

Annex A: Construction Scorecard

Quality (Workmanship)

Weighting: 10%

Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. The workmanship and compliance with the quality provisions outlined in the drawings and specification as per the terms and conditions of the contract. This may include (but is not limited to) materials, grade, and measurements.
2. The effectiveness and demonstration of effort to minimize and mitigate deficiencies during the construction/development phase of the project.

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• Early identification of deficiencies and effective remedial action was taken proactively before substantial completion of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• Minimal deficiencies were identified, and appropriate remedial action was taken in a timely manner
<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• Significant deficiencies were identified, and appropriate remedial action was taken in a timely manner following substantial completion of the project.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deliverables were not compliant with the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications;• A significant deficiency or multiple 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 the requirements of the contract, including applicable standards and certifications; and• A significant deficiency or multiple deficiencies were identified and appropriate remedial action was not taken or ineffective.

Quality (Documentation Quality)

Weighting: 10%

Indicators for this evaluation include (as applicable):

1. **Content Requirements:** The content of the document addresses all contract requirements.
2. **Level of Detail:** The level of detail provided is appropriate, without missing or extraneous information.
3. **Quality of Writing:** The quality of writing, including clarity, grammar, completeness, and consistent use of technical terms, meets or exceeds expectations.
4. **Format:** The format follows the provided templates, and guidelines as applicable.
5. **Standards:** The document meets or exceeds 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 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. 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 + 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.

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. 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, 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.

Management (Health and Safety)

Weighting: 20%

The contractor's effectiveness in managing and administering the occupational health and safety provisions as stipulated in the contract documents and those required by provincial/territorial legislation or those that would otherwise be applicable to the site of the work. Indicators for this evaluation include:

1. The provision of all required documentation and permits. Including a health and safety program, site specific hazardous assessment, provincial/territorial notice of project, and the building permit. Timeliness of Health and safety documents.
2. The appointment of a superintendent/supervisor who was competent and in compliance with the duties specified in the relevant provincial/territorial Occupational Health and Safety Act and/or regulations.
3. Timeliness and responsiveness to any non-compliance safety issues noted by PSPC or a representative of the authority having jurisdiction (AHJ).

DR: Departmental Representative

AHJ: Authority Having Jurisdiction (Ministry of Labor, CNESST inspector, Building inspector etc.)

HASSSP: Hazard Assessment Site Specific Safety Plan

CMSA: Construction and Maintenance Safety Advisor

HRB-OHSD: Human Resources Branch-Occupational Health and Safety Directorate

Score	Scoring Guide
<input type="checkbox"/> 5 Exceptional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding health and safety plans and practices that exceeded standards. • DR was proactively notified of potential hazardous conditions on site and provided all contractual / regulatory reportable incidents with a copy of the incident reports in a timely manner. • Provided all DR requested health and safety documents in an appropriate manner and proactively provided HASSSP updates to the DR. • Provided the HASSSP documents one week prior to the "pre-start meeting" within the contractually required timeframe. • The contractor proactively identified and addressed hazards on site. The DR or CMSA written "Site Observation Report" identified a few minor hazards throughout the project that were addressed in an appropriate manner and the written / signed confirmation the hazard was addressed was submitted to the DR.
<input type="checkbox"/> 4 Surpassed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commendable health and safety plans and practices that met standards and sometimes exceeded. • DR was notified of all contractual/regulatory reportable incidents and was provided with the DR with a copy of the incident reports in a timely manner. • Provided all DR requested health and safety documents in a timely manner and regularly provided written HASSSP updates to the DR. • Provided the HASSSP documents at the "Pre-Start Meeting" within the contractually required time and completed within three attempts. • The DR or CMSA written "Site Observation Report" identified only a few minor hazards throughout the project that were addressed in a timely manner and the written/signed confirmation the hazard was addressed and submitted to the DR.

<input type="checkbox"/> 3 Achieved	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptable health and safety practices that met standards. • DR was notified of all contractual/regulatory reportable incidents and was provided a copy of the incident reports as required. • Provided the HASSSP documents within the contractually required time and completed within three attempts. • Contractor received one to a few AHJ issued “Orders” that were addressed in a timely manner. • The DR or CMSA written “Site Observation Report” identified hazards that were addressed in a timely manner and the written/signed confirmation the hazard was addressed was submitted to the DR. • One unplanned project related building/facilities shutdown or one building evacuation.
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 Moderate Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and safety practices were below standards, with multiple concerns. • The DR needed to give written direction to the contractor to ensure the contractor met the contractual/regulatory reporting requirements. • Numerous and repeated requests were required by the DR to obtain health and safety documents from the contractor. • The HASSSP documents were not provided within the contractually required time limit and required a single meeting to explain the requirements. • One critical injury/incident. • One AHJ or DR imposed “Stop Work”. • Contractor received several AHJ issued “Orders” that were gradually addressed. • Hazards identified by the DR or CMSA in the “Site Observation Report” were not addressed in a timely manner. • Numerous unplanned project related building/facilities shutdowns or building evacuations with, however a plan to resolve future issues was developed.
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 Significant Improvement Needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsatisfactory health and safety practices without effort to meet standards. • Failed to notify the DR of a contractual/regulatory reportable incident or if the DR had to inform the AHJ in lieu of the contractor. • Failed to provide requested health and safety documents within the contractually required timeline throughout the project. • Did not provide the HASSSP documents within the contractually required timeline, and required an extended period of time to provide the documents or required multiple meetings to explain the HASSSP requirements. • One project related fatality and/or numerous critical injury/incidents. • Numerous AHJ or DR imposed “Stop Work”. • Contractor received several AHJ issued “Orders” and failed to address the “Orders” in an appropriate manner. • Repeated/ongoing hazards identified by the DR or CMSA in the “Site Observation Report” were not resolved. • Numerous unplanned project related building/facilities shutdowns or evacuation.

Cost (Firm Price)

Weighting: 20%

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's 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's 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's 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.

<p>□ 1 Significant Improvement Needed</p>	<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.
---	--

Schedule (Project Management)

Weighting: 20%

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 and required 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 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 which led to significant delays to the project schedule.