procurement officers affect efficiency and cost of the tendering process?

ii. How does the time factor (unnecessarily long tender process) affect the efficiency and the cost of the tendering process in Australia? What are the causes of delays in the tendering process and how could they be addressed? If you operate in other international markets, how does the length of the tender process compare in international markets with Australia?

iii. Are you able to share examples of bidding costs in your organisation and do you find these unreasonable and why?

iv. How does a selection criteria based on the lowest bidder affect the efficiency and ultimately the cost of the tender process?

v. Are there any other issues affecting the efficiency or the cost of bidding for major road transport project which have not been identified in the previous questions? What are they and how do they impact the efficiency and the cost? How could they be addressed?

vi. Is lack of harmonization in the tender process requirements across States a source of inefficiency and costs? Would you recommend a harmonized tender process across Australia?

vii. Do you operate in other countries? How do you compare the efficiency and cost of the tendering process for road infrastructure project in Australia and in international markets? What are the sources of the difference in efficiency and in cost?
7 – STAGE 1 FINDINGS

7.1 GENERAL COMMENTARY

THEMES/ISSUES/CHALLENGES ACROSS THE TENDER PROCESS TO BE INVESTIGATED IN STAGE 2

Please refer to section 6.1.3 which details the feedback from the stakeholders. We recommend Stage 2 read all of the transcripts taken from the interviews out of Stage 1 and develop on the key themes.

The main issues identified domestically were:

1. Risks / Governance
2. Planning
3. Process
4. Time
5. Different requirements from the different road authorities
6. Tender detail and presentation information required
7. Duplication of work

In regards to our research, past studies such as RA’s National Procurement and Tendering Surveys (2011–2015) and Deloitte’s Economic Benefits of Better Procurement Practices (2015) have identified the several potential centres of inefficiencies and excess costs in the tendering process in general infrastructure projects. These are most likely to be the same for major transport infrastructure projects and should be what Stage 2 of the project should focus its investigation on.

The Deloitte study (2015) shows that bid costs for professional services firms involved in public sector infrastructure projects range between 0.6 per cent and 2.9 per cent of the total project value. In a major road infrastructure of about $1 billion, that means that for each company deciding to bid, the cost will be between $6 million and $29 million. For the winning company, the cost of bidding will be included in its price quotation and therefore be recovered. But, assume that we had five participating companies. The total loss for the four losing companies (i.e. the loss for the economy) will be between $24 million and $116 million, a very high cost. It means that for delivering a $1 billion project, the economy should be prepared to lose up to $116 million! That is why everything must be done to make the tendering process as efficient and cost effective as possible.

From the above mentioned research, the effectiveness and cost of the tender process can be investigated by collecting and analysing data on the following parameters:

1. Publication of pipeline projects
2. Clarity of tender documents:
   - Quality of project brief information (project definition and objectives, clear scope and design boundaries)
   - Amount of detail and documents required for submission
   - Clarity of selection criteria
   - Tender period
3. Effectiveness of pre-qualification methods
4. Quality and timeliness of tender information (briefing and feedback)
5. Appendices to tender documents
6. Number of bidders
7. Skills of procurement managers
8. Incentives for innovation
9. Contract clauses (how risks and liabilities are apportioned).

EXPECTED OUTCOMES OR INITIAL HYPOTHESES

The Stage 2 Team will collect data on all the above-mentioned parameters in Australia and where possible in international markets, to determine how they affect the efficiency and the cost of the bidding for major transport infrastructure projects and to also compare the situation in Australia and abroad.

We hypothesise that for all these parameters there is room for improvement, thus also room for improvement in the efficiency and reduction of the cost of the bidding process. We further hypothesise that the tender process in some international markets is more efficient and cost effective than in Australia. Data needs to be collected on those parameters in such a manner that we would be able to test those hypotheses. Data will also need to be collected on what can be done to improve on all those parameters, to allow Stage 2 to make robust recommendations.

8 – STAGE 2 TENDERING PROCESS REVIEW FRAMEWORK

8.1 PROJECT PROCESS

8.1.2 STAGE 2 REQUEST FOR SERVICE AND MINIMUM DELIVERABLES

STAGE 2 REQUEST FOR SERVICE

Based on the current Request for Service, at the commencement of the Stage 2 project, RA will clarify and confirm the below project objectives:

• Implement the results of Stage 1 scoping study, incorporating additional direction obtained via Roads Australia members and directors.
• Receive a direct briefing from a group of key RA members.
• Interview Roads Australia members and other relevant organisations.
• Assess the evidence and compare the cost of tendering in Australia with other countries.
• Provide key advantages and disadvantages of the existing tender process.
• Present recommendations to improve the cost and time efficiency of the tender process.
• Highlight key areas where the tender process can improve value for money during the procurement of major transport infrastructure in Australia.
MINIMUM DELIVERABLE

Based on the Request for Service, we believe that the minimum deliverables may be as follows:

1. Provide a summary of key insights found during the interview process with RA members.
2. An analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of current tender processes in Australia.
3. Reveal whether the cost of tendering in Australia is higher or lower than overseas.
4. List key recommendations to improve cost and time efficiency in each jurisdiction.
5. Suggest a best practice process for tendering for major transport infrastructure in Australia.
6. Predict the future of procurement in Australia for major transport infrastructure.
8.2 CONCLUSION

We recall that in the framework of the industry-based MBA jointly delivered by Dūcere and University of Canberra, Roads Australia decided to submit a Request for Service (RFS) to MBA students to investigate the efficiency and cost of bidding for major road infrastructure projects. The ultimate objective of the RFS is to establish whether there is truth or not in the often expressed but unsubstantiated concern that the cost of bidding in Australia is higher than in other international markets.

As mentioned in the introduction of this report, the project was divided into two stages and we were assigned to Stage 1. Over the last 14 weeks we have worked tirelessly to understand the tendering process for road transport infrastructure both in Australia and abroad and to identify the issues affecting its efficiency and cost. Through the review of the existing literature we were able to identify the issues which may affect the efficiency and cost of bidding. These issues were confirmed by the industry stakeholders we engaged through a quick survey. We are confident that through this double-pronged approach we have identified all major issues that Stage 2 should investigate to have a clear understanding of the efficiency and cost of the tender process both in Australia and abroad and draw useful conclusions and recommendations.

Minding of the fact that the quality of Stage 2 findings will largely depend on the efficiency and effectiveness of stakeholder engagement and the quality and efficiency of data collation, management, analysis and maintenance, we undertook research to identify the most recommended tools to use to achieve the two. We have developed a 7-stage stakeholder engagement toolkit and have identified and recommended a reputed, sophisticated and yet flexible and easy-to-use Australia designed platform called GroupQuality, to be utilised to conduct surveys and data analysis. It is noteworthy that since this project is undertaken in the framework of an MBA Education, GroupQuality has graciously offered a free license for the use their platform.

Conscious of the fact that bidding for costly road infrastructure is highly sensitive due to the competitive nature of proposals and that industry players regard their intellectual property as a key competitive advantage, we developed a set of data security measures which will ensure the confidentiality and security of data collected from the industry stakeholders and hopefully encourage high participation in the study.

Furthermore, we have identified and availed a list of industry players from whom Stage 2 will collect information on issues affecting the efficiency and cost of the tender process. Some of these industry players operate both in Australia and in other international markets and are therefore able to share information on the tendering process abroad. However, to avoid relying only industry players who may have vested interested in championing the view that the cost of bidding in Australia is higher than elsewhere, through the International Road Federation (IRF), we also identified roads construction companies and agencies in Europe who will be able to inform Stage 2 on the issues under investigation.

We are convinced and confident that we laid a useful and robust framework for Stage 2 MBA students to hit the ground running and be able to rapidly collate, manage, maintain and analyse the necessary data to comprehensively address the issues of efficiency and cost of the bidding for major road infrastructure in Australia and ascertain whether the cost is higher than in other international markets. However, we wish to underline strongly the fact that Stage 2 project will only last 14 weeks and its success will largely depend on how well Roads Australia will sensitise all its members to the need for smooth cooperation with the MBA students, especially in providing timely and comprehensive responses to the survey questionnaire.
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APPENDIX 1: STAGE 1 PROJECT PLAN AND TIMELINE

### Project Plan

**Roads Australia Sponsors**
- Ian Webb (CEO), Maree Meats (National Policy Manager), Scott Owen (Capacity Chair)

**MBA Project Team**
- Brian Savage (team client representative), John Velasco, Jessica Bisley, Charlie Mungathe, Monique Keys, Hayd Thorne

**Project Milestones**
- **Project Plan:**
  - Thursday 23 March 2016
- **Draft Report:**
  - Friday 24 April 2016
- **Final Report and Presentation:**
  - Friday 27 May 2016

### Deliverables

1. **Project Plan**
2. **Report and Presentation**
   - Delivering the requirements of the RFS

### Success Measures

- Completed roadmap for Stage 2, endorsed by RA
- Stakeholders matrix and interview questions
- Approved format to gather and assess data

### In Scope

- Receive a direct briefing from a group of key Roads Australia members
- Identify what information needs to be collected to assess the tender process for major transport infrastructure projects across Australia. Include planning, design, construction, operations and maintenance procurement
- Identify how to collect both local and international data and information required to conduct the investigation
- Outline how communication and data will be managed with government and industry partners who give feedback to this study. Address confidentiality and privacy
- List questions the project needs answered, and identify the key people in government and industry (in Australia and overseas) that need to be interviewed
- Interview Roads Australia members and other relevant organisations
- Outline key themes to investigate and analysis, hypothesise the result
- Outline how the group would proceed to carry out and implement this study

### Key Stakeholders

1. MBA Industry Project team
2. Dr Sebastian Dijou (Academic Convenor)
3. Roads Australia Sponsors
4. Members of Road Australia
5. Federal and State Road agencies, major construction companies, major infrastructure consulting companies
6. RA sister organisations in North America or other regions

### Roles/Interests

- 1. Respond to the Roads Australia RFS
- 2. Provide academic guidance to the students and grade their individual and group papers related to the Industry Project
- 3. Confirm RFS details, as well as provide information and guidance across the project deliverables
- 4. Assess the Final Report and ensure it is acceptable and complete for Stage 2
- 5. Collect information and views on the efficiency and the cost of the tender process in their countries

### Out of Scope

- Any scope listed in Stage 2
- Comprehensive interviews with data collections from RA members and other key contacts
- Any comprehensive analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of the current tender processes in Australia
- Suggestions for best practice processes for tendering for major transport infrastructure in Australia
- Predicting the future of procurement in Australia for major transport infrastructure
- Interviewing the RA members and key contacts about detailed costs of tendering

### High-Level Risks

- **Team issues** (unavailability, technology issues, miscommunication) – to be mitigated through clear communication, weekly team meetings and clear processes
- **Confidentiality breeches** – mitigated by signing RA confidentiality agreements and additional Team Confidentiality Assurance
- **Stakeholders issues** (inconsistent expectations, unavailability of key resources, delays in receipt of information) – mitigated through clear meeting outcomes, clear communications and follow through, and a good knowledge management plan
- **Deviation from project scope** – mitigated by having regular meetings with the client and regular monitoring of the project deliverables against the project plan

### Project Timeline

[Diagram showing project timeline with key milestones and activities]
APPENDIX 2: INFRASTRUCTURE PROCUREMENT QUESTIONNAIRE (STAGE 1)

1. We have been asked to assess the efficiency and the cost of bidding for only the D&C and PPP models. In your view, are these the priority models for industry to seek change?

2. What do you believe are the key issues with the current procurement process (relating to the above two models) in the state/nation where you operate?

3. In your view what key issues should the project pursue, and why?

4. What information should the project seek to review?

5. Can you provide key themes that are to be pursued for this project?

6. What are your suggestions for improvement to the tendering process? How do you think these issues could be overcome?

7. Do you find the bidding process in Australia efficient or inefficient? What are, in your opinion, the causes of inefficiencies, if any?

8. In your view, how can further value be offered to the public (eg. tax payers) throughout the procurement process?

9. What questions do you believe should be included in a questionnaire to the industry regarding the current costs and efficiency of the process?

10. How could the project extract the best information from industry to examine the detailed elements of the tender process? What reassurance do you think industry will need to offer detailed information for analysis?

11. What aspects are most important to you for the project to pursue?

12. Can you give us an example of the costs incurred for a tender? Can you describe the costs incurred during a tender process? What attributes contribute to the cost, and in what approximate proportions? (all internal labour costs – or include sub-contractor component or external costs) How are tender costs tracked through your organisation? How much of the tender cost incorporates additional effort as a value add from your organisation? e.g. innovation, detailed design
13. If your company operates outside Australia, do you find the cost of bidding in Australia lower, comparable or higher to the costing bidding in other countries? Please offer project examples where possible.

14. If the cost of bidding is unreasonably higher in Australia than in other markets, what do you think are the causes and how could they be addressed?

15. Do you operate overseas and will you assist the second stage with actual statistics or comparisons?

16. Is there anything you would like to add/comment?
APPENDIX 3: EMAIL FROM GROUPQUALITY

From: Steven Mallows <steven@groupquality.com>
Date: Tue, May 17, 2016 at 2:05 PM
Subject: Re: Questionnaire tool
To: Heidi Thorne

Hi Heidi

Thank you for your email.

Yes, you can run a test of the tool. To sign-up just create a trial account and we will upgrade you for the 16-week project period. https://groupquality.com/groupquality-market-research-tool-free-trial-registration/

You can find all you need to know about how to use the system here: https://support.groupquality.com/

The survey section is here: https://support.groupquality.com/hc/en-us/categories/200103997-Online-Web-Mobile-Surveys the Survey results section will have some more info about reporting.

I have attached 3 version of the report you can pull from the system to do your analysis in excel or other tool. There is a cross tab tool and some reporting in the system, but it depends on how detailed you need to be. [files available in handover drive]

1. ...Summary.xlsx is a report from the summary report area

2. ...participants-full is a report that is a full data extraction for each participant, it is delimited by characters depending on the question types you use.

3. ...participants-coded is the report which has each result, and is coded and requires the data key to decode the numbers. This version is good if you have complex question types. The data key is also included and you can change the variable name in the tool for each question before you export. The key is then used to run a macro or similar to change the numbers to text answers if you need to.

More info at the reports section of the survey help centre as shown above.

4. Online chat focus groups has lots of info here: https://support.groupquality.com/hc/en-us/categories/200103967-Live-Synchronous-Groups-Interviews

5. There is also a webinar video here which is focused on usability groups, but the same process applies and is a good intro. https://support.groupquality.com/hc/en-us/categories/200193743-GroupQuality-Software-Webinars

Kind regards

Steven Mallows
GroupQuality.com
## APPENDIX 4: RESEARCH TOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Tool</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Brief summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey Gizmo</td>
<td><a href="https://www.surveygizmo.com">https://www.surveygizmo.com</a></td>
<td><em>$25 and $75 for the professional package</em></td>
<td>Data collection and analysis shouldn’t be isolated activities. You need software that can flex, adapt, and scale across your organization. With its incredible power and unmatched pricing, Survey Gizmo can do all this and more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey monkey</td>
<td><a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com">https://www.surveymonkey.com</a></td>
<td>$24 monthly plan for limited features. The best is the platinum which is $1,020 annually. <a href="https://www.surveymonkey.com/pricing/details/?utm_source=help_center">https://www.surveymonkey.com/pricing/details/?utm_source=help_center</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GroupQuality</td>
<td><a href="http://groupquality.com">http://groupquality.com</a></td>
<td>I contacted them about the price for using this software and they said that since we want to use it for an MBA project, they can give us a free license.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualtrics</td>
<td><a href="https://www.qualtrics.com">https://www.qualtrics.com</a></td>
<td>US $2,500 per annum which allows one licence and access to their reporting and 24-hour support</td>
<td>*Qualtrics Research Suite survey software, which allows to conducting online surveys. *Surveys can be shared among peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edentify</td>
<td><a href="https://www.edentify.com.au">https://www.edentify.com.au</a></td>
<td>Approximately $2,500 although they would like to meet with us prior to quoting to develop the package required.</td>
<td>*Specializes in Internet based research, online database management, and email marketing. *65,000 members available to survey in an online platform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asteriod</td>
<td><a href="http://www.roymorgan.com">http://www.roymorgan.com</a></td>
<td>The fees are included in the database build or licence (I have emailed them for a quote)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Survey</td>
<td><a href="https://www.keysurvey.com">https://www.keysurvey.com</a></td>
<td>I have emailed them for a quote and demo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Familiar and well used questionnaire tool including graphs/reports for the results.*

*GroupQuality offers an online survey tool, which is:*
  *User friendly*
  *Scalable (small to large surveys).*
  *Integrated.*
  *Australia’s Agile Market Research Software and Insight Consulting Services.*

*Qualtrics Research Suite* survey software, which allows to conducting online surveys.

*Statistical, model building, geographic mapping and interpretive consultancy.*

*Questionnaire tool and graphs/reports from the data collected.*

*Mobile, Online and Offline Data Collection for every survey process.*
Advantages:
- Easy to follow instructions
- Use the Survey Gizmo reporting suite or connect your data with other analysis tools easily & quickly.
- Automated analysis is done for you so it is easy to see correlations, patterns, and trends between questions.
- Survey can be branded
- 2,000 new customers a week, 240k active customers, 196 countries, 130k new surveys
- Secure and Reliable Architecture - Your data collection and analysis are mission-critical, so you need software that’s going to be there constantly and consistently.
- Built on Amazon Cloud Services and ten years of experience.

<p>| You can view and analyse your results at any time during the collection process in the Analyse section of the survey. Here you can see a summary view of your data; browse individual responses; create and export dynamic charts; use filter, compare, and show rules to analyse specific data views and segments; view and categorize open-ended responses, and easily download your results in multiple formats. Cyber security issues are resolved as the user controls the data/questions etc. With any professional plan, you can download your results in a variety of formats. You can keep an offline copy of your survey results, send the exports to others, download individual | It is a perfect tool for validating ideas, measuring customer satisfaction, employee feedback, etc. Qualtrics Research Suite survey software generate different graphs, reports readily exportable into word, pdf, PowerPoint for making presentations. Tool can track who the invites are sent to, when they are opened and survey recipients can start, stop and re-do a survey at any time. | *The drill down technology employs the power of visual analysis to make your data more insightful, interactive, and actionable. *The flexible core technology allows for deep configurations and bi-directional data flows between programs ensuring information is accurate and up-to-date. *Can be branded and it is easy to use. *Email reminders and tracking function. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>responses for printing, or export your raw data for further analysis.</th>
<th>GroupQuality provides a platform for efficient community discussion boards with a lot of options such as:</th>
<th>You can also directly export your survey data to SPSS for sophisticated statistical analysis.</th>
<th>Questionnaire is easy to read and has a lot of functions such as heat tracing, videos and large icons for the questionnaire.</th>
<th>Asteriod software will analyse and access a database. Thorough training videos on U Tube.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Ability to share different forms of media (images, concepts and videos)</td>
<td>*Helps to understand customers (profiling, attitudes and behaviours). *Helps to understand market dynamics (mkt positioning, communication, specific media targeting, market segmentation). *Multiple users and a closed system ensures confidentiality.</td>
<td>*Filter reports by topic, participant, tags and search for key words. *Transcripts of the discussion are immediately available for download.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Example of a mock survey report - <a href="http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/454498_572c1dff4aa60.07933010">http://data.surveygizmo.com/r/454498_572c1dff4aa60.07933010</a></th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Not available</th>
<th>Please find attached summary and reporting examples</th>
<th>Results can be visualised and graphed and collated</th>
<th>Licensing of build software has two options. User builds their own or they can build it for you. *Please see attached report examples</th>
<th>Please see attached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Disadvantages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Automated analysis may be a cyber security breach</th>
<th>This is a popular survey tool so the amount of responses obtained may be reduced as the novelty has worn off and these surveys are common. We have not seen the report quality. Please see this website for further disadvantages: <a href="http://www.relevantinsights.com/5-things-surveymonkey-cant-do#sthash.FzBoNw8N.dpbs">http://www.relevantinsights.com/5-things-surveymonkey-cant-do#sthash.FzBoNw8N.dpbs</a></th>
<th>Cyber security – you use their system and they control the tool.</th>
<th>Cyber security – you use their system and they control the tool.</th>
<th>It is not a database in itself / seems costly.</th>
<th>*Cyber security issues *American company</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Recommendation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This tool is suitable for this project.</th>
<th>This is a popular tool although due to its popularity, we believe that another professional tool would derive a more successful response rate.</th>
<th>We recommend that Edentify is not used due to the cost. The reports look professional although it does not suit the project.</th>
<th>This program would suit a larger database and not this project.</th>
<th>Awaiting quote to assess project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Appendix 5: RA/Ducere Shared File Index

Please see a list of files in and note that these files will be transferred to the secure drive at Roads Australia.

- **Ducere_RA Shared Files**
  - **Process Map**
    - Process Map Data and Information Collated Stage 1
  - **Project Plan**
    - RA_Ducere Stage 1 Team_Project Plan_v3
    - Update to Project Plan
  - **RA 2015 Procurement Survey**
    - 2015 RA National Procurement Survey NSW Results Presentation
    - 2015 RA National Procurement Survey QLD Results Presentation
    - 2015 RA National Procurement Survey VIC Results Presentation
    - 2015 RA National Procurement Survey Results Summary
  - **Domestic Research**
    - DR1 Deloitte/Consult Australia_Economic Benefits of Better Procurement Processes
    - DR2 Consult Australia_More for Less
    - DR3 Roads Australia_Australian Procurement Landscape
    - DR4 Clayton Utz Insights_Making PPP more Efficient
    - DR5 McKell/NRMA_Pipe Dreams
    - DR6 KPMG/Infrastructure Australia_PPP Procurement
    - DR7 Arcadis_Infrastructure Procurement in a Resource Constrained Market
    - DR8 APCC/Austroads_Building and Construction Procurement Guide
    - DR9 WA Govt_Infrastructure Procurement Options Guide
    - DR10 Building Smart Australasia_Sub_ICT in Design and Planning of Infrastructure
    - DR11 RMIT Academics_The Use of Early Contractor Involvement
    - DR12 NSW AG_Managing Unsolicited Proposals in NSW
    - DR13 ICEC World Congress_A Theoretical Framework for Reducing Tendering Costs
    - DR14 SA Govt_Construction Procurement Policy Project Implementation Process
    - DR15 Sustainability Vic_Collaborative Procurement Fact Sheet
    - DR16 ACA_D&C Projects A Model Procurement Process
    - DR17 ACA_Guidelines for Tendering
    - DR18 NSW Govt_Government Procurement
    - DR19 NSW Govt_ Unsolicited Proposals
    - DR20 QLD Govt_Contractor PQC Tendering and Selection Process
    - DR21 NSW Govt_PPP in NSW
    - DR22 NSW Govt_Rail Infrastructure Project Costing in NSW
  - **International Research**
    - IR1 ITF_Better Regulation of PPP for Transport Infrastructure
    - IR2 PWC/EU_Public Procurement in Europe_en
    - IR3 KPPIP_Getting into Infrastructure
    - IR4 The New Times_Understanding How Framework Agreements Work in Public Tendering
    - IR5 European Commission_Guidance on Framework Agreements
    - IR6 Salini_Procurement in Australia vs Europe
  - **Stage 1 Questionnaire**
    - Questionnaire Response Status
    - Questionnaire_Sample email to RA for V2
    - RA Infrastructure Procurement Questionnaire_V1
    - RA Infrastructure Procurement Questionnaire_V2
    - Sharing of Companies to Interview