

Completion Readiness Assessment - Framework (CRAF)

ITEM No.	Core Coverage Areas / Criteria	Indicator Type	Weighting	Performance Level				
				0	1	2	3	
				Non-Compliant	Compliant	Beyond Expectations	Performance Broadly recognisable as World Class	
				Performance is broadly non compliant with CRL process, procedure or contract requirements	Performance is compliant with CRL process, procedure and contract requirements	Performance has positively gone beyond that level set out within CRL process, procedure and the contract	Performance evidenced is recognised as being exceptional and likely to be industry best practice / frontier	
1	a) Closure of CRAF Actions	Criteria: a) Close out of previous CRAF Actions / Action Tracker status	INPUT	10%	* CRAF Action Tracker not in place / Tracker not regularly submitted	* CRAF Action Tracker in place and regularly submitted	* CRAF Action Tracker in place and periodically submitted	* CRAF Action Tracker in place and code 1
			OUTPUT	15%	* Closure of previous CRAF Actions (<80%)	* Closure of previous CRAF Actions (80% to <90%)	* Closure of previous CRAF Actions (90% to <100%)	* Closure of previous CRAF Actions (100%)
	b) Completion Resourcing and Programming	b) Resources are in place / available for All completion activities for example: - Production / collation of certification packages. - Planning & Consents activities; - Maintain / update databases such as DOORS / DRACAS; - O&M Manuals; - 3D models / CAD etc... Note: This list is not exhaustive. During the assessment of the respective disciplines this will be examined. Accepted programme in place	INPUT	5%	b) Resources not in place / available for All completion activities (Refer to Compliant)	Resources are in place / available for All completion activities. For example: - Certification Team - Production / collation of certification packages; - Consents Co-ordinator - Planning & Consents activities; - DOORS - Resource to maintain / update DOORS database; - DRACAS - Resource to maintain / update DRACAS database; - O&M Manuals - Resource to produce manuals; - 3D models / CAD - Resource to produce models and expedite CAD activities etc... Note: This list is not exhaustive. During the assessment of the respective disciplines this will be examined.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Dedicated QM in place who reports directly to the Project Director (WI Clause 20.6.2) * Completion initiatives demonstrated * Regular meetings to review Completion Status	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Senior management commitment evident - presence in Completion Status meetings * Regular and effective use of Visualisation (VIS) Boards for completion activities / Regularly updated / Briefings held
					* Organizational charts not in place. No reporting lines for completion activities	* Accepted Organisational charts in place with reporting lines for completion activities	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Regular submission of organisational charts	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Periodic submission of organisational charts
2	Check of Site Works - Testing & Commissioning (T&C) Activities	Criteria: Sample check/surveillance of planning and controls relating to a risk based selection of current Testing & Commissioning (T&C) activities that will consist of a review of: - Key T&C documentation - T&C schedules and resource levels; - T&C Competencies; - T&C critical issues status etc... T&C Assurance evidence: Contractors Test Strategies, Test Plans, Test Procedures, Com Lot Definitions, Commissioning Logics, and Test Reports, T&C certificates (IRN's, PCC's, PAC's, AC's) etc...	INPUT	5%	* Planning & control systems unsatisfactory for Testing and Commissioning: - Key T&C documentation - T&C schedules and resource levels; - T&C Competencies; - T&C critical issues status etc...	* Planning & control systems in place for Testing and Commissioning: - Key T&C documentation - T&C schedules and resource levels; - T&C Competencies; - T&C critical issues status etc...	* As outlined in 'Compliant' - Regularly submitted and accepted by CRL	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
			OUTPUT	5%	T&C Assurance evidence not in place for sample	T&C Assurance evidence in place for sample	* As outlined in 'Compliant' - Submitted and accepted by CRL ahead of programme	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
3	Health and Safety (WI Vol 2B - Parts 17 and 19.6) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C1]	Criteria: - Health & Safety Files (H&S Files) Check 7 elements for inclusion: Works description; Hazards; Design Criteria; Decommissioning arrangements; Cleaning & maintenance arrangements; Utilities; As Built drawings (including CDM mgt and MDLs)	INPUT	5%	* Health & Safety File format not agreed with the PM (WI Clause 19.6)	* Health & Safety File format agreed with the PM (WI Clause 19.6)	* As outlined in 'Compliant'	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
					* Contractor has not produced a plan to deliver Health & Safety Files. PMI requirements addressed.	* Contractor has produced a plan to deliver Health & Safety Files. PMI requirements addressed.		
			OUTPUT	5%	* Information required for the production of the health and safety file for the relevant part of the works not submitted to the PM for acceptance four weeks prior to Completion of the whole of the works or any section of the works	* Four weeks prior to Completion of the whole of the works or any section of the works the Contractor has submitted information required for the production of the health and safety file for the relevant part of the works to the PM for acceptance	* H&S Files - submissions over due	* H&S Files - submissions delivered to programme
							* H&S File drafted and uploaded into eB	

Completion Readiness Assessment - Framework (CRAF)

ITEM No.	Core Coverage Areas / Criteria	Indicator Type	Weighting	Performance Level				
				0	1	2	3	
				Non-Compliant Performance is broadly non compliant with CRL process, procedure or contract requirements	Compliant Performance is compliant with CRL process, procedure and contract requirements	Beyond Expectations Performance has positively gone beyond that level set out within CRL process, procedure and the contract	Performance Broadly recognisable as World Class Performance evidenced is recognised as being exceptional and likely to be industry best practice / frontier	
4	Technical Compliance (WI Vol 2B - Parts 7, 13, 22 and 32 Stations, Shafts & Portals and Parts 29 and 32 Systemwide) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C2] Note: Red Line Drawings examined as part of Planning, Heritage & Highways (ECP Ref C3) and Technical Information (ECP Form C9)	Criteria:			Performance rating from consultation with Discipline / Dashboard reports:	Performance rating from consultation with Discipline / Dashboard reports:	Performance rating from consultation with Discipline / Dashboard reports:	Performance rating from consultation with Discipline / Dashboard reports:
		Crossrail Project Functional Requirements (CPFR) / Systemwide Performance Specification (Spec) CPFR/PS - Design	INPUT OUTPUT	2% 2%	* CPFR / Performance Spec Design - Wrap up tracker - RED (> or = 10% documents still required for issue of Design Certificate of Integration);	* CPFR Design - DOORS Database complete with PE acceptance	* CPFR Design - CPFR Wrap up tracker - GREEN (0% documents required for issue of Design Certificate of Integration); RMCR produced	* Design - CPFR / Performance Spec Wrap up tracker - GREEN (Zero documents required for issue of Design Certificate of Integration); Design RMCR is accepted by CRL
		CPFR/PS - Construction	INPUT OUTPUT	2% 2%	* CPFR Construction / Performance Spec Validation applicable clauses not Identified / No plan detailing compliance in place (40% evidenced on time);	* CPFR Construction / Performance Spec Validation - applicable requirements Identified and validation criteria identified, 70% evidence provided and 40% evidence approved & Requirements accepted in DOORS / Excel (for C620); RMCR in progress by Contractor	* CPFR Construction / Performance Spec Validation - DOORS database 95% complete with evidence accepted, draft RMCR in CRL review	* CPFRs / Performance Spec Clauses analysed, evidence of compliance ahead of plan, (100% evidenced on time); RMCR Approved
		Engineering Safety Management (ESM)	INPUT	4%	* Engineering Safety Management (ESM) - Contractor Deliverables not in place (e.g. ESJ); - CRL Deliverables not in place (e.g. SJ)	* Engineering Safety Management (ESM) - Contractor Deliverables in place (e.g. ESJ - Engineering Safety Justification); - CRL Deliverables in place (e.g. SJ - Safety Justification)	* As outlined in 'Compliant' - Contractor Tracker in place - Contractor Deliverables accepted by CRL	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' - Contractor deliverables regularly submitted and accepted by CRL
			OUTPUT	4%	* Performance score not acceptable as advised by the Engineering Safety Management (ESM) Representative depending upon: ESM Tracker performance and Project Wide Hazard Record (PWHR) status	* Performance score acceptable as advised by the Engineering Safety Management (ESM) Representative depending upon: ESM Tracker performance and Project Wide Hazard Record (PWHR) status	* As outlined in 'Compliant'	* As outlined in 'Compliant'
		Interoperability Regulations	INPUT	4%	* Interoperability Regulations - No plan to deliver outstanding Technical Standards for Interoperability	* Interoperability Regulations - plan in place to deliver Technical Standards for Interoperability (TSI)	* As outlined in 'Compliant' - accepted by CRL	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' - regularly submitted and accepted by CRL
			OUTPUT	4%	* Interoperability Regulations -TSI % Compliance: - Design (<100%); - Construction (<80%); - Testing & Commissioning (<80%)	* Interoperability Regulations -TSI % Compliance: - Design (100%); - Construction (80% to < 100%) - if plans exist to deliver the outstanding TSIs - Testing & Commissioning (80% to < 100%) - if plans exist to deliver the outstanding TSIs	* Interoperability Regulations -TSI % Compliance: - Design (100%); - Construction (100%) - Testing & Commissioning (100%)	* Interoperability Regulations -TSI % Compliance: - Design (100%); - Construction (100%) - Testing & Commissioning (100%)
		Gate Impact Reports Note: Output performance is what is expected 6 months before the Completion Date.	INPUT	4%	* Gate Impact Report (GIR) - No Tracker or list in place of all GIRs since Final Design Overview (FDO) * CRL GPCs not issued for latest signed off batch	* Gate Impact Report (GIR) - Tracker or list in place of all GIRs since FDO * Tracker / list updated within 1 period * CRL Gate Pass Certificates (GPCs) issued for latest signed off batch	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Tracker / list up to date	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Tracker / list up to date and regularly submitted to CRL
			OUTPUT	4%	* Gate Impact Report (GIR) Status - GIR signed off with Gate Pass Certificate (<75%); * FDS(b) - Not submitted and accepted by CRL * Outstanding FDO information from Contractor	* Gate Impact Report (GIR) Status - GIR signed off with Gate Pass Certificate (75% to < 90%); * Final Design Statement FDS(b) submitted and accepted by CRL * No outstanding FDO information from Contractor	* GIR Status - GIR signed off with Gate Pass Certs (90% to < 100%); * As outlined in 'Compliant'	* GIR Status - GIR signed off with Gate Pass Certs (100%); * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
		Data Recording & Corrective Action System (DRACAS) and RAM Demonstration	INPUT	4%	* No resource in place to maintain DRACAS - eg Tier 1 RAM Engineer * No consistency in DRACAS reporting process ie DRACAS records are not initiated, incomplete, not completed, or DRACAS records are not rectified	* Competent resource in place to maintain DRACAS – e.g. Tier 1 RAM Engineer * DRACAS records are consistent (initiated, completed and rectified) * Serial numbers of components changed are recorded * Typically 75% of records are completed at any time	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Already reviewed DRACAS records and writing the RAM argument * Already chosen statistical techniques for the RAM argument	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Reliability Growth graphs produced
			OUTPUT	4%	* No RAM demonstration evidence; DRACAS records are not available.	* Solid RAM Demonstration evidence * Clear which DRACAS records relevant to RAM performance	* Already have some conclusions / reliability growth plans on assets	* Draft RAM argument / RAM Demonstration case shared with CRL
		CRL Observations	INPUT / OUTPUT	2% / 2%	* Observations by CRL Field Eng staff (CRL satisfaction with works): - Less than 90% satisfaction	* Observations by CRL Field Eng staff: - demonstrates a CRL satisfaction rate of 90% - respond to unsatisfactory observations - demonstrate analysis being conducted	* Observations by CRL Field Eng staff: - demonstrates a CRL satisfaction rate of 95% - initiates improvement actions and rectifies any unsatisfactory observations within the working shift - demonstrates preventative actions - coordinates CRL field engineers and responds to CRL audit and surveillance activities - demonstrates 'Lessons Learned'	* Observations by CRL Field Eng staff: - as outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' - demonstrates a CRL satisfaction rate of 98% - share Lessons Learned across the organisation
5	Planning, Heritage & Highways (WI Vol 2B - Part 3) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C3]	Criteria: - Planning & Heritage Consents - Highway Consents	INPUT	5%	* Consents programme not in place	* Consents programme in place	* Consents programme in place - aligned with CRL	* Consents programme in place - aligned with CRL and the contractor
			INPUT	5%	* Consents register not in place / not maintained in accordance with the WI	* Consents register in place and maintained in accordance with the WI	* Consents Register in place and updated prior to the consents meeting	* Consent Register in place and updated weekly with CRL being made aware of updates. Requests sent to CRL for weekly reviews/updates
			OUTPUT	5%	* Consents Co-ordinator / Specialist - not in place. Resourcing inadequate to plan / submit / deliver consents to programme	* Consents Co-ordinator / Specialist in place. Resourcing in order to plan / submit / deliver consents to programme	* Contractor has a dedicated consents coordinator role that is filled with an employee in place	* Contractor has a dedicated planning role and has a fully qualified planning specialist in place
6	Environment (WI Vol 2B - Parts 6, 17 and 21) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C4]	Environmental Completion Review criteria Environment reporting data; Site waste management plans; Survey information; Contaminated land; Maintenance regime; CARs, NCRs, Environmental incident investigations - in line with RIVO process; Environmental design; Archaeological information; Boreholes; BREEAM & CEEQUAL; Schedule 17 pt 3 consents; Discharge consents; Noise.	INPUT / OUTPUT	5% / 5%	Performance score to be taken from latest Environment Completion Review	Performance score to be taken from latest Environment Completion Review	Performance score to be taken from latest Environment Completion Review	Performance score to be taken from latest Environment Completion Review
					(As per RAG table with respect to Contract close timescales)	(As per RAG table with respect to Contract close timescales)	(As per RAG table with respect to Contract close timescales)	(As per RAG table with respect to Contract close timescales)
7	Undertakings and Assurances (WI Vol 2B - Part 4) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C5]	Criteria: - U&As closed out - CDT evidence uploaded	INPUT	5%	* Commitments Compliance Plan (CCP) not in place. Open PIR (Potential Incident Report)	* Commitments Compliance Plan (CCP) in place updated at least every 6 months. No Open PIR.	* Commitments Compliance Plan (CCP) updated more frequently when there is a change in scope or other significant development with works (such as key dates/sectional completion).	* U&A KPI is maintained at 100% * Provide closing out comments or qualifying statement during SC/ECP. * No design U&As open for FDO. * No U&As open for ECHR-Interim Acceptance
			OUTPUT	5%	* Evidence not uploaded to date in the Commitments Database Tracker (CDT)	* All evidence uploaded to date in the Commitments Database Tracker (CDT)	* As outlined in 'Compliant'. * And more comprehensive evidence provided than planned.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Closeout evidence in place and uploaded in CDT.

Completion Readiness Assessment - Framework (CRAF)

ITEM No.	Core Coverage Areas / Criteria	Indicator Type	Weighting	Performance Level			
				0	1	2	3
				Non-Compliant Performance is broadly non compliant with CRL process, procedure or contract requirements	Compliant Performance is compliant with CRL process, procedure and contract requirements	Beyond Expectations Performance has positively gone beyond that level set out within CRL process, procedure and the contract	Performance Broadly recognisable as World Class Performance evidenced is recognised as being exceptional and likely to be industry best practice / frontier
8	Document Quality & Control (WI Vol 2B - Parts 20 and 13 and 14 Stations, Shafts & Portals and Parts 20 and 29 Systemwide) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C9]	INPUT	5%	* Last 2 or 3 periodic CMDLs are late (CMDL not submitted within the 4 weeks from the last effective date).	* Only 1 or none of the last 3 periodic CMDLs are late.	* All of the last 3 CMDLs have been submitted on time.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Upcoming period MDL submission draft is kept ready or transmitted to CRL despite any delays by CRL team to review the previous CMDL.
				* Deliverables status report (Code1/2/3/4/Uncoded) not published on regular basis (Weekly/Fortnightly/Monthly).	* Deliverables status report (Code1/2/3/4/Uncoded) published on regular basis (Weekly/Fortnightly/Monthly).	* Follow-up is done with Document Owners on regular basis including deliverables due for submission in the upcoming period. (Last 3-6 months reports/records to be evidenced).	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * As a result of the above, >=95% of all deliverables submitted formally in eB for CRL review. * 0% Uncoded-late documents (documents submitted within the Planned/Forecast dates).
				* Data Retention, Archiving, Retrieval and Destruction procedure(s) not available. * <i>Document Control procedure not available.</i>	* Data Retention, Archiving, Retrieval and Destruction procedure(s) in place and coded Code 1. * Document Control procedure is in place and coded Code 1.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Able to demonstrate good process knowledge and provide necessary evidence (as applicable).	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * No NCRs/Actions raised during the last Internal / External audit (ISO Contractor Audits) regarding: 1) 'Data Retention, Archiving, Retrieval and Destruction' procedure(s). 2) Document Control procedure.
				* MPS requirements are not tracked (required columns missing). * Wherever approved MCRs are listed/available in the MPS/eB report, >=20% of such materials do not have the corresponding data fields fully populated in the MPS. * MPS regularly submitted for acceptance (at least once in 6 months) - as applicable. * MPS coded Code 1/2.	* Wherever approved MCRs are listed/available in the MPS/eB report, <20% of such materials do not have the corresponding data fields fully populated in the MPS. * MPS coded Code 1/2.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * All fields are populated except for those materials for which MCRs are under review / not due.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * All materials/MCRs are captured in the MPS. * MPS coded Code 1/2 (as applicable) with 'no comments'.
				* Schedule of samples/ mock-ups/ prototypes/ test panels and benchmarks (WI Clause 20.7) not available.	* Accepted Schedule of samples/ mock-ups/ prototypes/ test panels and benchmarks (WI Clause 20.7) coded Code 1/2.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * All fields are populated except for those materials for which relevant data fields are not available / as applicable.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * All details are captured in the schedule. * Document coded Code 1/2 (as applicable) with 'no comments'.
				* >=30% of sampled RIR drawings are not transmitted formally to CRL. * >=30% of sampled RIR drawings are missing eB relationships with the respective RIRs.	* <30% of sampled RIR drawings are not transmitted formally to CRL. * <30% of sampled RIR drawings are missing eB relationships with the respective RIRs.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * No metadata errors between drawings and the respective RIRs.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * RIR is coded Code 1.
	Output Criteria: - Code 1 or 4 documents - Obsolete / Cancelled documents - Drawing deliverables (including DD%) - Deliverables on MDL (eB structure) - Records in order (Metadata) - O&M deliverables vs O&M DocControl User Guide - IM Training deliverables	OUTPUT	5%	* Accepted/eB approved deliverables are <70% i.e. Code 1/4, DD% drawings are Rev Cxx/Xxx and drawings with Rev x.x are Code 1/4.	* Accepted/eB approved documents are >=70% - <95% i.e. Code 1/4, DD% drawings are Rev Cxx/Xxx and drawings with Rev x.x are Code 1/4.	* Accepted or eB approved documents are >=95% i.e. Code 1/4, DD% drawings are Rev Cxx/Xxx and drawings with Rev x.x are Code 1/4.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * 0% Uncoded-late documents (documents submitted within the Planned/Forecast dates). * 'Latest CMDL vs eB' discrepancy <3%.
				* >=10% of the overall Obsolete/Cancelled documents are required to be re-instated and submitted to CRL (for CARE etc.) - as applicable.	* 3% - <10% of the overall Obsolete/Cancelled documents are required to be re-instated and submitted to CRL (for CARE etc.) - as applicable.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * <3% of the overall Obsolete/Cancelled documents are required to be re-instated and submitted to CRL (for CARE etc.) - as applicable. * Approved 'Forecast Dates' are applied whenever placeholders are late (as applicable) instead of marking them Obsolete / Cancelled.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * No Placeholders have been marked Obsolete in the last 6 months that will need to be re-instated now for submission to CRL.
				* >=30% deliverables (including DD% drawings) are not assigned eB structure (MDL code)	* <30% deliverables (including DD% drawings) are not assigned eB structure (MDL code)	* 100% of the deliverables (including DD% drawings) are assigned eB structure (MDL code)	* All deliverables (including Placeholders) are assigned correct eB structure (MDL code) as soon as the deliverables are created in eB (Samples to be checked).
				* >=30% sampled documents have Incorrect/Incomplete metadata , content or eB relationships (percentage of missing 'Actual Dates', 'Planned/Forecast dates', 'Obsolete dates' etc. also will be checked against the overall deliverables count). * O&M documents' eB relationships are not set-up as per the Document Control User Guide.	* <30% of sampled documents have Incorrect/Incomplete Metadata/content/eB relationships. * O&M documents' eB relationships are set-up as per the Document Control User Guide. (<i>Exemptions if any, should be evidenced clearly.</i>)	* 100% of sampled documents have correct Metadata/content/eB relationships. * As outlined in 'Compliant' * >=90% O&M documents submitted are Code 1/2/4.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Preventive checks are done on regular basis for ensuring correct metadata, error free documents etc. (Last 3 months reports/records to be evidenced). * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * 100% of O&M documents submitted are Code 1/4.
				* >=40% of IM Training documents are Code 2/3/Uncoded-late.	* <40% IM Training documents are Code 2/3.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * >=90% of all IM Training documents submitted for CRL review.	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * 100% of IM Training documents submitted for CRL Review. * >=90% IM Training documents are coded Code 1/4.
				Assets (WI Vol 2B - Part 13.5 Stations, Shafts & Portals and Pt 29.2.10 Systemwide) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C9]	INPUT	5%	* Asset information is not developed as per Works Information Part 13.5 (Stations, Shafts & Portals) and Part 29.2.10 (Systemwide)
OUTPUT	5%	* Performance score as advised by the Project Information Manager (as per status of from Asset Information Metrics) - Labelling Quantity - % Complete prior to IRN (<100%) - Labelling Quality - in Line with CRL requirements (<80%) - Verification completed (<80%)	* Performance score as advised by the Project Information Manager (as per status of from Asset Information Metrics) - Labelling Quantity - % Complete prior to IRN (100%) - Labelling Quality - in Line with CRL requirements (80% to <90%) - Verification completed (80% to <90%)				* Performance score as advised by the Project Information Manager (as per status of from Asset Information Metrics) - Labelling Quantity - % Complete prior to IRN (100%) - Labelling Quality - in Line with CRL requirements (90% to <100%) - Verification completed (90% to <100%) - Audits on Data Quality
3D Models/As Builts (WI Vol 2B - Parts 7 and 13) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C9]	INPUT	5%	* Performance score Not-acceptable as advised by the 3D / 4D Model Compliance Coordinator (as per status of as built deliverables)	* Performance score Acceptable as advised by the 3D / 4D Model Compliance Coordinator (as per status of as built deliverables)	* As outlined in 'Compliant'	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'	
			OUTPUT	5%	* 3D / As built deliverables not identified to CRL * Projectwise models not being updated regularly * Design not to CAD standards or outside ECMS.	* 3D / As built deliverables identified to CRL * ProjectWise models updated but not shared on ProjectWise. * Design to CAD standards and wholly inside ProjectWise	* 3D / As Builts identified and delivered to programme * ProjectWise 3D models regularly Shared within ProjectWise * Design to CAD standards and wholly inside ProjectWise.

Completion Readiness Assessment - Framework (CRAF)

ITEM No.	Core Coverage Areas / Criteria	Indicator Type	Weighting	Performance Level				
				0	1	2	3	
				Non-Compliant	Compliant	Beyond Expectations	Performance Broadly recognisable as World Class	
				Performance is broadly non compliant with CRL process, procedure or contract requirements	Performance is compliant with CRL process, procedure and contract requirements	Performance has positively gone beyond that level set out within CRL process, procedure and the contract	Performance evidenced is recognised as being exceptional and likely to be industry best practice / frontier	
11	O&M manuals (WI Vol 2B - Part 7) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C9]	Criteria: * O&M Manuals	INPUT	5%	* List of O&M deliverables not identified or incomplete based on associated PFUs/FUs in AIMS and/or incorrect template types assigned to PFU(s) in scope based on IM and tiering of PFU agreements. * Forecast dates not provided, are unrealistic and/or continuously missed * Manufacturer's Literature not available in eB to reference for O&M * CRL O&M Team feedback on the requirements or asset information in scope is ignored, or continuously questioned by author and/or tier 1. * Lack of evidence of Tier 1 Self Assurance on O&M content as outputs of technical authoring resources and/or comment responses on resubmission. * Asset data enabling activities incomplete to support O&M. Examples which impede O&M delivery are: - Incomplete list of PFUs in AIMS and/or PFUs with contractor code allocated which does not represent their scope of works. - Assets not allocated to PFUs/FUs or incorrectly allocated. Civils assets types and numbers do not match installation on site. - EQ IDs not created for all makes and models of equipment and/or not allocated to any Asset Tags.	* List of O&M deliverables identified or Complete based on associated PFUs/FUs in AIMS and/or Correct template types assigned to PFU(s) in scope based on IM and tiering of PFU agreements. * Provision of forecast dates and periodic updates to forecast dates are provided to CRL in the CRL template requested for use. Local tracker and definitions of scopes are not used in this process only the definitions as they appear in eB documents. * Manufacturer's literature to support operation and maintenance of all equipment types installed or due to be installed is available in eB with a compliant document number to reference in O&M. * Tier 1 thoroughly checks the work of their authors prior to submitting to CRL to ensure quality and technical accuracy. * Tier 1 checks comment responses on resubmission of O&Ms to ensure they are correct, appropriate and clearly show how the comment has been addressed. * Tier 1 attends meetings with author and O&M team to provide critical clarifications/ corrections to technical author, agreeing general principles and ensuring they are consistently applied.	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * As outlined in 'Compliant' * Contractor has engaged with CRL and IM at every stage to ensure they are meeting requirements and have tied the delivery of O&M to the other enabling/dependent activities such as asset information, certification and training to demonstrate a strategy for their completion activities * As outlined in 'Compliant' * Tier 1 has actively sought to ensure all required literature is available to the O&M author prior to delivery and submission of the O&M to ensure the complete information needed to fulfill requirements has been included in the O&M. * As outlined in 'Compliant' * As outlined in 'Compliant' * Tier 1 attends meetings with author and O&M team to provide critical clarifications/ corrections to technical author as well as assuring live updates agreed to documents nearing acceptance, agreeing general principles and ensuring they are consistently applied	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
			OUTPUT	5%	* O&M deliverables not produced or poor quality submissions with little information about the as-installed system and its operation / maintenance. * Multiple iterations needed before submission to the IM to resolve basis compliance not adhered to in feedback from CRL O&M team. Little evidence of Tier 1 self-assurance in checking content prior to submission and whether comments have been properly closed * O&M deliverables are delivered late or are not part of a realistic programme provided in advance to CRL aligned with certification and enabling information being available	* O&M deliverables produced in line with installed assets and submitted in a timely manner in line with forecast dates. * CRL O&M Team feedback and use of available exemplars is utilised, comment responses reflect clearly the changes made so review close out is made easier with citations from new text and clear description of how the comment is addressed.	* O&M deliverables produced ahead of forecast dates and achieve IM acceptance by revision 3 (10%) * As outlined in 'Compliant' ; plus - Known issues with Civils Asset data have been resolved and corrected with the CRL Asset Technician. - EQ IDs all created and assignment of asset tags to EQ IDs completed.	* O&M deliverables produced ahead of forecast dates and achieve IM acceptance by revision 2 (15%)
12	Technical Training for Infrastructure Managers (WI Vol 2A - Part 1 Stations, Shafts & Portals and WI Vol 2A Pt 21 Systemwide) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C20]	Criteria: * Detailed Training Strategy and Plan * All supporting Training Manuals / Materials * Completed Training Delivery per agreed program	INPUT	5%	* Detailed Training Strategy and Plan is not developed as per Works Information Vol 2A - Part 1 (Stations, Shafts & Portals) and Vol 2A - Part 21 (Systemwide)	* Detailed Training Strategy and Plan produced as per Works Information Vol 2A - Part 1 (Stations, Shafts & Portals) and Vol 2A - Part 21 (Systemwide) * Training Strategy and Plan details both theoretical and practical approach to training * Supporting Training Manual produced including session plans, train the Trainer notes and all relevant as built	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Detailed Supporting Training Manuals produced with 3D Models	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Detailed Supporting Training Manuals produced with visual aids (training video's, simulations etc)
			OUTPUT	5%	* Training Delivery Program not completed * Training not delivered in accordance to Training Programme (< 100%)	* IM Operation and Maintenance staff acquire knowledge and skills required for safe operations and maintenance of the facilities, assets and/or systems. * Training delivered in accordance to Training Programme (100%) * IM staff are 'competent' of delivering acquired knowledge and skills	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * IM staff are 'proficient' of delivering acquired knowledge and skills	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * IM staff are 'expert' of delivering acquired knowledge and skills * Training delivered ahead of dates planned in Training Programme

Completion Readiness Assessment - Framework (CRAF)

ITEM No.	Core Coverage Areas / Criteria	Indicator Type	Weighting	Performance Level			
				0	1	2	3
				Non-Compliant	Compliant	Beyond Expectations	Performance Broadly recognisable as World Class
				Performance is broadly non compliant with CRL process, procedure or contract requirements	Performance is compliant with CRL process, procedure and contract requirements	Performance has positively gone beyond that level set out within CRL process, procedure and the contract	Performance evidenced is recognised as being exceptional and likely to be industry best practice / frontier
13	Certification of Works (WI Vol 2B - Parts 20 and 13.3 Stations, Shafts & Portals and Parts 20 and 29.2 Systemwide) Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C20] Delivery of planned certification packages to time and quality, including redlines and asset information Criteria: - COWL; Packages & Construction Certs signed off; CARs, NCRs FCDs & RFIs closed out; Observations closed; Installation Release Notes (IRNs), Pre-Commissioning Certificates (PCC), Acceptance Certificates (ACs) etc... Note: Certification KPI No. of certificates to go / X periods = baseline target run rate required No. of certificates to go / X periods (decreases each period we do) = the actual run rate	INPUT	10%	* Lack of ownership of the certification process * Lack of a plan/procedure that describes the requirements and how they will be met	* Identified person(s) responsible for managing the certification process * Plan/procedure in place that supports the CRL requirements	* As outlined in 'Compliant' * Regular meetings, at an appropriate timescale to the status of the works, with input from engineers/package managers responsible for the works * Clear monitoring and measurements of progress * Certification team supporting the vis-boards	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations' * Ownership of the process and outputs by senior management e.g. PM * Collaborative involvement with interface parties e.g. C660 or RFL * Verifiable data provided for the vis-boards
				* Lack of a schedule/tracker or a schedule/tracker with no evidence of regular maintenance (Schedule not in accordance with Document Control requirements)	* Schedule/Tracker in place with evidence of maintenance and control of the certificates (Schedule should be titled, eB numbered, revision coded & dated in accordance with Document Control requirements)	* As outlined in 'Compliant'	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
		OUTPUT	10%	* Unable to verify the progress status identified in the reports * Lack of Signatures from all required parties * Signatures not by persons with required competence	* Progress of the stages of certification is tracked and monitored * All signatures required on the certificates are obtained, else clearly states n/a. * Signatures by persons with required competence * Certification packages are controlled and protected throughout the process until uploaded and accepted in eB.	* As outlined in 'Compliant'	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
				* No. of certificates signed but not yet uploaded and accepted code 1 in eB is increasing * No. of certificates accepted code 1 does not meet the target run rate required to support handover	* No. of certificates signed but not yet uploaded has a minimal gap, that is clearly controlled and tracked * No. of certificates accepted code 1 meets the target run rate	* No. of certificates accepted code 1 exceeds the run rate	* As outlined in 'Beyond Expectations'
				* Cumulative Actual Run Rate is >50 above baseline	* Cumulative Actual Run Rate is 26 to 50 above baseline	* Cumulative Actual Run Rate is 0 (Equal to baseline) to 25 above baseline	* Cumulative Actual Run Rate is below the baseline
14	Defects & Nonconformances Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C20] Cost of defects against earned value Ref: Employer's Completion Process [ECP C20] (WI Vol 2B - Part 20) Criteria: Contractor identifies defect in a timely manner and takes preventive measures to avoid repeats.	INPUT / OUTPUT	3% / 3%	* Contractor raises < or = to 80% of NCRs - not in line with QPI RFT4	* Contractor raises >80% to <95% of (Nonconformance Reports) NCRs - in line with QPI RFT4	* Contractor raises 95% to <100% of NCRs - in line with QPI RFT4	* Contractor raises 100% of NCRs - in line with QPI RFT4
				* % Overdue NCRs is not in line with QPI (>10%)	* % Overdue NCRs is in line with QPI (>5% to 10%)	* % Overdue NCRs is in line with QPI (>0% to 5%)	* % Overdue NCRs is in line with QPI (0%)
				* NCR Closure Rate <50%	* NCR Closure Rate 50% to 75%	* NCR Closure Rate 75% to 99%	* NCR Closure Rate regularly 100%
				* Demonstrate schedule / programme to track & manage close out of NCRs	* Demonstrate full investigation of root cause analysis complete for all CAT 1 NCRs (SPOT-On or equivalent completed by certified RCA practitioner SPOT-On or equivalent eg CQI)	* Demonstrates analysis on Non-Conformance has been communicated across organisation	Root cause analysis carried out for all defects
				* Demonstrate corrective actions	* Zero 'open' Works Information Clause 20.9 Defective Quality Management System Notices	* Clear demonstration on preventative actions	