



OUTCOMES AND ANALYSIS REPORT

**Roads Australia Technical Specifications and Procurement
Roadshow
Thursday 3 July 2014
BRISBANE**

Breakout Session 1 – Technical Specifications

Breakout Session 2 – Procurement



Aims and objectives

Following the Roads Australia Board workshop and policy alignment session with road agency representatives in early 2014, it was agreed as part of the Communique and outcomes to prioritise and consider:

standardisation and harmonisation of technical specifications and procurement, where possible, including incentives, insurance and materials

The technical specifications and procurement roadshow workshops are the first step in beginning the conversation with road agencies, Austroads, ARRB, Standards Australia and RA member companies.

The aim and objectives of these workshops is to involve all relevant players within the industry to provide feedback and real life examples to consider which technical specifications could be standardised and/or harmonised to drive innovation, reduce the cost of infrastructure and work collaboratively across jurisdictions.

The first and second workshops in Sydney and Brisbane are the beginning of a series of roadshow events across Australia that will form the basis for an end-of-year report to Austroads and state agency representatives for consideration of standardisation and harmonisation of technical specifications across jurisdictions where possible.

Roads Australia is undertaking this initiative in collaboration with all relevant players in the industry and looks forward to feedback from all parties. The outcomes and analysis report from each of the sessions will become a 'living document' for feedback.



Breakout Session 1 – Technical Specifications

Key themes identified in groups

- Roadside barriers/wire rope safety barriers/temporary barriers
- Traffic management/control at worksites
- Asphalt specifications
- Pavement specifications
- Signage
- Recycled/warm asphalt

<p>Question 1</p> <p>With regards to the key areas/themes listed in the outcomes analysis document from the Sydney workshop, please identify the highest priority for standardisation and/or harmonization for the specifications listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road barriers / temporary barriers 2. Traffic management/control at worksites 3. Asphalt specifications 4. Pavement specifications 5. Signage 6. Recycled/warm asphalt 	<p>Group 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consistency of traffic management 2. Asphalt specifications is harmonised with RMS 3. From a maintenance perspective, reduce costs of replacement, e.g. Wire barriers, light standards etc.
	<p>Group 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic management/control at worksites 2. Asphalt specifications 3. Road barriers / temporary barriers 4. Pavement specifications 5. Recycled/warm asphalt 6. Signage
	<p>Group 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asphalt specifications/Pavement specifications/Recycled/warm asphalt 2. Traffic management/control at worksites 3. Road barriers / temporary barriers 4. Signage <p>General notes: pricing specifications – TMR insists on tubes Structures – Australian Standards</p>
	<p>Group 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Barriers – products manufacturing inconsistencies between states/standardise performance warranty/Austrroads guide, design is vague in terms of application 2. AC Spec harmonisation – well advanced 3. Recycle material – RAP – differences across states and local authorities, i.e. Brisbane City Council
	<p>Group 5</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pavement specifications 2. Road barriers / temporary barriers 3. Asphalt specifications 4. Traffic management/control at worksites <p><u>NB:</u> Road sign gantries QLD heavy – people accessible Precast concrete Austrroads standards Vs QLD spec (20% cost for QLD spec)</p>
	<p>Group 6</p>

	<p>Based on dollar impact – Asphalt and Pavements should be first focus</p> <p>Group 7</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic management/control at worksites 2. Road barriers / temporary barriers 3. Signage – achieves similar standard for motorists 4. Asphalt specifications 5. Recycled/warm asphalt 6. Pavement specifications
<p>Question 2</p> <p>In relation to Question 1 (above), please provide a clear example/s where duplication and/or over prescription (of the identified technical specification) could be eliminated? Please be specific.</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Differences in training of traffic controllers • QLD has MUTCD other states haven't linked to legislation • QLD tied to Austroads guide to pavement design • Concrete pavements example where RMS is the leader. Other states should use this. • As a driver RMS Signage better than QLD, e.g. speed cameras – fixed sites <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client requirements for specific barrier types rather than a prescriptive method of barrier determination • NSW needs to come up to standard with QLD <p>Group 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Pricing – square driven piles not permitted in QLD 2. Bridge barriers – meet standard, acceptable elsewhere/global product that can't be used in QLD 3. Concrete Pipes – Australian Standards 80 years all states, except QLD which is more prescriptive <p>Group 5</p> <p>Over prescription. Same product same performance, different spec gantries and concrete pipes</p> <p>Group 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to less prescriptive and accountable results – more outcome focus • Get consistency but align to intended best practice



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QLD has largely aligned with Austroads, with only few supplements for local conditions • Varying use of shuttle buggy for laying AC
	<p>Group 7 Old QLD asphalt spec has prescriptive versus having a performance specification with responsibility sitting with contractor.</p>
<p>Question 3</p> <p>Can you provide an example/s of where proven technology/materials from international jurisdictions has taken a lengthy amount of time in the approvals process? And provide suggestions to fast track the process.</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIPES appears a good idea (ARRB) • Variable message signs get bogged down in what the products delivered rather than what the outcome required was <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trailer mounted arrow boards for RMS • Recognition of international certifications regimes and approved by exception • Need to be conscious of too many product types to minimised maintenance and operation management <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zone guards – 2 years <p>** Regarding TIPES approval will TMR still require separate approval? ** Will ARRB TIPES cover off on all products and ensure national approval?</p> <p>Group 4 Accepted practice Vs best practice Some standards limit innovation Standardise outputs rather than inputs</p> <p>Group 5 Transport Infra Product Evaluation Scheme – no special requirements More recognition of other experts – international and other states</p> <p>Group 6</p>



	<p>Government joint invest shift whole industry where works Needs collaborative approach with industry not prove it Warranties will /may allow private sector risk ie. performance based TIPES eg. Fast track EME Asphalt taken 20 years</p>
<p>Question 4</p> <p>Where has it been difficult to innovate or get approval for new and/or recycled materials? Please provide suggestions to overcome any current barriers.</p>	<p>Group 7 Crumbed/powdered rubber asphalt – assessed by pavement experts favourable. Negative response from a less technical person, use of trial on low profile road was required despite extensive overseas experience.</p> <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RAP – 15% applied • Cross jurisdiction recognition. Look to Europe. • High modules asphalt – consider WoL costs (rolling resistance) <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative pricing are presented as a matter of course • Design process leaves no room for innovation. But there must be a cultural willingness to honestly review the options. <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crushed glass examples – e.g. used by WAMR but not universally used by other state road agencies • Promote TIPES process to suppliers – show a clear path that will lead to universal guidelines for acceptance. <p>Group 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New concrete mix design – durability increase/allow use on low risk project applications/driven by road product agency • Bridge design approval – outside the box, but not time to get through hoops at project phase (only product suppliers can do this) <p>Group 6 NB: QLD/TMR now shirting to this particularly with warranty periods</p>

	<p>Group 7 Refer to Question 3</p>
<p>Question 5</p> <p>Do you think that asphalt specifications could be standardised across jurisdictions?</p> <p>And if so, why?</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current harmonisation of QLD/NSW is good. Should be considered in other states <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Asphalt suppliers providing across state boundaries • 3 months Vs 2 year warranty between QLD and NSW • Handle regional variance with specs/addendum • Allow for installers to work across boundaries <p>Group 3 Yes, asphalt, pavement design could be standardised across all jurisdictions</p> <p>Group 4 Design philosophies Testing methods</p> <p>Group 5 Yes</p> <p>Group 6 Yes. Have base spec with small addendum for site specific local conditions</p> <p>Group 7 Yes, significant benefits in doing so. Four main suppliers should give priority to reach agreements easier. Mix and performance of different SRAs asphalt have little differences.</p>
<p>Question 6</p> <p>Do you think performance based specifications would provide better Value for Money?</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Performance based spec with what detail you need to provide to prove it with underpinning prescriptive technical specs that is deemed to comply with technical specs. • Interactive tender process – guided tender alternatives – needs to be two way communication <p>Group 2</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great level of monitoring and compliance costs for agency • Risk will be priced into cost in any event • Risk of suppliers/contractors to continue operating
	<p>Group 3 Yes</p>
	<p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tender proposal – risk of ultimate success and acceptance/client view of risk allowance for what may lie ahead/uncertainty re: performance • Collaborative contract – more conclusive
	<p>Group 5 Absolutely</p>
	<p>Group 6 Yes, combined with longer warranty periods.</p>
	<p>Group 7 Absolutely. Risk implications need to be considered</p>
<p>Question 7 Other comments/suggestions for inclusion</p>	<p>Group 1 Value for Money means different things to different states and occupation</p>
	<p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modular bridges as a replacement solution for small (timber) bridges – standardisation for this solution • Standardisation will local government • With simplification rationalisation of specs increased surveillance needs to be considered • TMR not accepting alignment with Australian Standards for concrete pipes
	<p>Group 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Harmonisation not about moving to easiest lowest common denominator - Identify shift to best practice and move on it
	<p>Group 7</p>



	Control and prescriptive specifications costs money. Need to consider the Whole approach change. If a PM says no despite evidence based practice and technical reviewer's approval, this costs money.
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



Breakout Session 2 - Procurement

Key themes

- Dual ECI in QLD is successful and slowly being adopted by other states
- Too many addenda
- Open, honest and specific feedback very useful
- Non-price criteria feedback is sanitised and limited in scope
- Generally feedback after close of tender is robust and helpful
- Standard of documentation is generally good, however, it is not always provided at the beginning of the process
- Involving suppliers and consultants at design stage will provide better value for money
- More transparency as to the evaluation criteria and weighting
- Better upfront planning



<p>Question 1</p> <p>Please provide an example/s of the where you think the briefing/interactive process UP TO the close of tender/ROI has and has not worked well. Please identify the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QLD ETI – TMR would not take up innovations by contractors • ECI/CPA – collaborative process during tender gives much better outcomes, but for more expensive to bid • Agreement to pay contractors external costs during ECI & CPA (as agreed with QMCA) is valued by contractors.
<p>Question 2</p> <p>Please provide an example/s of the where you think the briefing/feedback process AFTER the close of tender or ROI including (where appropriate) the tender debrief has and has not worked well? Please identify the State.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QLD – process TMR developed for feedback post does not always tell the real story • QLD – feedback process certainty is appreciated, however, more specifics are needed. And advise the “hard” truths. • Understanding probity needs to be present, however, allow a greater level of open and honest question/answer
<p>Question 3</p> <p>In the last 12 months how would you rate the level and standard of tender documentation used in each State? Please be specific and list examples.</p> <p>Rating out of 10 0 = poor 10 = excellent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QLD – TMR tender documentation is good quality • The SWTC is over prescriptive, the SWTC when printed out on a recent project had folders 4.5m long • Otherwise, current CPA contract with SWTC that has a ‘hard dollar’ SWTC are not compatible. • NSW – greater level of detail in earthworks/civil always allows reduced tender costs, i.e. reduce the level of external consultant interaction. Investigate similar drawing standards to TMR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMS – 8 • TMR – 6 • VicRoads (maintenance) – 7 • RMS technology – 3
<p>Question 4</p> <p>Do you feel the assessment and award of contracts could be streamlined and/or fast tracked? Please be specific and list examples.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QLD – on complex D&C/CPA contracts, the issue of how to incorporate the RFIs that cover specs, commercial and in the tender stage, how to incorporate in contracts such that precedence if documents properly reflects the tender RFIs • Decide early to then enable time for a collaborative process, ultimately there is a balance to driving a streamlined process whilst allow time for innovation to develop. • More time planning / industry engagement allows reduction in tenders and assessments



Question 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• TMR surveillance/contract admin teams are far too big on projects. Elsewhere (other states) contractors QA systems give the assurance required to satisfy compliance.• TMR contract admin teams need to learn and get on board with TMR collaborative culture drive.
Other comments/suggestions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More transparency of programs/procurement across all states• Often through a lack of planning and pressure by the client the tender process gets compressed and that may lead to tenderers not having the time to provide the most competitive bid or consider all options.