



Vendor Rating Dashboard

OVERALL SUPPLIER PERFORMANCE	March	73%		
------------------------------	-------	-----	--	--

Total Performance



Overall Supplier Performance




BDR THERMEA GROUP

Vendor Rating Scores


Supplier: Silmav S.p.A

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		
The level of field replacements within 12 months	NFF reduction		
8D score (Amount/repeats, containment, completion)	8D score	6	4
Response to AQP PPAP requirements	AQP PPAP	6	5
Continuous improvement of the suppliers processes	Process Capability		
TOTAL		18	15
SUPPLY CHAIN PERFORMANCE		Max Score	SCORE
On time and in full delivery performance.	OTIF	6	1
Order flexibility	Flexibility	6	5
Response to orders and ammendments	Response	6	6
Packaging damage caused by supplier	Damage	6	5
Labelling	Damage	6	5
TOTAL		30	22
COST & ORGANIZATIONAL PERFORMANCE		Max Score	SCORE
The integrality of informing BDR of price movements	Price movement	6	5
The openness of the provided cost breakdown	Cost Breakdown	6	1
Participation in VA/VE projects	VA / VE	6	4
Total ecovadis score	Ecovadis	6	4
TOTAL		24	14
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	4
The ability of the supplier to reduce risks	Capability confirmation	6	4
TOTAL		18	13
TOTAL		90	64

Operations Diagram





Organization / NPD Performance



Improvement Year Overview

Supplier: Silmav S.p.A



Supplier: Silmav S.p.A

Quality Comments

Durability	N/A	
Process capability	N/A	

Supply Chain Comments

OTIF	not including W13 score due to start of the lockdown	
------	--	--

Costs & Organizational Performance Comments






Ecovadis score	SAF Group score	
----------------	-----------------	--

NPD Performance Comments

--	--	--





Quality Year Overview

Supplier: Silmav S.p.A



Supply Chain Year Overview


Supplier: Silmav S.p.A




Costs, Organizational and NPD Performance Year Overview

Supplier: Silmav S.p.A


Cost movements




Cost breakdown




Ecovadis score




VA / VE




Overall communication



Engineering cooperation




Capability confirmation




Year Overview

Supplier: Silmav S.p.A


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 amendments 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.