

**Capital Works & Development
Infrastructure Development**
Level 11
815-825 George Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Telephone: (02) 9379 6289
Facsimile: (02) 9379 6299
Our Ref:

Date: 5 August 2002



StateRail

Holman Engineering Pty Ltd
Unit A2, 4 Central Ave
THORNLEIGH NSW 2120

Ph: 9484 6889
Fax: 9484 0126

Dear Mr. Holman

**Contract No. C02055
Precise Clocks – Stage 3**

We refer to your organisation's engagement with State Rail in the execution of the above-mentioned Contract.

To facilitate continuous improvement, the performance of your organisation has been monitored during the period of the Contract and its assessment is contained in the attached performance report.

Should you wish to discuss this matter further please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours faithfully



**Dianne Rillos
Project Manager
Infrastructure Development**

cc CopyTo
Sam Lodh
Gery Pether

STATE RAIL AUTHORITY

Contractor Performance Report

General information

Contractor's Name Holman Engineering Pty Ltd
 ABN 42 060 483 016 Contract No. C02055
 Contract Description Supply 184 Digital Clocks & 17 Master units
Adhere to the schedule prepared by SRA & Argus.
Deliver / Consign the Clocks to Argus as per schedule.
for Digital Clocks Stage 3.

Contract period (weeks): 7 weeks Original due date for practical completion: 17 May 2002

Date of acceptance of tender: March 2002 Original Contract sum: \$ 292,362.

Reason for report

| midway through 4-7 month Contract | six - monthly report | practical completion | final completion | termination of Contract | continuing unsatisfactory performance |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (give details) | | | | | |

Contract progress

Total extension of time approved (days): NIL Extended date for practical completion: N/A

Percentage of work completed at report date: 100 % Actual date of practical completion: 17/5

Contract sum as varied at report date: N/A Final sum: \$ 292,362.

Contractor's performance rating

| | Unsatisfactory (0-4) | Acceptable (5-6) | Good (7-8) | Superior (9-10) |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| Time management | [] | [] | [] | [9] |
| Standard of service | [] | [] | [] | [9] |
| Quality systems | [] | [] | [] | [9] |
| Management and suitability of site personnel | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Management of subcontractors etc. | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Contract administration | [] | [] | [] | [9] |
| Variation requests by Contractor | [] | [] | [8] | [] |
| OHS&R management | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Management of industrial relations | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Environmental management | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Workforce or skills development | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Cooperative relationships | [] | [] | [] | [9] |
| Other | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| | [] | [] | [] | [] |
| Overall Performance (Totals) | [] | [] | [8] | [45] |

Total Point Score = [53]

Total Maximum Points = [60]

Overall Performance Grade = $\frac{\text{Contractor's Total Point Score [53]} \times 100}{\text{Total Maximum Points [60]}}$
 = [88%]

Notes: The Contractor's Total Point Score is the total of the points scored against all the performance criteria.
 The Total Maximum Points applicable is the number of criteria graded against x 10.
 The Total Maximum Points may vary from report to report, depending on the number of performance criteria the Contractor's is graded against.
 The Overall Performance Grade percentage is then assessed as follows:

| | |
|----------------|-----------|
| Superior | over 85% |
| Good | over 65% |
| Acceptable | over 50% |
| Unsatisfactory | under 50% |

Recommendation

Suitability for further work:

Suitable

Not Suitable

Must (✓) as appropriate on completion of Contract

If 'Not Suitable' is ticked, detailed reasons must be given

Overall comments (Use separate report if necessary)

Reporting Officer

In my opinion:

The company, met the requirements of the project. I found the company was committed & focused in delivering to the schedule.
The product delivered is a high standard.
The after sales service is also to be commended.

Name (please print) Dianne Rillos Phone No. 93796289
Signature Dillos Date 5-8-02

Reviewing Officer

I concur / ~~do not concur~~ with the Reporting Officer's assessment detailed in the report.

In my opinion: Holman Engineering provides a good product and also shows a commitment for meeting tight deadlines.

The report has been forwarded to the Contractor:

Yes No

Recommended for further work (to be answered on completion of Contract):

Yes No

If the recommendation is "No" the unsatisfactory performance aspects have been discussed with

NOT APPLICABLE (print name and phone number of Contractor's Representative)

on _____ (insert date of discussion)

Minutes of meeting and Contractor's response attached

Yes No

Name of Reviewing Officer (please print) S. LODH Phone No. 93796279

Signature [Signature] Date 5/8/02