

## Performance Evaluation Details

<b>ID</b>	E5
<b>Project</b>	On-Site Door Repair and Overhead Door Preventive Predictive Maintenance
<b>Project Number</b>	21ITB131067C-GS
<b>Supplier</b>	Piedmont Door Solutions
<b>Supplier Project Contact</b>	Jim Adams (preferred language: English)
<b>Performance Program</b>	Goods and Commodity Services
<b>Evaluation Period</b>	04/01/2023 to 06/30/2023
<b>Effective Date</b>	07/04/2023
<b>Evaluation Type</b>	Formal
<b>Interview Date</b>	Not Specified
<b>Expectations Meeting Date</b>	Not Specified
<b>Status</b>	Completed
<b>Publication Date</b>	07/04/2023 05:07 PM EDT
<b>Completion Date</b>	07/04/2023 05:07 PM EDT
<b>Evaluation Score</b>	82

### Related Documents

There are no documents associated with this Performance Evaluation

## OVERALL RATING GUIDE - GOODS AND COMMODITY SERVICES

Evaluation Score Range

Outstanding = 90-100%

Excellent = 80-89%

Satisfactory = 70-79%

Needs Improvement = 50-69%

Unsatisfactory = -50%

### QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE

14/20

Rating

<b>Satisfactory:</b> Overall compliance requires minor User Department resources to ensure achievement of contract requirements.

Comments

The vendor provided goods and services of good quality. Technicians employed by the vendor were trained and the work met requirements in specifications and code. There have been no quality problems during the review period. Vendor does not work on rollup doors and doors/gates used for vehicular traffic. That is a limitation.

### TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> There are no delays and the contractor has exceeded the agreed upon time schedule.

Comments

Vendor's performance generally complied with schedules agreed upon, at the time of assignment of job or against work order/service call. There has been no serious delays in normal maintenance work or deliveries, during this review period.

### BUSINESS RELATIONS

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues exceeds Government expectation.

Comments

The vendor has been very responsive to requests for services. Received excellent and timely response, for ordinary and emergency calls made on a weekend, from vendor's service organization. The Account Manager helped Fulton County track the work and invoices.

### CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> Contractor representative communicates routinely with the User Department, professional and responsive to User Department's request for information.

Comments

Services met user quality expectations most of the time and met specifications. Vendor's dedicated Account Manager made the communications very effective and eliminated the need for multiple channels of communication.

### COST CONTROL

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> Compliance with contract pricing, minor cost discrepancies identified by User Department that require explanation, quickly resolved cost/price issues; compliance with invoice submission, corrections resolved quickly.

Comments

There have been no contract-pricing issues. There was one occasion where the vendor sent invoices after working on a wrong object. This invoice was later cancelled as requested by Fulton County. Other than that, the invoices were accurate and in time.

### GENERAL COMMENTS

Comments

*Not Specified*

## Performance Evaluation Details

<b>ID</b>	E5
<b>Project</b>	On-Site Door Repair and Overhead Door Preventive Predictive Maintenance
<b>Project Number</b>	21ITB131067C-GS
<b>Supplier</b>	DH Pace Company, Inc.
<b>Supplier Project Contact</b>	Jordan Fisher (preferred language: English)
<b>Performance Program</b>	Goods and Commodity Services
<b>Evaluation Period</b>	04/01/2023 to 06/30/2023
<b>Effective Date</b>	07/04/2023
<b>Evaluation Type</b>	Formal
<b>Interview Date</b>	Not Specified
<b>Expectations Meeting Date</b>	Not Specified
<b>Status</b>	Completed
<b>Publication Date</b>	07/04/2023 04:32 PM EDT
<b>Completion Date</b>	07/04/2023 04:32 PM EDT
<b>Evaluation Score</b>	79

### Related Documents

There are no documents associated with this Performance Evaluation

## OVERALL RATING GUIDE - GOODS AND COMMODITY SERVICES

Evaluation Score Range

Outstanding = 90-100%

Excellent = 80-89%

Satisfactory = 70-79%

Needs Improvement = 50-69%

Unsatisfactory = -50%

### QUALITY OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> There are no, or very minimal, quality problems, and the Contractor has met the contract requirements.

Comments

The vendor provided goods and services of good quality. Technicians employed by the vendor were experienced. Work was carried out as required in the specifications or in compliance with industry standards. There has been no quality problems during the review period.

### TIMELINESS OF PERFORMANCE

14/20

Rating

<b>Satisfactory:</b> There are no, or minimal, delays that impact achievement of contract requirements.

Comments

Vendor's performance was generally honoring the schedules in the work order or service calls. However, there were delays in delivery which affected some planned maintenance or capital investment projects. Example: Replacement/upgrade of doors recommended by the Police Department for Government Center. Vendor needs to improve upon this.

### BUSINESS RELATIONS

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> Response to inquiries and/or technical, service, administrative issues exceeds Government expectation.

Comments

The vendor has been very responsive to requests for services. Received excellent and very effective response, to emergency calls. Vendor cooperated with County's requirement of completing services and submitting invoices, within deadlines.

### CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

17/20

Rating

<b>Excellent:</b> Contractor representative communicates routinely with the User Department, professional and responsive to User Department's request for information.

Comments

Parts and Services delivered by the vendor met user quality expectations and specifications most of the time. Vendor has an Accounts Manager dedicated to Fulton County and he made the communications very effective and minimized the response time in many service calls.

### COST CONTROL

14/20

Rating

<b>Satisfactory:</b> Minimal contract pricing issues, cost discrepancies identified by User Department that require explanation, cost/price issues resolved in timely manner.

Comments

Vendor's prices were considered high compared with prices paid for similar services to other contractors, but this was matched by quality of work. Invoices submitted were timely. No corrections to individual invoices were necessary during the review period but there have been some instances of duplicate or double invoicing. Vendor needs to look into this matter.

### GENERAL COMMENTS

Comments

Vendor is reliable as far as quality of work and ability to respond to diverse requirements. Suggest retaining the contract.