

Setia

Date: 03 Apr 2018

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 Jul 2017 to Dec 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 |
|-------|--|--------------------------|--|
| A | 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. |
| B | 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. |
| C | 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. |
| E | 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 : 63.68

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Teoh Guat Lin', written in a cursive style.

TEOH GUAT LIN
General Manager
Group Contracts Division

Contractor Evaluation Result For Review Period : Jul 2017 To Dec 2017

| Contract No | Business Unit | CE | CPA | ICQ | CSS | SIS | LQA | LMQA | Contractor Performance Score | Estimated Contract Sum | Weightage (Contract Sum/ Total Contract) | Final Score | Grade |
|--|---------------|-------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------------------------------|------------------------|--|-------------|-------|
| Company : GAGASAN TEGUH SDN BHD | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Type of Work: INF (Others (Please specify)) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEH2/MISC(SI)-15/C00 SEH2 - Setia Ecohill 2 | | 63.68 | | | | | | | 63.68 | 298,824.00 | 1.0000 | 63.68 | C |
| | | | | | | | | | Total Contract Sum | 298,824.00 | Final Result & Grade | 63.68 | C |

CONTRACTOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

BUSINESS UNIT : SEH2 - Setia Ecohill 2

CONTRACTOR NAME : GAGASAN TEGUH SDN BHD

PERIOD : 01/07/2017 - 31/12/2017

SECTION : PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

- 1 Overall quality & workmanship**
Acceptable (15.00)
Workmanship met S P Setia Quality Standard requirements.
- 2 Specification compliance**
Acceptable (12.00)
Strict adherence to specification requirements.
- 3 Ability to meet schedule**
Good (7.50)
Exceeded 5% master program schedule requirements. Deliveries were made on time.
- 4 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.
- 6 Responsiveness to instructions**
Acceptable (2.40)
All instructions were responded to within 14 calendar days.
- 7 Organization structure (adequacy and quality of personnel)**
Acceptable (2.40)
Maintain adequate human resources to main project schedule.
- 8 Site Safety & housekeeping**
Acceptable (6.00)
Minor non-compliance with some minor remedial actions required.
Achieve 51% to 74% score in site safety inspection.
- 9 Adequacy of material & machinery**
Acceptable (2.40)
All materials are ordered and received on time. Equipment needed is available and maintained. No delays.
- 10 Submission of drawings, as-built, manuals etc.**
Good (1.50)
All submissions on time. Few minor errors found, rectified in timely manner.
- 11 Site diary, report, PQP, checklists and other project documentation requirements**
Good (3.00)
Frequently provided documentation that was accurate, clear, complete and current. Additional detailed information was given without request.
- 12 Attendance of site / coordination meetings**
Acceptable (3.00)
Attended meetings on a timely basis most of the time with valid reasons for lateness or absence. Sufficient representation by the contractor

SECTION : PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION

13 Involvement of key personnel (include project managers and directors)

Acceptable (2.40)

Key personnel was generally knowledgeable and in control of the project and clearly met the developer's expectations.

Section Score : 62.40 / 100.00

Section Mark : 46.8

SECTION : CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION

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

Good (11.25)

Usually submitted complete and on time.

2 Submission of quotations & rates when requested

Average (6.00)

Submissions are usually complete and on time with minimal reminder.

3 Accuracy of measurements

Good (7.50)

Few errors; quickly corrected and submitted.

4 Reasonableness of quotation

Acceptable (6.00)

Willing to negotiate, often compromises, some unresolved issues.

5 Cooperation with contracts department

Average (9.00)

Adequate working relationship, problems resolved.

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

Good (7.50)

Usually submitted complete and on time.

Section Score : 47.25 / 70.00

Section Mark : 16.88

Total Mark : 63.68