

## Annex D: Marine (Small Vessels) Scorecard

### Quality (Technical Compliance)

**Weighting: 50%**

The indicator for this evaluation is:

1. Compliance with the Technical Statement of Requirement (TSOR) and standards, including, but not limited to:
  - Transport Canada: Construction Standards for Small Vessels – TP 1332E, Safety of Life at Sea (SOLAS) certified (as applicable).

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

## Management (Communication and Coordination)

**Weighting: 25% for small vessels, 15% for refits**

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"> <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 one or more indicators.</li> </ul>

## Cost (Fixed Time Rate)

**Weighting: 10% for refits, N/A for small vessels**

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 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> </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 (Project Management)

**Weighting: 25%**

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