

# GPAC Hospitality Operator EOI

Assessment Scoring Matrix



# Assessment Scoring Matrix

TOTAL Score: 100 Points

Each criterion is weighted to reflect its relative importance to GPAC's operational, cultural and community objectives.

Assessors should score each criterion using the descriptors below and provide brief commentary to support moderation and panel discussion.

## 1. Strength and suitability of proposed concept and alignment with GPAC

Weighting: 20 points

Score Range	Description
0 - 5 Poor	Concept is underdeveloped, generic or poorly articulated. Limited or no alignment with GPAC's role as a cultural and community venue.
6 – 10 Adequate	Concept is generally sound but lacks distinctiveness or clear relevance to GPAC audiences and context.
11 – 15 Good	Well-considered concept that responds to GPAC's creative, civic and visitor role. Clear target audiences identified.
16 – 20 Excellent	Compelling, distinctive concept that clearly enhances GPAC as a cultural destination. Strong Alignment with GPAC values, audiences and programming. Demonstrates vision and adaptability over time.

Qualitative considerations:

- Understanding of GPAC as a performing arts and civic venue
- Fit with diverse audiences and visitation patterns
- Contribution to GPAC's identity and sense of place
- Creativity balance with practicality



## 2. Demonstrated hospitality experience and operational capability

Weighting: 20 points

Score Range	Description
0 - 5 Poor	Limited relevant experience. Insufficient evidence of capacity to manage the hospitality provision in a venue of this scale and complexity.
6 – 10 Adequate	Relevant experience demonstrated, though limited exposure to high-visitation or complex operating environments.
11 – 15 Good	Strong hospitality experience with evidence of sound operational systems, staffing and management capability.
16 – 20 Excellent	Extensive, highly relevant experience including arts, cultural or event-based venues. Clear evidence of robust operational leadership and resilience.

Qualitative considerations:

- Experience in comparable venues or mixed-use environments
- Staffing, management and governance approach
- Ability to scale operations across daytime, event and peak periods
- Track record of reliability and consistency

## 3. Quality and appropriateness of food and beverage offer

Weighting: 15 points

Score Range	Description
0 - 4 Poor	Offer is unclear, inappropriate for GPAC or lacks quality and coherence.
5 – 8 Adequate	Offer meets basic expectations but lacks differentiation or responsiveness to GPAC audiences.

9 – 12 Good	Well-considered menu and bar offering suited to GPAC's operating context and customer mix.
13 – 15 Excellent	High quality, flexible and appealing offer that enhances the overall visitor experience and support diverse service periods including catering.

Qualitative considerations:

- Understanding of GPAC as a performing arts and civic venue
- Fit with diverse audiences and visitation patterns
- Contribution to GPAC's identity and sense of place
- Creativity balance with practicality

#### 4. Customer experience approach and understanding of a performing arts environment.

Weighting: 15 points

Score Range	Description
0 - 4 Poor	Limited understanding of customer flow, performance schedules or venue sensitivities.
5 – 8 Adequate	Demonstrates basic understanding of customer experience requirements but lacks depth or specificity.
9 – 12 Good	Clear customer service philosophy aligned with a performing arts environment
13 – 15 Excellent	Strong audience-centred approach that integrates seamlessly with performance schedules, accessibility needs and GPAC operations.

Qualitative considerations:

- Awareness of pre-show, interval and post-show dynamics
- Approach to accessibility and inclusivity
- Atmosphere, tone and service style



- Coordination with Front of House and GPAC staff

## 5. Commercial viability and clarity of proposed business model

Weighting: 20 points

Score Range	Description
0 - 5 Poor	Commercial proposal is unclear, unrealistic or unsupported by assumptions.
6 – 10 Adequate	Basic commercial model presented but with gaps or limited justification.
11 – 15 Good	Clear, credible and commercially sounds model with reasonable assumptions.
16 – 20 Excellent	Strong well-articulated business model demonstrating financial sustainability, shared value and long-term viability.

Qualitative considerations:

- Clarity of rent and revenue structure
- Investment and fit-out approach
- Understanding of GPAC trade patterns and risk
- Balance between commercial return and service quality

## 6. Capacity to deliver a collaborative, flexible and high-quality service

Weighting: 10 points

Score Range	Description
0 - 3 Poor	Limited evidence of collaborative approach or service adaptability.
4 – 6 Adequate	Willingness to collaborate expressed but not strongly evidenced.
7 – 8 Good	Demonstrates a practical, cooperative approach with flexibility across services.
9 – 10 Excellent	Strong partnership mindset with clear examples of collaboration,

---

	responsiveness and continuous improvement.
--	--

Qualitative considerations:

- Willingness to work closely with GPAC over time
- Flexibility across programming and demand
- Approach to feedback, problem-solving and evolution
- Alignment with Council and GPAC values

