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How Is Vendor Evaluation Used?

- Vendor Evaluation supports you in procuring both materials and external services, by making use of data from MM, from the Logistics Information System (LIS info structure S013), and from quality management.
- An enterprise will want to evaluate its vendors based on different criteria. This evaluation may be useful in negotiations with the vendor.
- Vendor Evaluation will enable you to choose the most appropriate vendor for a specific requirement, and supports you in the continuous monitoring of existing supply relationships.
- A precondition for the use of vendor evaluation is that you previously specify in customizing the criteria by which your vendors are to be evaluated, and how which aspects of their performance are to be rated.

General Information

- Vendor evaluation is always evaluated for:
  - purchasing organization
  - vendor
- Each time an evaluation is processed, the vendor gets an overall score, which is determined from the scores of the Main Criteria with the application of a weighting key.
Scoring levels in Vendor Evaluation and Weighting Keys

- You can use weighting keys to determine what share of the overall score is made up by each main criteria.
- All weightings must be defined as weighting keys in customizing for each purchasing org.
- When vendor evaluation run for the first time, must assign a weighting key to each vendor.

Criteria

Main Criteria

- The type and number of main criteria can be specified on an enterprise-specific basis.
- The system supports a maximum of 99 main criteria.
- For each purchasing organization, it has to be decided which main criteria are to comprise the basis for the overall score. The following main criteria are provided in standard:
  - PRICE
  - QUALITY
  - DELIVERY
  - SERVICE
  - EXTERNAL SERVICE PROVISION (new erp2005)
**Sub-criteria (I)**

**Types of Sub-criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eval. criterion</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01 Price</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33,3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02 Quality</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>33,3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03 Delivery</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>33,3 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05 Service</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,0 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sub-criteria (II)**

- Each main criteria is sub-divided into several sub-criteria.
- Option of defining own sub-criteria for each main criteria in addition to what's provided in standard.
- Maximum of 20 sub-criteria for each main criteria.
- Can define different weightings for individual sub-criteria for each purchasing org. in customizing. Applies to all vendors within the purchasing org.
- The scores for the sub-criteria are calculated at the time of the evaluation, and represent the average of the individual scores for the relevant materials.
- Smallest units in vendor evaluation that can be scored.
The scores for Main Criteria are calculated from the scores of the Sub-criteria:

- **Manual - scoring method**: You enter the score into the system yourself before carrying out an evaluation.
- **Semi-automatic - scoring method 1, C and D**: You enter scores for quality and timeliness of delivery or performance at info record level (for a material) or in the service entry sheet (for an externally performed service).
- **a score can be entered for each info record. (extras -> vendor evaluation)**
- **Fully automatic - scoring method 2 to 9, A and B**: Scores are calculated automatically during on-line processing.

**Automatic Sub-criteria**

**Automatic Evaluation Price Level**

- **Price Level - Scoring Method 4**: Evaluates relationship of a vendor's price to the market price.
- **Effective price and Market price are determined based on information stored in the info record (condition record and market price EINE-EFFPM)**
- **When no market price has been maintained, the system checks all materials for that vendor, and all info records for each material, and calculates an average to be used as the market price.**
- **Percentage determined for price level based on effective and market price - used to assign a score (defined in customizing - table T147K)**
- **This comparison is made for each material that a vendor has provided.**
- **This information is only calculated during an evaluation (transaction ME61) and saved in the table ELBP.**
- **Score not maintained in info structure S013**
- **Consulting note 806836**

**Automatic Evaluation Price Behavior**
• Price Behavior - Scoring Method 5
  • Evaluates how a vendor's price has changed over time in comparison with the development of the market price
  • Effective price and Market price are used to determine a price comparison based on information stored in the info record (condition record and market price EINE-EFFPM)
  • When no market price has been maintained (EINE-EFFPM), the system checks all materials for that vendor, and all info records for each material, and calculates an average to be used as the market price.
  • The price comparison is a percentage variance between the previous year and current year’s market prices - used to assign a score (defined in customizing - table T147K)
  • This comparison is made for each material that a vendor has provided.
  • This information is only calculated during an evaluation (transaction ME61) and saved in the table ELBP.
  • Score not maintained in info structure S013
  • Consulting note 806838

Automatic Evaluation On-time Delivery Performance

• On-time Delivery - Scoring Method 3
  • Used to assess the extent to which a vendor delivers ordered goods punctually
  • Based on calendar (specified in customizing) days
  • Calculates difference between the goods receipt posting date (EKBE-BUDAT) and the statistics-relevant delivery date (EKET-SLFDT) - used to determine a score in table Points Scores for the Automatic Criteria (T147K).
  • For each goods receipt this score is calculated and saved in table S013.
    • S013-PWTT1 - Points score for on-time delivery in the current period.
    • S013-PWTT2 - Points score for on-time delivery cumulated and smoothed from all periods.
  • Final score is an average of all scores you have on S013 for a vendor/purchasing org./material
  • different periods updated in S013 for material, purchasing org., vendor
  • Score of 0 means on-time delivery was not evaluated for the period
  • Minimum delivery quantity defined in customizing
  • vendor who delivers on-time won't get a good score if not all goods delivered
  • No on-time delivery score for service items

Automatic Evaluation Quantity Reliability (I)

• Quantity Reliability - Scoring Method 2
  • Used to assess the extent to which a vendor delivers the quantities specified in Purchase Orders
  • The percent value is calculated and used to determine a score in table Points Scores for the Automatic Criteria (T147K)
    • \( F1 = GR\text{ quantity} - PO\text{ quantity} \)
    • \( F1 = F1 / PO\text{ quantity} \times 100 \)
  • For each goods receipt this score is calculated and saved in table S013
    • S013-PWMT1 - Points score for quantity reliability in the period
    • S013-PWMT2 - Points score for quantity reliability cumulated and smoothed from all periods.
  • Final score is an average of all scores you have on S013 for a vendor/purchasing org./material
  • different periods updated in S013 for material, purchasing org., vendor
  • Score of 0 means on-time delivery was not evaluated for the period
  • No on-time delivery score for service items

Automatic Evaluation Quantity Reliability (II)

• Scores for quantity reliability are only calculated when for a position in a purchasing document:
  • The "delivery completed" indicator (EKPO-ELIKZ) is set OR
  • The deletion indicator (EKPO-LOEKZ) is set OR
  • The GR quantity is equal to or greater than the order quantity
  • Related Notes:
    • 710033
    • 854105
    • 865034
    • 941300
    • 979236
    • 1142061
  • Consulting note: 1044799

Automatic Evaluation Shipping Instruction

• Shipping Instruction - Scoring method 6
  - When goods are received against a purchase order, the system checks whether the purchasing department has specified any shipping instructions.
  - If so, the receiving clerk must enter a score for the vendor's compliance with the shipping instructions before posting the goods receipt. Keys with corresponding scores are maintained for shipping instructions in Customizing.
  - The new individual score is then merged with the vendor’s previous score for the sub-criterion. To calculate the new score for the sub-criterion from the already existing composite score and this new individual score the system applies the smoothing factor Compliance with shipping
- When you run a new evaluation, the system calculates the average from the individual scores for all the materials. The result is the vendor's score for the sub-criterion "Compliance with Shipping Instructions.
- If you want to have a scores for Shipping Instructions you need to set shipping instructions in PO and provide a score in GR.

**Automatic Evaluation Quality**

- Quality - Scoring method 7

- Calculated with the information of the quality notification.
- Each time a GR is posted for quality inspection a score should be introduced manually for this audit lot.
- First system computes a score for the lots that were inspected.
- If there is a GR without inspection it will receive the maximum score.
- Then system compares the number of GR for the period (table S012 field ALIEF) against the information from the quality notification.

Check if the USER-EXIT is active.

**Automatic Evaluation Shop floor Complaint**

- Shop Floor Complaint - Scoring method 8

- From the on-line documentation: “During the vendor evaluation process, the system checks whether the costs associated with the faulty delivery exceed the maximum percentage of business volume defined in the Customizing system.”
- The "cost associated" are based on the information from Quality Notification (transaction QM03). **This information is saved on table QMEL.**
- The "business volume" is determined by the invoice value for the period defined on the purchasing org. vendor evaluation customizing: T147-STAGE.
- The sums of invoice's values are taken from table S012 for the period.
- Check if the USER-EXIT is not active.
- Check if there are invoices for the period.

**Automatic Evaluation Quality Audit**

- Quality Audit - Scoring method 9

- Based on the information of Quality Management.
- The scores for an Audit lot are introduced in the Quality Management system.
- When an evaluation is carried out system check the parameter Quality audit in customizing.
- If the indicator is set, the system calculates the average score for all the quality audits in the validity period.
- The result is the vendor's score for the quality audit.
- If the indicator is not set, only the most recent audit lot is included. This then represents the vendor's score for the sub-criteria.
- Check if the USER-EXIT is active.

**Semi-Automatic Evaluation**

- The scores for semiautomatic criteria come from info records.

Scores for quality and timeliness of delivery or performance are entered at info record level (for a material) or in the service entry sheet (for an externally performed service).

- For scoring method 1 a score can be entered for each info record. Info records are based in the relation vendor X material. The score for the Sub-criteria then corresponds to the average score for all info records.
- When you define a scoring method "1" - Semi-automatic determination for a sub-criteria then you can enter manually a score in the info. record Transaction ME12 -> Extras -> Vendor Evaluation

When you define a scoring method "C" - Determination from quality rating "D" - Determination from timeliness rating of service then you can enter a manually score in the Entry Sheet under Vendor Evaluation

**Customizing Vendor Evaluation**

**Customizing Vendor Evaluation (I)**
Customizing Vendor Evaluation (II)

- Define Weighting Keys
  - define the weighting keys for the main criteria of vendor evaluation

- Define Criteria
  - define the criteria by which the system computes scores for vendors
  - specify whether the scores for the sub-criteria are computed manually, semi-automatically, or automatically
  - can activate user exit: customer's own program to determine score

Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Control Data

Define individual Vendor Evaluation System settings for each purchasing organization
All parameters must be maintained in order for the system to be able to compute scores
Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Applicability Period (I)

- Period in calendar days within which data is to be taken into consideration for vendor evaluation purposes - older data not taken into account
- The applicability period is taken into consideration as described in the example when the scores for the following criteria are computed:
  - GR lots
  - Complaints level
  - Semi-automatic criteria
- The applicability period is not taken into consideration for the following criteria:
  - Price level
  - Price history

Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Applicability Period (II)

- If new data is available within the applicability period for the following criteria, all data is applied for evaluation purposes
- If no data is available, these criteria are not rated:
  - Quantity reliability
  - On-time delivery performance
  - Variance from shipping notification
  - Shipping instructions
  - Quality audit
  - Timeliness of service provision
  - Quality of service provision

Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Business Volume and Single/Sole Source

- Business Volume for Calculating Reject Score (in DETAILS)
  - Specifies the percentage for the business volume that will be taken into consideration when calculating the partial criterion ‘complaint’.
  - Represents the limiting value for the lowest quality score of the partial criterion complaint.
- Single/sole source (in DETAILS)
  - Only taken into account if the vendor is the only source for this material and no market price has been maintained for the
- If you don't want to calculate a score for the price level and price history, don't set the indicator.

### Parameters for Subcriteria

**Price Level**
- Single/Sole Source

**Complaints/Reject Level**
- ShareBusnVolume%: 10,000

### Customizing Purchasing Org. Data

#### Standardizing Value and Minimum Delivery Qty

- Standardizing value for delivery time variance (in DETAILS)
  - Value in days that specifies how many days variance from the planned delivery date are to count as a 100% variance.

- Minimum delivery quantity (in DETAILS)
  - Indicates the percentage of the order quantity that counts as the minimum quantity to be delivered.
  - If the minimum delivery quantity is not reached, the system does not determine a score for the goods receipt.

### On-Time Delivery

| StdDelVar. | 100 |
| MinDelVar. | 10.0 |
| MinDelQty/StdDelTmVar from Material |

### Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Minimum Delivery % and standardizing value

- Minimum delivery percentage and standardizing value for delivery time variance
  - If the indicator has been selected, it checks whether a value has been maintained in the material master record
  - When set, this information will be taken from the relevant fields in the material master record
    - If no value exists, the value from the Minimum delivery percentage field is used.
    - If no value in the minimum delivery % field either, partial goods receipts are included in the calculation of the score.

### Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Smoothing Factors

- Smoothing of Individual Scores
  - A score for a new goods receipt or the scores for a new service will change the existing scores for the current month.
  - The new individual score does not have the same significance as the previous composite score, because the latter was calculated from a number of individual scores. For this reason, the new individual score is given a lower weighting (that is to say, it is smoothed).
  - In carrying out this process, the system applies the relevant smoothing factors that you have defined for each individual score in Customizing.
Customizing Purchasing Org. Data Points Scores for the Auto Criteria

- Points Scores for the Automatic Criteria
  - Scores are defined regarding the percentage calculated during an evaluation
  - Relation between scores and percentage are always "up to"

Customizing Tables

- Customizing Tables (T147)
  - T147 - Control table for vendor evaluation
  - T147A - Definition for main criteria
  - T147B - Text for main criteria
  - T147C - Definition for sub-criteria
  - T147D - Text for sub-criteria
  - T147E - Definition of weighting keys
  - T147F - Description of weighting keys
  - T147G - Main criteria
  - T147H - Interval for delivery time statistics
  - T147I - Definition of sub-criteria for the main criteria
  - T147J - Weighting keys
  - T147K - Assignment: Percentage X Score
  - T147L - Intervals for quantity reliability
  - T147M - Definition of scope of list
  - T147N - Text for scope of list
  - T147O - Scope of List
  - T027A - is the table for defining shipping instructions
  - T027C - specifies the points scores for compliance
Vendor Evaluation Process

- Maintain Vendor Evaluation
  - scores for the manual main criteria and sub-criteria can be entered
- Automatic Re-evaluation
  - provides you with a list comparing the scores from the 1st evaluation with the newly-calculated scores

Vendor Evaluation Process Manual Maintenance (I)

Vendor Evaluation Process Manual Maintenance (II)

Prerequisites

- Before you can evaluate vendors on the basis of manual sub-criteria, you must maintain the scores for these sub-criteria.

Procedure

- Branch from the overview screen to the screen for the first main criterion.
- Enter scores for the manual sub-criteria.
- Branch to the next sub-criterion and enter scores for manual sub-criteria here.
- Repeat this procedure for all your other main criteria.
- If you then carry out the next vendor evaluation via Edit -> Automatic re-evaluation, the system calculates the scores on the basis of the automatic, semi-automatic, and manual sub-criteria

Vendor Evaluation Process Automatic Re-evaluations (I)
Vendor Evaluation Process Automatic Re-evaluations (II)

- From the system menu, choose Logistics -> Materials management -> Purchasing and then Master data -> Vendor evaluation -> Maintain. The initial screen appears.

- Enter the keys for the purchasing organization and vendor and then press ENTER. An overview of the main criteria for this purchasing organization is displayed.

- Maintain the mandatory-entry field Weighting key. If you do not know the weighting key, use the Possible entries facility.

- From the menu bar, choose Edit -> Auto. re-evaluation The system first calculates the scores for the automatic sub-criteria, then the scores for the main criteria, and finally the overall score for the vendor.

- Save the evaluation.

Vendor Evaluation Process Evaluation in the Background

- You can evaluate your vendors on a regular basis by means of background processing.
- The **Evaluation in the Background** function can be found in the Purchasing menu.
- If you want to start a background processing request for vendor evaluation, you need a variant (to limit the number of vendors to be evaluated, for example).
- Choose Master data -> Vendor evaluation -> Follow-on functions -> Evaluation in the background.
- On the initial screen, enter a job name and the name of the variant. Specify when the background evaluation should take place and how often it should be repeated.
- Save the background processing request.
Useful Transactions

- ME61 - Maintain Vendor Evaluation
- ME63 - Calculate Scores for Semi-Automatic and Automatic Criteria
- ME64 - Compare evaluations
- OMO2 - Updating periods
- OMEK - Score for Shipping instruction (Purchasing -> Material master)
- OLI3 - Statistical setup
- MEKH - Market price
- QM03 - Quality notification

To make a reorganization in table S013 and/or S012 there are two transactions/programs available:
- OLI3 - RMCENEUA - Statistical setup of info structure from Purchasing documents
- OLIX - RMCSISCP - Copy/delete version of an info structure

Database Tables

- ELBK - Header Data
  - Contains data as Weighting key, Overall score, etc
    - GEWSL - weighting key
    - GESBU - overall score
    - LEBEW - created by
    - LEBDT - created on
- ELBP - Main Criterion for Vendor Evaluation
  - Contains scores for main criteria and the individual scores for the associated sub-criteria
    - HKRIT - Main criteria
    - BEURT - score
    - KRT01 to KRT20 - Scores for sub-criterion 1 - 20
- ELBM - Material-Related Item
  - Scores for semi-automatic criteria at info record level.

S013 PURCHIS: Statistics for Vendor Evaluation (I)

- S013 - Statistics for Vendor Evaluation
  - Contains scores calculated during the on-line booking of some documents
  - Contains information that related for the current period and the cumulative score
  - Cumulative points scores of S013 are not entered in the VE evaluation record until re-evaluation is carried out.
  - Fields
    - VRSIO: Version number in the information structure
    - SPMON: Period to analyze - month
    - SPTAG: Period to analyze - current date
    - SPWOC: Period to analyze - week
    - SPBUP: Period to analyze - posting period
    - EKORG: Purchasing organization
    - LIFNR: Vendor's account number
    - MATNR: Material Number
    - WERKS: Plant

S013 PURCHIS: Statistics for Vendor Evaluation (II)
• PWMT1 Points score 1 for quantity reliability
• PWMT2 Points score 2 for quantity reliability
• PWTT1 Points score 1 for on-time delivery performance
• PWTT2 Points score 2 for on-time delivery performance
• PWEV1 Points score 1 for compliance with shipping instructions
• PWEV2 Points score 2 for compliance with shipping instructions
• PWWE1 Points score 1 for service quality
• PWWE2 Points score 2 for quality of service
• PWFR1 Points score 1 for service timeliness
• PWFR2 Points score 2 for service timeliness
• PWQA1 Points score 1 for quality audit
• PWQA2 Points score 2 for quality audit
• LAVI1 Points score 1: Shipping notification
• LAVI2 Points score 2: Shipping notification
• ALAV1 Points score 1: Variance from shipping notification
• ALAV2 Points score 2: Variance from shipping notification

Important Functions:

Function Group MEL0

• EVAL_SEMIAUTOMATIC_CRITERIA
• EVAL_AUTOMATIC_CRITERIA_S013
• EVAL_PRICELEVEL_CRITERIA
• EVAL_PRICEHISTORY_CRITERIA

Important Programs - Breakpoints
Price Level

Breakpoints:
EVAL_PRICELEVEL_CRITERIA
ME_GET_PRICE_FOR_SUPPLIER - vendor price
ME_PRICING_MARKET_PRICE - market price
In Function PRICING form xkomv_bewerten calculates the market
Price.
ME_PRICING_INFORECORD - info record price
TKOND-EFFPR = KOMP-NETPR (LMEL0F03) - vendor effective price
TKOND-EFFPM = KOMP-NETPR (LMEL0F03) - market price

Important Programs - Breakpoints
Price Behavior

Breakpoints:
EVAL_PRICEHISTORY_CRITERIA - function module principal
ME_GET_PRICE_FOR_SUPPLIER - function for price calculation.

Important Programs - Breakpoints
On-Time Delivery

Breakpoints:
EVAL_AUTOMATIC_CRITERIA_S013 - Function module where the scores from table S013 are computed
CALCULATE_SCORE_S013 - Form routine where the scores from table S013 are computed
LIS_WE_1 - Form routine (in function group EINS) where the score is calculated when booking a goods receipt.
LIS_WE_2 - Form routine (in function group EINS) where the score is calculated when booking a goods receipt.
ME_DELIVERY_TIME_VARIANCE - Function module that calculates the variance between the goods receipt posting date and the statistics
delivery date.

Important Programs - Breakpoints
Quantity Reliability

Breakpoints:
EVAL_AUTOMATIC_CRITERIA_S013 - Function module where the scores from table S013 are computed
CALCULATE_SCORE_S013 - Form routine where the scores from table S013 are computed
LIS_WE_3 - Form routine (in function group EINS) where the score is calculated when booking a goods receipt. At this point the score is saved in
table XMCEKPO field PWMT.

Important Programs - Breakpoints
Quality

Breakpoints:
QM_DATEN - Routine (in program MM06LI00) that calculated score for subcriteria assigned for the main criteria Quality.
QLIB_GR_LOT_KQD - function module that returns a score from the quality management.
QM_MAX_PUNKTE
QM_DATEN_MODIFIZIEREN
QM_BEWERTUNGEN

Important Programs - Breakpoints

Shop floor Complaint

Breakpoints:
QM_DATEN - Routine (in program MM06LI0O) that calculated score for subcriterias assigned for the main criteria Quality.
QLIB_GR_QMEL_KQD - Function where the comparison between the value of returns and the total value of invoices are made.
QM_MAX_PUNKTE
QM_DATEN_MODIFIZIEREN
QM_BEWERTUNGEN

Important Programs - Breakpoints

Quality Audit

Breakpoints:
QM_DATEN - Routine (in program MM06LI0O) that calculated score for subcriterias assigned for the main criteria Quality.
QLIB_GR_LOT_KQD - function module that returns a score from the quality management.
QM_MAX_PUNKTE
QM_DATEN_MODIFIZIEREN
QM_BEWERTUNGEN
At this point the score is saved in table XMCEKPO field PWQA.

Important Programs - Breakpoints

Shipping Instruction

Breakpoints:
EVAL_AUTOMATIC_CRITERIA_S013 - Function module where the scores from table S013 are computed
CALCULATE_SCORE_S013 - Form routine where the scores from table S013 are computed
LIS_WE_2 - Form routine (in function group EINS) where the score is calculated when booking a goods receipt.
At this point the score is saved in table XMCEKPO field PWEV.

Important Programs - Breakpoints

Automatic sub-criteria during online posting

- Reads data from S013 - updated during on-line postings
- ex. goods receipt posting updates S013 for on-time delivery and quantity deviation
  Function Group EINS
  Form Lis_verbuchung Set bp at if flg_v1 ne space.
  Check values in xmcekpo (ex. PWMT and PWTT - quantity reliability and on-time delivery)

```plaintext
if flg_v1 ne space.
  V1-Verbuchung starten
  **flg_no_update_task flag for debugging purposes only in >=45**
  if flg_no_update_task eq 'X' "Disposition --> Online verbuchen"
    call function 'MCE_STATISTICS_UPD_V1' EXPORTING
      zeitp  = h-zeitp
      control = mcontrol
    TABLES
      xmceket = xmceket
      xmcekko = xmcekko
      xmcekpo = xmcekpo
      xmcekpa = xmcekpa
        "4.0 Partner
      xmcekkn = xmcekkn
        "4.0 Kontierungen
      xmcekpv = xmcekpv
        "4.0 Versanddaten
      xmcesl = xmcesl
        "4.0 Leistungen
      xmcoes = xmcoes
        "4.0C Bestellbestätigungen
      xmccliak = xmccliak
        "4.0C Lieferavis Kopf
      xmccliap = xmccliap
        "4.0C Lieferavis Position
      xmcckomv = xmcckomv
        "4.0C Konditionen
    else. /*Normale --> Über Verbucher"
      call function 'MCF_STATISTICS_UPD_V1' in update_task

```

Important Programs - Breakpoints

Automatic sub-criteria during Set-Up OLI3

Reconstruction: transaction OLI3
Function Group EINS
Form EKBE_BELEG_VERBUCHEN
Set bp at: if mccontrol-modus <> con_modus_newbw.
Check values in xmcekpo (ex. PWMT and PWTT - quantity reliability and on-time delivery)

if mccontrol-modus <> con_modus_newbw.
call function 'MCE_STATISTICS_NEW'
EXPORTING
control = mccontrol
zeitp = h-zeitp
ale_send = ale_send
ale_logsys = ale_logsys
TABLES
xmceket = xmceket
xmcekko = xmcekko
xmcekpo = xmcekpo
xmcekpa = xmcekpa "4.0 Partner
xmcekkn = xmcekkn "4.0 Kontierungen
xmcekpv = xmcekpv "4.0 Versanddaten
xmcelsl = xmcelsl "4.0 Leistungen
xmcakes = xmcakes "4.0C Bestellbestätigungen
t_mcinf = t_mcinf.
endif.

RMCS013 - update of S013
RMCS013
Form compute_pwtt1 - Form compute_pwtt2
Form compute_pwmt1 - Form compute_pwmt2

Tips and Tricks

(I)

• Old evaluations are not stored.
• The cumulative points scores of S013 are not entered in the VE evaluation record until re-evaluation is carried out.
• To activate table S013 use transaction OMO2. If the update of this table is not active, no scores will be computed.
• A new evaluation is calculated in program SAPMM06L - OK_CODE, RM06LBAT - Evaluation of automatic sub-criteria per vendor.
• A vendor's score for Quantity reliability is only updated in the statistics when a purchase order is closed.
• The applicability period is not taken into account with respect to all vendor evaluation criteria (check the information in session about customizing).
• The minimum delivery percentage is only taken into account if the delivery is received on time.
• The minimum delivery percentage is only relevant to on-time delivery performance.
• When a score for the main or sub criteria has a value 0, this means that this criteria was not evaluated and not that the vendor has the
worst possible result.

(II)

- The deletion indicator in transaction ME61 up to the moment has no functionality. A workaround would be use report RMEVALDL (see note 52054). There is no evaluation for the criteria On-time delivery and quantity for service item.
- When there is no last year price (market, effective price) information available, scores for the sub-criteria price level are not calculated.
- Evaluations of services are entered in the service entry sheet. Please check section SEMIAUTOMATIC EVALUATION.
- Invoices are not included in VE. That is to say, a vendor who submits invoices containing prices that differ from the order price does not receive a better or worse rating (price level, etc.). Reason: relevant objects such as info record, conditions etc. are not changed as a result of this. - Now available in new functionality provided by invoice verification!