

## Annex C: Fairness Monitoring Scorecard

### Quality (Fairness Monitor Performance)

#### Weighting: 40%

Measures the contractor's effectiveness in supplying services and deliverables of the required quality, in conformance with the contract.

Services may include attending and providing feedback on contractor meetings, and reviewing and providing feedback on procurement-related documents.

Deliverables may include Work Plan(s), Interim Report(s), Final Report(s), Addenda to the Final Report, and Summary Report.

Deliverables are expected to be final versions of acceptable quality following prescribed templates. If significant revisions are required by Canada for acceptance, the assessment will be based on the quality of the original submission, not the revised version.

Indicators for this evaluation include (as applicable):

1. **Service Delivery:** Provision of timely and comprehensive fairness reviews of required documents and engagement activities.
2. **Understanding of Scope:** The feedback provided is limited to fairness related issues and does not include unsolicited input that is unrelated to the scope of the contract.
3. **Quality of Writing:** The quality of writing of the formal deliverables, including clarity, grammar, completeness, consistent use of technical terms, adherence to template and format requirements, and consistency between French and English documents (where required).
4. **Quality of Content:** The content of formal deliverables follows the provided standards, definitions, and guidelines regarding the assessment of fairness.
5. **Thoroughness of Fairness Assessments:** Degree to which relevant fairness questions, concerns and issues were proactively identified.

The contractor's performance is rated for each indicator according to the following criteria:

**Succeeds +:** The contractor met or exceeded performance expectations consistently and flawlessly.

**Succeeds -:** The contractor did not always meet performance expectations. Some minor errors or shortcomings that could be improved upon were noted.

**Significant Underperformance:** The contractor did not consistently meet minimum performance expectations. There were repeated deficiencies noted which had a considerable impact on overall contractual outcomes, requiring significant effort to address.

Indicator	Rating	Supporting Justification
1. Service Delivery	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Understanding of Scope	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Quality of Writing	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Quality of Content	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Thoroughness of Fairness Assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Based on the ratings received for all indicators, the contractor is scored according to the table below:

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds + against all applicable indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against only 1 indicator and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against only 2 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against 3 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.</li> </ul>

## Management (Fairness Monitoring Program)

### Weighting: 20%

The contractor's effectiveness in managing activities needed to execute the contract from the perspective of the Fairness Monitoring and Business Dispute Management Directorate.

Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. **Communication:** The contractor is consistent and proactive in their communications, provides clear and comprehensive information, and timely progress updates.
2. **Relationship Management:** The contractor maintains and coordinates effective professional relationships with all stakeholders. This may include subcontractors, client department representatives, end users, third parties and other points of contact, as applicable for the contract.
3. **Flexibility:** The contractor demonstrates openness, collaboration and cooperation in coordinating activities and in responding to inquiries and requested changes to deliverables.
4. **Reliability:** The contractor manages contract work independently, including following through on agreed upon action items, decisions and commitments, without excessive guidance, oversight or intervention required.
5. **Continuous Improvement:** The contractor demonstrates commitment to improving contract outcomes by acknowledging performance areas of weakness, taking corrective action, and providing valuable input for process improvement.

The contractor's performance is rated for each indicator according to the following criteria:

**Succeeds +:** The contractor met or exceeded performance expectations consistently and flawlessly.

**Succeeds -:** The contractor did not always meet performance expectations. Some minor errors or shortcomings that could be improved upon were noted.

**Significant Underperformance:** The contractor did not consistently meet minimum performance expectations. There were repeated deficiencies noted which had a considerable impact on overall contractual outcomes, requiring significant effort to address.

Indicator	Rating	Supporting Justification
1. Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Relationship Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Continuous Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Based on the ratings received for all indicators, the contractor is scored according to the table below:

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds + against all applicable indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against only 1 indicator and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against only 2 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against 3 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.</li> </ul>

## Management (Client Assessment)

### Weighting: 20%

The contractor's effectiveness in managing activities needed to execute the contract from the perspective of the client (contracting authority).

Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. **Communication:** The contractor is consistent and proactive in their communications, provides clear and comprehensive information, and timely progress updates.
2. **Relationship Management:** The contractor maintains and coordinates effective professional relationships with all stakeholders. This may include subcontractors, client department representatives, end users, third parties and other points of contact, as applicable for the contract.
3. **Flexibility:** The contractor demonstrates openness, collaboration and cooperation in coordinating activities and in responding to inquiries and requested changes to deliverables.
4. **Reliability:** The contractor manages contract work independently, including following through on agreed upon action items, decisions and commitments, without excessive guidance, oversight or intervention required.
5. **Continuous Improvement:** The contractor demonstrates commitment to improving contract outcomes by acknowledging performance areas of weakness, taking corrective action, and providing valuable input for process improvement.

The contractor's performance is rated for each indicator according to the following criteria:

**Succeeds +:** The contractor met or exceeded performance expectations consistently and flawlessly.

**Succeeds -:** The contractor did not always meet performance expectations. Some minor errors or shortcomings that could be improved upon were noted.

**Significant Underperformance:** The contractor did not consistently meet minimum performance expectations. There were repeated deficiencies noted which had a considerable impact on overall contractual outcomes, requiring significant effort to address.

Indicator	Rating	Supporting Justification
1. Communication	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Relationship Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Continuous Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	

Based on the ratings received for all indicators, the contractor is scored according to the table below:

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds + against all applicable indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against only 1 indicator and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against only 2 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against 3 indicators and no significant underperformance against any indicators.</li> </ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Succeeds - against 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.</li> </ul>

## Cost (Fixed Time Rate)

**Weighting: 10%**

Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. Accuracy and timeliness of invoices.
2. Reasonableness of billed hours relative to the estimated level of effort for work performed.
3. Justification and approval of additional work.
4. Proactive cost avoidance by the contractor.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invoices were always submitted promptly and in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing requirements of the contract with no errors requiring correction.</li><li>• Billed hours were reasonable relative to the estimated level of effort required for the work performed.</li><li>• Notification and approval of additional work was timely and had acceptable justification.</li><li>• Substantial cost avoidance as a result of early identification of issues and/or opportunities for greater efficiency in performance of the work.</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invoices were always submitted promptly and in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing requirements of the contract with no errors requiring correction.</li><li>• Billed hours were reasonable relative to the estimated level of effort required for the work performed.</li><li>• Notification and approval of additional work was timely and had acceptable justification.</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Invoices were usually submitted promptly and in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing requirements of the contract with minimal errors requiring correction.</li><li>• Billed hours were reasonable relative to the estimated level of effort required for the work performed.</li><li>• Notification and approval of additional work was timely and had acceptable justification.</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Isolated instance(s) of issues related to billing and cost control, such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Unreasonable delay between submission of invoices and the time the work was performed, making validation difficult.</li><li>○ Insufficient justification of billed hours relative to the estimated level of effort required for work.</li><li>○ Inadequate budget monitoring and notification of contract increases in required level of effort.</li><li>○ Commencement of unauthorized work.</li></ul></li><li>• The contractor made a reasonable effort to address cost control issues and minimize recurrence.</li></ul>
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Persistent issues related to billing and cost control, such as:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Unreasonable delays between submission of invoices and the time the work was performed, making validation difficult.</li><li>○ Insufficient justification of billed hours relative to the estimated level of effort required for work.</li></ul></li></ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Inadequate budget monitoring and notification of contract increases in required level of effort.</li><li>○ Commencement of unauthorized work.</li><li>● The contractor did not make a reasonable effort to address cost control issues or corrective measures were ineffective.</li></ul>
--	---



## Schedule (On-time Delivery Rate)

**Weighting: 10%**

The indicator for this evaluation this evaluation is:

1. The number of key deliverables or milestones that were met on time in accordance with the requirements of the contract.

When deliverables are submitted, Canada may require corrections before acceptance. If significant corrective actions are required, the date the final accepted deliverable is provided is considered the completion date.

It is recognized that contracted timelines may be dependent on timely completion of actions or deliverables by Canada, and/or impacted by unanticipated events outside of the contractor's responsibility or control. When such circumstances arise, it is at the discretion of the evaluator to include an excusable delay adjustment in the evaluation of a deliverable or milestone.

<b>Score</b>	<b>Scoring Guide</b>
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	100% of deliverables were received on time and met the requirements of the contract.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	90-99% of deliverables were received on time and met the requirements of the contract.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	70-89% of deliverables were received on time and met the requirements of the contract.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	60-69% of deliverables were received on time and met the requirements of the contract.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	59% or less of deliverables were received on time and met the requirements of the contract.