

Annex E: Task Based Informatics Professional Services Scorecard

Quality (Resource Quality and Continuity)

Weighting: 10%

The contractor's effectiveness in supplying deliverables of the required quality, in accordance with the contract. Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. The contractor's effectiveness in providing quality resources (including replacements) as per the education and experience criteria specified in the contract, for the applicable resource category and level.
2. The contractor's effectiveness in assuring continuity and minimizing substitution of qualified resources.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor provided qualified resources to meet all contract requirements. • The resource(s) proposed in contractor's bid proposal performed all contractual work for the entire contract period; and • No substitutions were requested by Canada for performance related issues during the contract period.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor provided qualified resources to meet all contract requirements. • The resource(s) proposed in contractor's bid proposal were substituted at the outset of the contract; • The substituted resource(s) had equivalent or greater qualifications and experience as those originally proposed; • The assigned resources performed all contractual work for the entire contract period; and • No further substitutions were requested by Canada for performance related issues during the contract period.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor provided qualified resources to meet all contract requirements. • Substitution(s) of the resource(s) was required to complete contractual work during the contract period; • The substituted resource(s) had greater or equivalent qualifications and experienced as the resources that were replaced; and • The reason for the substitution of resources was not related to performance issues.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor provided qualified resources to meet all contract requirements. • During the contract period, replacement of resource(s) was requested for performance related issues; • The substituted resource(s) had greater or equivalent qualifications and experienced as the resources that were replaced; and • Performance related issues were resolved as a result of the substitution.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The contractor was not able to provide qualified resources to meet all contract requirements; or • The contractor was unable to provide qualified replacement resource(s) when requested or performance related issues persisted after replacement.

Quality (Technical Compliance)

Weighting: 10%

The indicator for this evaluation is:

1. Compliance with the Technical Statement of Requirement (TSOR) and any applicable standards.

Note that deficiencies are the result of workmanship errors, as opposed to deviations which are intentional changes. Either may result in non-compliance with requirements that may or may not be acceptable.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the TSOR and with the required standards and certifications (as applicable).• There were no deviations or deficiencies identified.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the TSOR and with the required standards and certifications (as applicable).• Some minor deviations identified that did not require correction.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the TSOR and with the required standards and certifications (as applicable).• Some minor deficiencies were identified but deemed acceptable and were addressed proactively.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were not compliant with either the TSOR or with the required standards and certifications (as applicable).• Significant deficiency or deficiencies were identified and appropriate remedial action was taken.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were not compliant with either the TSOR or with the required standards and certifications (as applicable).• Significant deficiency or deficiencies were identified and appropriate remedial action was not taken or was ineffective.

Quality (Document Quality)

Weighting: 10%

Indicators for this evaluation include (as applicable):

1. **Content Requirements:** The content of the document addressed all contract requirements.
2. **Level of Detail:** The level of detailed provided was appropriate, without missing or extraneous information.
3. **Quality of Writing:** The quality of writing, including clarity, grammar, completeness, and consistent use of technical terms, met or exceeded expectations.
4. **Format:** The format follows the provided templates, and guidelines as applicable.
5. **Standards:** The document met or exceed all applicable standards.
6. **Revisions:** Minimal or no draft versions requiring revisions. Required revisions are minor, not extensive, and addressed promptly.

The contractor's performance is rated for each attribute 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. Content Requirements	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
2. Level of Detail	<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. Format	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Standards	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6. Revisions	<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"> Succeeds + performance against all applicable indicators
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - performance against only 1 indicator, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - performance against only 2 indicators, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - performance against 3 indicators, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - performance against 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.

Management (Communication and Coordination)

Weighting: 20%

Indicators for this evaluation include (as applicable):

1. **Communication:** The contractor is consistent and proactive in their communications, provides clear and comprehensive information, and timely progress updates.
2. **Issue Management:** The contractor is proactive and effective in responding to and resolving issues (e.g. shipment delays, quality defects). Contracting and Project Authorities are informed of risks and issues and provided with mitigation recommendations in a timely manner. Any issues are resolved or effectively mitigated by the contractor.
3. **Delivery Management:** Deliveries contain the correct quantities (including for sizes and other requirements) as prescribed in the contract schedule. Invoices and packing slips are on time, accurate, and complete in accordance with the basis of payment and invoicing instructions included in the contract.
4. **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.
5. **Flexibility:** The contractor demonstrates openness, collaboration and cooperation in coordinating activities and in responding to inquiries and requested changes to deliverables.
6. **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.
7. **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. Issue Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
3. Delivery Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
4. Relationship Management	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
5. Flexibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
6. Reliability	<input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds + <input type="checkbox"/> Succeeds - <input type="checkbox"/> Significant Underperformance <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	
7. 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"> Succeeds + against all applicable indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - against only 1 indicator, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - against only 2 indicators, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - against 3 indicators, and no significant underperformance against any indicators.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Succeeds - against 4 or more indicators or significant underperformance against 1 or more indicators.

Cost (Firm Price or Per Diem Rate, according to Basis of Payment) Weighting: 20%

Firm Price

Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. Justification of change order requests.
2. Reasonableness of price quotations for negotiated work.
3. Timeliness of issue identification and notification.
4. Identification and provisioning of credits (if applicable).

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient justification was provided for all change order requests. • Contractor requests for change orders were submitted promptly and change order processes were followed. • Cost breakdowns for negotiated work were always detailed and supportable, and use of time and materials pricing was not required for any change orders. • Credits were identified and provided where applicable. • Substantial cost avoidance as a result of early identification and mitigation of issues (including prior to contact award).
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient justification was provided for all change order requests. • Contractor requests for change orders were submitted promptly and change order processes were followed before commencing work. • Cost breakdowns for negotiated work were always detailed and supportable, and use of time and materials pricing was not required for any change orders. • Credits were identified and provided where applicable.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient justification was provided for all change order requests. • Contractor requests for change orders were submitted promptly and change order approval processes were followed before commencing work. • Cost breakdowns for negotiated work were usually detailed and supportable, and use of time and materials pricing was not required for any change orders. • Credits were identified and provided where applicable.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Isolated instance(s) of performance issues related to cost control, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ questionable justification for change order requests ○ late notification of change orders resulting in additional costs that could have been mitigated or avoided through early identification ○ commencement of unauthorized work ○ Insufficient justification of billed hours relative to the estimated level of effort required for negotiated work. ○ failure to identify or provide credits where applicable • The contractor made a reasonable effort to address cost control issues and minimize recurrence.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Persistent performance issues related to cost control, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ questionable justification for change order requests ○ inadequate price support for negotiated work ○ commencement of unauthorized work ○ late notification of change orders resulting in additional costs that could have been mitigated or avoided through early identification ○ failure to identify or provide credits where applicable • The contractor did not make a reasonable effort to address cost control issues or corrective measures were ineffective.

Per Diem Rate

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

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The contractor did not make a reasonable effort to address cost control issues or corrective measures were ineffective. |
|--|---|

Schedule (Project Management)

Weighting: 30%

Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. The timeliness and effectiveness in establishing the initial schedule, including (as applicable) critical path, task orders, milestones, and delivery schedule.
2. The timeliness and effectiveness of progress monitoring and notification when revisions to the schedule are required.
3. The timeliness and effectiveness in addressing issues and minimizing delays within the contractor's control.
4. The contractor's ability to identify opportunities to improve efficiency throughout the contract.

SCORE	SCORING GUIDE
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor. • Proactive and collaborative improvements to project efficiency throughout the contract, contributing to significant early completion (>10%) of the overall project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were attributable to the contractor. • Proactive and collaborative improvements to project efficiency throughout the contract, contributing to moderate early completion of the overall project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely provision of a schedule that was reasonable and in accordance with contract requirements. • Detailed and effective progress monitoring and notification of changes to the project schedule. • Issue identification and mitigation was effective with minimal or no delays to the project schedule that were avoidable.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial schedule provided was not feasible requiring significant revisions and administrative effort by Canada to make acceptable. • Progress monitoring and notification was inconsistent and required significant administrative effort by Canada. • The contractor made some effort to mitigate of potential delays to the project schedule that was partially effective.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commencement of the project was delayed as a result of late delivery of an acceptable project schedule. • Minimal or unreliable progress monitoring and notification resulted in operational impacts to the project. • The contractor was not responsive when addressing issues leading to significant delays to the project schedule.