

Submit Form

DEPARTMENT OF PURCHASING & CONTRACT COMPLIANCE				
CONTRACTORS PERFORMANCE REPORT OTHER SERVICES				
Report Period Start	Report Period End		Contract Period Start	Contract Period End
1/1/2015	3/31/2015		1/1/2015	12/31/2015
PO Number				PO Date
15SC96228K				1/1/2015
Department	PUBLIC WORKS/GENERAL SERVICES			
Bid Number	U S Communities contract			
Service Commodity	Elevator and Escalator Maintenance			
Contractor	KONE Elevator			

- 0 = Unsatisfactory *Achieves contract requirements less than 50% of the time, not responsive, effective and/or efficient, unacceptable delay, incompetence, high degree of customer dissatisfaction.*
- 1 = Poor *Achieves contract requirements 70% of the time. Marginally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays require significant adjustments to programs; key employees marginally capable; customers somewhat satisfied.*
- 2 = Satisfactory *Achieves contract requirements 80% of the time; generally responsive, effective and/or efficient; delays are excusable and/or results in minor programs adjustments; employees are capable and satisfactorily providing service without intervention; customers indicate satisfaction.*
- 3 = Good *Achieves contract requirements 90% of the time. Usually responsive; effective and/or efficient; delays have not impact on programs/mission; key employees are highly competent and seldom require guidance; customers are highly satisfied.*
- 4 = Excellent *Achieves contract requirements 100% of the time. Immediately responsive; highly efficient and/or effective; no delays; key employees are experts and require minimal directions; customers expectations are exceeded.*

1. Quality of Goods/Services (-Specification Compliance - Technical Excellence - Reports/Administration - Personnel Qualification)

Comments:

0 Services provided by the vendor are in compliance with maintenance requirements. However Fulton County's requirement in the specifications for a dedicated technician stationed at the County premises has not been complied with.

1

2

3

4

2. Timeliness of Performance (-Were Milestones Met Per Contract - Response Time (per agreement, if applicable) - Responsiveness to Direction/Change - On Time Completion Per Contract)

Comments:

0 Response to service calls has been poor. Most of the service calls made in the post-noon session are either not looked at on the same day or resulted in over time charges. Vendor has not taken upon themselves the responsibility of repair of non-functional equipment. Three equipment have been defective for three months and the vendor has not provided any time line or proposal for repairing them and making them operational

1

2

3

4

3. Business Relations (-Responsiveness to Inquiries - Prompt Problem Notifications)

Comments:

0 Vendor's office maintains good communication with Fulton County and has been responsive to inquiries. However better updating by technicians on the status of elevators is required.

1

2

3

4

4. Customer Satisfaction (-Met User Quality Expectations - Met Specification - Within Budget - Proper Invoicing - No Substitutions)

Comments:

0

1

2

☐ 3 Quality expectations are not met. Improvements are required in problem identification, notification and resolution. Invoices infrequent;y lists charges not covered by contract and this has resulted in avoidable correspondence and denial of charges.
☐ 4

5. Contractors Key Personnel (-Credentials/Experience Appropriate - Effective Supervision/Management - Available as Needed)

☐ 0 **Comments:**
☐ 1 Contractor has not assigned a team of technicians to service this contract. This results in delay in repair services. Technicians are not available in certain instances like inoperative wheel chair lift.
☒ 2
☐ 3
☐ 4

Overall Performance Rating:	2.0		
Would you select/recommend this vendor again? (Check box for Yes. Leave Blank for No)		Rating completed by:	Vijaya.Nair 
☒ Yes ☐ No			
Department Head Name	Department Head Signature		Date
KUN SUWANA RPA			5/7/2015
RW 8/10/15			

SEE ATTACH → KONE PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT PLAN
Next page

KONE Performance Improvement plan

KONE's performance on the contract was reviewed in the monthly meeting with the following company representatives on 5/21/15

1. Major Horton
2. Warren Diffenderfer

Fulton County was represented by

1. Paul Williams
2. Vijay Nair

Representatives were given a copy of the Contract Performance Report and the following points were discussed.

1. Contractor's presence in the premises. It was brought to their notice that there was no technician present in the premises to take service calls. KONE was of the opinion that this was not in the contract and having staff on the premises will add cost to the contract. Representatives were requested to identify the cost.
KONE was asked to perform daily evaluation of elevators and report any non-operational elevator/s
2. It was brought to their attention that service calls were not responded in a timely manner and resulting from this, the service happens after hours and County is charged over-time cost. KONE agreed to make arrangements to have the service calls sent to Major Horton and Warren Diffenderfer at the same time a technician is notified, so that better follow up will be possible at their end.
KONE was asked to provide information on the ETA for each service calls received by them from FC
3. Difference in hours of operation – KONE's technician leaves the site at 3 even if a work is pending. KONE was told that this schedule was not suitable for Fulton County operations. KONE said this was resulting from the fact that their technicians are affiliated to the union and it was difficult to change the timings.
4. Issue of repairs pending on elevators, from the date KONE contract started was brought to the attention of KONE representatives. KONE said they would submit proposals for repairs because these were pre-existing conditions. Major Horton agreed to expedite quotes for repair for the elevators at Central Library, Government Center and the escalator at Government Center
KONE agreed to provide weekly status update of elevator problems, entrapments and other issues.
5. Several invoices carried charges that were not recognized. Copies were given to Mr. Horton after explaining why they were rejected. Mr. Horton agreed to review the invoices.
6. These plans will be reviewed again in the meeting to be held on August 20, 2015