



OUTCOMES AND ANALYSIS REPORT

**Roads Australia Technical Specifications and Procurement
Roadshow**

Wednesday 30 July 2014

MELBOURNE

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 series of workshops 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 documents from the Sydney & Brisbane workshops, please identify the highest priority for standardisation and/or harmonization for the specifications listed below. Please number in priority order.</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. Traffic management/control at worksites 2. Pavement specifications 3. Road barriers / temporary barriers 4. Asphalt specifications/recycled/warm asphalt 5. Signage
	<p>Group 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road barriers / temporary barriers 2. Traffic management/control at worksites 3. Signage
	<p>Group 3</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road barriers / temporary barriers 2. Traffic management/control at worksites 3. Signage 4. Asphalt specifications 5. Pavement specifications 6. recycled/warm asphalt
	<p>Group 4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asphalt specifications 2. Road barriers / temporary barriers 3. Pavement specifications 4. Signage 5. Traffic management/control at worksites 6. Recycled/warm asphalt
	<p>Group 5</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Asphalt specifications



	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Pavement specifications 3. Traffic management/control at worksites 4. Recycled/warm asphalt 5. Road barriers / temporary barriers 6. Signage
	<p>Group 6</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic management/control at worksites 2. Pavement specifications 3. Road barriers / temporary barriers 4. Asphalt specifications/Recycled/warm asphalt 5. Signage
	<p>Group 7</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Road barriers / temporary barriers 2. Traffic management/control at worksites 3. Signage 4. Asphalt specifications 5. Recycled/warm asphalt 6. Pavement specifications
	<p>Group 8</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic management/control at worksites 2. Road barriers / temporary barriers 3. Signage 4. Recycled/warm asphalt 5. Asphalt specifications

	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"> • Traffic management – accreditation in every jurisdiction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Traffic control - Road safety authority - Delivery requirements – protection of construction zones • Pavements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Every state has different requirements for mix regardless of materials use • Road barriers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public domain – profile requirements different in every state - Proprietary – panel approved does not mean approval across all states
	<p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonisation training of different products and standards • Each state is different – need consistency where possible
	<p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over testing of quarry testing • Traffic management standard for large and small projects to educate travelling public across the regions and states • Enforcement of traffic management by policy on construction sites
	<p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asphalt used on Hume Highway needed the contractor to design two mixes with different binder contents between NSW and Victoria border • Different type of posts used on barrier fences increases maintenance task
	<p>Group 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Foam bit stabilisation – material characteristics and design
	<p>Group 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic Management – Standard safety approach – currently inconsistent • Road Barriers – design no flexibility to allow for innovation • Signage – over prescription. Need more balance across states
	<p>Group 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barriers – guard rail post/blocks – a lot are different • Traffic – vests are different in each state, training for traffic management plans are also different • Signage – align naming conventions
	<p>Group 8</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barriers – profiles of barriers – value for money considerations appear to not drive desire of profiles and shape. Lack of conformity on determination of transition lengths. • Traffic management – Austroads/VicRoads/Safety alert and various interpretations of what is required need consistency across the country.
<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"> • Slip form barriers – acceptable in some states, not in others • Safety barriers – proprietary products are approved by panel • Bridge code and roads barrier codes are not aligned – levels of containment • Highly modified bidders and their recognition in design methodologies is not occurring. • Use of RAP <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Red tape is stifling innovation • Standardisation of approval requirements • Safety barrier – actual standardisation <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New composite cover for drainage and sewer • Need a national product assessment criteria <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A polymer modified binder included PBD polymer which was widely used in Europe which required trials in every state before being accepted. Took about 10 years. <p>Group 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMS has one traffic management board to approve things, however, it can take 2 years for approvals. <p>Group 6</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For example crash safety barriers. All states want to test it differently. <p>Group 7</p> <p>It took 3 years to get guardrail approved across all jurisdictions</p>
<p>Question 4</p> <p>Where has it been difficult to innovate or get approval for new and/or recycled materials?</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most proprietary products – regardless of what it is, need procurement models to facilitate use of specific products • Binders, levels of Rap, other waste in fills. <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficulty to reuse old product on new road. <p>Group 3</p>



<p>Please provide suggestions to overcome any current barriers.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to question 3 <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rap not able to be used in asphalt in Tasmania because not in spec therefore industry won't invest in plant and equipment. • Shared risk between industry and SRA's to allow introduction of new polymer in binder. <p>Group 5</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SRA's generally worry about product failures, it's about industry identifying these concerns and assisting SRA's. <p>Group 7 RAP – cost savings, advantages Vs WoL costs How do we capture, measure and evaluate innovation and efficiencies within our industry?</p> <p>Group 8 Use of Rap is specified as maximum amounts, however, industry has done a lot of work in determining this could be greater but this is yet to be recognised by road authorities specs.</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"> • Yes. Use consistent mix registration process <p>Group 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Mixed design variable is rock and this could be expanded <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is doable if NSW and QLD can do it, why the rest of the country can't. Still needs to safety local requirements. <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes. Asphalt specs should be standardised between states. • Producers are often national companies and supply more than one state with their production plants. <p>Group 5 Yes</p> <p>Group 7 Yes</p> <p>Group 8 Yes, consistency</p>
<p>Question 6</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generally yes, if they can be approved. Consistent approach to demonstrating VfM so there is improved certainty and understood investment. <p>Group 2</p>



<p>Do you think performance based specifications would provide better Value for Money?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, but quality of safety and risk may increase <p>Group 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, subject to DLP to reflect it. France has 10 years DLP and includes maintenance <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yes, but it's a long term project because it will require development of performance measures and investment by industry. Long term performance based contracts can deliver VfM. <p>Group 5 Yes</p> <p>Group 8 Yes, outcomes would be better</p>
<p>Question 7</p> <p>Other comments/suggestions for inclusion</p>	<p>Group 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical specifications are currently written in each state • Australian Standards and Austroads Guides and State supplements – way too much duplication and inconsistency between the documents • The hierarchy is unyielding • Gaps in supplements/Austroads – no man's land is some design requirements in Victoria, eg. Road geometry @ 80km/h design speed. <p>Group 4</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk of multi-state standardisation is that it will result in lowest common denominator winning out. Preferred approach is basing it on best practice. <p>Group 7</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Road line marking should be consistent. <p>Group 8</p> <p>More standardised approach for design. Procurement process – concern that VfM usually appears to be cheapest price not value.</p>



Breakout Session 2 - Procurement

Key themes

- Too many/late 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
- More transparency as to the evaluation criteria and weighting
- Better upfront planning
- Delegate to departmental staff and keep the projects out of political cycles
- Time taken to respond to queries



<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"> • Late Addenda • Ability to consider innovation examples through positive guidance workshops, currently this is ad hoc. • Need honest and credible feedback • Briefings offer little value – no participant will say anything to disclose/share IP.
<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"> • VIC – sometimes the tender debrief is too late. • Time taken to respond to queries. • Tasmania – post tender 3 months evaluation process with no interaction with the tenderers
<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"> • VIC generally roads tenders come out in a similar format, which is helpful/important • VIC = 6 out of 10 • Often tender have been rushed out resulting in missing information or amended information, this leads to an increase in cost to tender for industry on D&C jobs through the need for rework on tenders. • Too bloody good, no space for innovation • 2 – 9. Varies massively • Specs sometimes appear to be a 'cut and paste' from various other tender documents.
<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"> • VicRoads Alliance procurement process is very good. Generally, the program is achieved. However, it is easy to extend assessment/BAFO period. This extension is expensive. • Yes, selection criteria standardisation. Yes, jobs that have been assessed and funded to go back in to the political system for approvals prior to award even when pricing is within approved budgets. • Yes, higher levels of delegation to the Department. • There needs to be recognition of post-performance • Yes, on large complex projects, need to limit number of tenderers to 2 or 3.