Setia

Date: 24 Aug 2017

GAGASAN TEGUH SDN BHD

No. 29-1, Jalan PUJ 3/5, Taman Puncak Jalil, Bandar Putra Permai, 43300 Seri Kembangan, Selangor

Attn: Mr Ng Eng Leong

Dear Sir/Madam,

CONTRACTOR'S PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

We recently concluded the Contractor's Performance Evaluation for the period of Jan 2017 to Jun 2017.

The purpose of this performance evaluation is to determine the level of services and quality of work rendered by the Contractor, as compared with S P Setia Group of Companies' quality and expectations. Contractors rated with good grades and performance may possibly be retained under our List of Approved Contractors, and given preference and priority to tender for future jobs from S P Setia Group of Companies.

Upon the confirmation of the final Contractor Performance Score, the following grading shall be used to rate the performance of your company:

Grade	Final Contractor Performance Score (%)	Description	Results
Α .	90.00% - 100.00%	Excellent / Outstanding	Contractor performance substantially exceeded expected levels of performance. The contractor consistently performed above contract requirements, displayed an overall superior understanding of contract requirements, and used innovative approaches leading to enhanced performance.
В	70.00% - 89.99%	Good	Contractor performance exceeded expected levels. The contractor performed above minimum contract requirements and displayed a thorough understanding of contract requirements.
С	60.00% - 69.99%	Acceptable	Performance met expected levels. The contractor met the minimum contract requirements.
D	30.00% - 59.99%	Poor / Needs Improvement	Performance was less than expected. The contractor performed below minimum contract requirements.
Е	0.00% - 29.99%	Bad / Not Recommended	The contractor failed to meet the minimum contract requirements.

Your company's Performance Score is graded as below:

Type : Infrastructure Works

Overall Score : 65.67

Overall Grade : C (Acceptable)

Final Score is weighted based on contract sum. Please refer to the detail calculation in the summary of your company performance as attached.

We trust that you will strive for continuous improvement and we look forward to a successful working relationship with your company.

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,

TEOH GUAT LIN
General Manager
Group Contracts Division

Contractor Evaluation Result For Review Period: Jan 2017 To Jun 2017

									Contractor Performance	Estimated Contract	Weightage (Contract Sum/	Final		
Contract No	Business Unit	S	CPA	ICQ	CSS	SIS	LQA	LMQA	Score	Sum	Total Contract)	Score	Grade	
Company: GAGASAN TEGUH SDN BHD	FEGUH SDN BHD													
Type of Work: INF (Others (Please specify))	thers (Please specify))													ă.
SEH2/MISC(SI)-15/C00 SEH2 - Setia Ecohill 2	EH2 - Setia Ecohill 2	65.67							65.67	298,824.00	1.0000	65.67 C	O	
									Total		i			
									Contract	298,824.00	Final Result & Grade	65.67	O	

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

BUSINESS UNIT:

SEH2 - Setia Ecohill 2

CONTRACTOR NAME: GAGASAN TEGUH SDN BHD

PERIOD:

01/01/2017 - 30/06/2017

SECTION: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Overall quality & workmanship

Acceptable (15.00)

Workmanship met S P Setia Quality Standard requirements.

Specification compliance 2

Acceptable (12.00)

Strict adherence to specification requirements.

3 Ability to meet schedule

Acceptable (6.00)

Met master program schedule.

Technical Expertise - Ability to solve technical/site problems

Acceptable (2.40)

Identified problem, proposed cost-effective solutions and achieved timely resolution.

5 Coordination of work with all parties involved in the project

Acceptable (2.40)

The work was routinely coordinated. Jointly identified problems and defined solutions with developer.

Responsiveness to instructions

Acceptable (2.40)

All instructions were responded to within 14 calendar days.

7 Organization structure (adequacy and quality of personnel)

Good (3.00)

Adequate and qualified staff was assigned to the project.

8 Site Safety & housekeeping

Good (7.50)

Minor non-compliance with few minor remedial actions required. Achieve 75% to 99% score in site safety inspection.

Adequacy of material & machinery 9

Good (3.00)

All materials ordered and received a head of time. Equipment is well maintained and available when needed. Frequently exceeded the requirements.

Submission of drawings, as-built, manuals etc. 10

Acceptable (1.20)

All submissions on time. Some minor errors found, rectified in timely manner.

Site diary, report, PQP, checklists and other project documentation requirements 11

Acceptable (2.40)

Documentation submitted was acceptable with some clarifications required. Details furnished in a timely manner upon

Attendance of site / coordination meetings 12

Good (3.75)

No lateness or absence. Meetings were attended by qualified or key personnel. Actively participated in the meetings. Frequently exceeded the requirements.

SECTION: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

Involvement of key personnel (include project managers and directors)

Good (3.00)

Key personnel was always knowledgeable and in control of the project and frequently exceeded the developer's expectations.

Section Score: 64.05 / 100.00

Section Mark: 48.04

SECTION: CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

1 Submission of claims (Progress, VO, Final Account - in correct format & error free)

Acceptable (9.00)

Submissions are usually complete and on time with minimal reminder.

Submission of quotations & rates when requested 2

Not Applicable (0.00) Not Applicable

Accuracy of measurements 3

Good (7.50)

Few errors; quickly corrected and submitted.

Reasonableness of quotation 4

Not Applicable (0.00) Not Applicable

Cooperation with contracts department 5

Good (11.25)

Good working relationship, minimal problems, easily resolved.

6 Submission of contractual documents (Insurance, bonds, CIDB, EOT, CPC, programme etc.)

Good (7.50)

Usually submitted complete and on time.

Section Score: 35.25 / 50.00

Section Mark: 17.63

otal Mark:

65.67