



Vendor Rating Dashboard

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------|-----|--|--|
| OVERALL SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE | August | 81% | | |
|------------------------------|--------|-----|--|--|

Total Performance



Overall Supplier Performance




BDR THERMEA GROUP

Vendor Rating Scores


Supplier: RESIDEO

| QUALITY PERFORMANCE | | Max Score | SCORE |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| The value of all Line Failures / all parts used. | Line PPM | 6 | 6 |
| Parts Replaced within 24 months after first use in the field | Field Returns | 6 | 5 |
| The level of field replacements within 12 months. | NFF reduction | | |
| 8D score (Amount/repeats, containment, completion) | 8D score | | |
| Response to AQP PPAP requirements | AQP PPAP | | |
| Continuous improvement of the suppliers processes | Process Capability | | |
| TOTAL | | 12 | 11 |
| SUPPLY CHAIN PERFORMANCE | | Max Score | SCORE |
| On time and in full delivery performance. | OTIF | 6 | 6 |
| Order flexibility | Flexibility | 6 | 4 |
| Response to orders and ammendments | Response | 6 | 5 |
| Packaging damage caused by supplier | Damage | 6 | 5 |
| Labelling | Damage | 6 | 5 |
| TOTAL | | 30 | 25 |
| COST & ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE | | Max Score | SCORE |
| The integrality of informing BDR of price movements | Price movement | 6 | 4 |
| The openness of the provided cost breakdown | Cost Breakdown | 6 | 4 |
| Participation in VA/VE projects | VA / VE | 6 | 3 |
| Total ecovadis score | Ecovadis | 6 | 2 |
| TOTAL | | 24 | 13 |
| NPD PERFORMANCE | | | |
| Overall communication (projects, change requests etc) | R&D Communication | 6 | 5 |
| The ability to use the suppliers expertise | Engineering degree of cooperation | 6 | 6 |
| The ability of the supplier to reduce risks | Capability confirmation | 6 | 5 |
| TOTAL | | 18 | 16 |
| TOTAL | | 84 | 65 |

Operations Diagram





Organization / NPD Performance



Improvement Year Overview

Supplier: RESIDEO



Supplier: RESIDEO

Quality Comments

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Durability | Automatic refund, always proceeds to field return expertise | |
| Problem solving competences | N/A | |
| Response to AQP PPAP requirements | N/A | |
| Process capability | N/A | |

Supply Chain Comments

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

Costs & Organizational Performance Comments






| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|

NPD Performance Comments

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | |
|--|--|--|







Quality Year Overview

Supplier: RESIDEO



Supply Chain Year Overview


Supplier: RESIDEO




Costs, Organizational and NPD Performance Year Overview

Supplier: RESIDEO


Cost movements




Cost breakdown




Ecovadis score




VA / VE




Overall communication



Engineering cooperation




Capability confirmation




Year Overview

Supplier: RESIDEO


Quality Summary




Supply Chain Summary



Commercial Summary



R&D Summary



Scoring Matrix: Quality & Supply chain

| Main criteria | Sub-criteria | Weight | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Quality 30% | Line PPM | 17% | > 5000 PPM | < 5000 PPM | < 1000 PPM | < 500 PPM | < 100 PPM | Zero PPM |
| | Durability | 17% | Very Unsatisfactory | Unsatisfactory | Far below expectations | Below expectations | Meets expectations | Exceeds expectations |
| | NFF reduction | 17% | Not willing to participate | Analysis results are shared | Some initial ideas, but no improvement | Initial improvements are seen | Significant reduction in NFF | Continuous yr. on yr. improvements |
| | Problem solving competences | 17% | Result of problem solving matrix score less than or equals 20% | Result of problem solving matrix score is greater than 20% | Result of problem solving matrix score is greater than 40% | Result of problem solving matrix score is greater than 60% | Result of problem solving matrix score is greater than 80% | Result of problem solving matrix score equals 100% |
| | Response to AQP PPAP requirements | 17% | Not willing or able to undertake AQP PPAP | Minimal support is given to BDR in the part approval process | PPAP requirements are met, but there are some issues with data / information provided | PPAP requirements are met, but the supplier does not take an active role in the design review process | Takes active role in development process, there are minor issues with information & data provided | Supplier takes an active role in the development process. AQP PPAP requirements are fully met |
| | Process capability | 17% | Not willing to improve or share process capability information | The supplier has started a process capability improvement programme | Some improvement in CPk levels, but some CTQs still have Cpk <1.0 | Improvement in CPK levels, but some CTQs still have Cpk <1.3 | Minimum CPK for all CTQs = 1.33 | All Safety critical CTQs Min. Cpk =1.67 All other CTQs Min. Cpk = 1.33 |
| Supply Chain 30% | OTIF | 20% | <80% | >80-85% | >85-90% | >90-95% | >95-99,5% | >99,5% |
| | Flexibility | 20% | Refuses all amendments | Consistently delivers to lead-time but only allows order pull forwards | Accepts deferment/pull forward of supply | Takes orders inside lead time, with 24h stock availability at the suppliers/consignment. While customer can make amendments all year | Takes orders inside lead time, immediate stock availability /consignment. All changes accepted and returns of overordering are approved | JIT / JIS capable with amendments - all year round |
| | Communication | 20% | No adequate communication | Sends order confirmation | Prompt reply to the schedule amendments and order confirmations | Reply to schedule ammendments and confirms orders within 24 hours | Sameday response to shortages or issues and confirms orders within 6 hours | Immediate effective response to requests, changes and problems. |
| | Packaging | 20% | The condition of the received goods is insufficient due to packaging (moisture, contamination and/or physical damage) | Random packaging with weights above 10kg or bulk pallets above 1.2metres | Uniform packaging with weights above 10kg or Bulk pallets above 1.2 Meters | Packaging under 10kg on mixed pallets are segregated based on approved exception by BDR and supplier | Uniform packaging sizes and pallet orientation in line with packaging specification | Uniform packaging sizes and pallet orientation in line with packaging specification, utilising returnable packaging unless agreed as non viable |
| | Labelling | 20% | No labelling or identification on containers and/or pallets | Minimal labelling with supplier part numbers on container and/or pallet | minimal labelling with BDR part numbers on container and/or pallet | Labels on containers have the following information/barcoding: BDR item no., Description, PO no., container quantity, batch/lot no. (manufacturing ref.), supplier name & code | All packaging labelled with barcodes containing the minimum information according to packaging specification | All packaging labelled (GS1 standards) containing the minimum information according to packaging specification |

Scoring Matrix: Costs & Organizational (commercial) and NPD Performance

| Main criteria | Sub-criteria | Weight | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|-------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| Commercial 20% | Cost movements | 25% | Supplier implements price movements without discussion | Supplier advises price movements based on latest market information | Some negotiation and forward booking. | Supplier works to offset cost increases | Supplier delivers consistent prices and collaborates to offset costs | Supplier fully collaborates and shares data and consistently delivers prices decreases |
| | Cost breakdown | 25% | Provides no information about costs | Basic materials cost shared | Material and some indirect cost details shared | Supplier has own patented branded product and wont disclose detailed costs | Supplier shares costs on a request only basis. | Supplier shares all cost breadowns and is open to collaborating to mutual benefit |
| | VA / VE | 25% | Not willing or capable | Limited capability and interest | Willing but no experience | Will participate succesfully but only when requested | Actively participates in BDR led savings workshops. | Identifies cost down opportunities and provides resource to implement them. Provable savings can be shown. |
| | Ecovadis score | 25% | No reassessment or <25 | 25-37 total score | Bronze 38-45 | Silver 46-61 | Gold 62-81 | >81 |
| NPD 20% | Overall communication | 33% | Does not respond to requests | Needs to be reminded to get answers to (all) requests | Response to requests is inconsistent. Sometimes its ok but occasionally not. | Usually responds well but with the occasional lapse. Not consistent across all areas | Proactively provides relevant information without the need for requests | Proof that they communicate affectively at all levels, inculding PPAP and ECR's |
| | Engineering degree of cooperation | 33% | Supplier does not cooperate at all. | Supplier is cooperative but lacks the ability to advise BDR on their product | Supplier understands and has capability but the cooperation never materialises | Supplier keeps asking until the request is completely understood. Provides feedback but no idea suggestions from the suppliers side | Supplier is proactive and cooperative but lacks some systems or resource to ensure structured cooperative engineering. | Supplier provides proactive cooperative enigeering, giving proper feedback to ensure correct understanding from both sides. |
| | Capability confirmation | 33% | Supplier cant prove the final product will fulfil requirements. | Supplier proves final product filfils minimum requirements but documents are unsatisfactory | Supplier proves final product fulfils minimum requirements by providing documentation | Supplier proves with Field Operational Test product will fulfil requirements. | Cooperation with DFMEA but following actions are unsatisfactory | After "first design" DFMEA. Risks are eliminated and specifications confirmed with testing of parts. |