



THE MULTI-LOCATION WASTE EQUIPMENT BENCHMARK

**Score your operation. Identify where cost
is hiding. See where you stand.**

A benchmark report drawn from more than 85,000
service calls per year across every US market,
facility type, and equipment category.

Published by Komar Industries.

CONTENTS

03 The Problem With “Good Enough”

04 The Fragmentation Tax

06 Five Benchmarks + Self-Assessment

13 What 85,000 Service Calls Reveal

16 What Happens After You Score Yourself



THE PROBLEM WITH “GOOD ENOUGH”

Most facilities managers running 50, 200, or 2,000 locations don't describe their waste equipment situation as a problem. The compactors compact. The balers bale. Service shows up. Nobody is calling it a crisis.

But there is a cost buried in that arrangement, and it almost never appears on a single invoice. It lives in the aggregate:



Response time variances across regions



Parts sourcing delays that extend downtime



Preventable emergency service calls



Managing multiple vendors across locations



Technicians unfamiliar with your specific equipment



Midnight equipment failures requiring urgent coordination

The operations with the lowest total cost of ownership and the most consistent uptime across their footprint did not get there by accident. They understood where the gaps were. Then they closed them.

This benchmark was developed from patterns observed across more than 85,000 service calls per year, across every facility type, equipment category, and North American market. Operations that score well on these five benchmarks experience fewer emergency service events, lower total cost of ownership, and measurably better uptime. Operations that score below 20 have identifiable gaps, most of which are fixable without replacing equipment.

This is not a product evaluation. It is an operational self-assessment.

Score based on your current reality, not your goal state. The interpretation guide at the end of Section 2 will tell you where you stand.

Work through the five benchmarks. Score yourself honestly. Add up your total. Read Section 3 before drawing conclusions about what the number means.

THE FRAGMENTATION TAX

What multi-vendor waste operations actually cost you

When a large retail chain or logistics operation builds out its waste equipment program, it rarely does so all at once. A compactor here, a baler contract there, a regional service provider that works well in three markets and patches it together in four more. Years pass. New locations arrive with inherited vendors. Contracts renew and life goes on.

The result is the natural accumulation of practical decisions made at different points by different people. But that accumulated structure has a cost, and most operations never add it up. There are four places where it concentrates.

4 HRS

PRIMARY METRO



12+ HRS

SECONDARY MARKET

72 HRS

**EQUIPMENT DOWN.
RECORD SAYS IT
WAS RESOLVED.**

6 WKS

**PRESSURE READING TRENDING
WRONG. NO FLAG RAISED.**

200

**LOCATIONS. ZERO SINGLE POINT
OF ACCOUNTABILITY.**



Service response variance

Response time across multi-vendor, multi-region operations can vary significantly depending on the market. A four-hour SLA in a primary metro becomes 12 hours in a secondary market where the provider subcontracts to a regional shop with its own technician availability, its own parts relationships, and its own definition of urgent. The contract language may be identical in every market. The actual experience is not.

Most operators discover this variance through escalations, not data. By the time a regional manager is calling corporate to report a down compactor, the problem has been sitting for two days.



No unified parts pipeline

Parts sourcing is the hidden variable in almost every service event that runs long. The technician arrives on time. The diagnosis is correct. But the part is not in local inventory, not available same-day, and has to come from a third-party distributor two states over. A four-hour repair becomes three days.

This does not show up as a failure on the service report. Both visits log as completed. The equipment was down for 72 hours, but the record says it was resolved. The relationship between parts origin and resolution time is almost never tracked, and it is consistently one of the strongest drivers of extended downtime.



Zero cross-location visibility

Without equipment monitoring, every facility is oblivious until something fails. There is no signal that a compactor motor is drawing more current than it should. No flag that a pressure reading has been trending wrong for six weeks. The first notification is the call from the floor manager, by which point the cost is already in motion: emergency dispatch, service premium, operational disruption, waste backlog.

In a well-monitored operation, that sequence begins with a predictive alert and ends with a scheduled visit. In an unmonitored one, it begins with a breakdown.



Vendor management overhead

Multiple service vendors across 200 locations means different contracts, billing reconciliation processes, escalation chains, and thresholds for what constitutes acceptable. When a dispute arises, whether it's a billing discrepancy, a repeat failure on a recently serviced unit, or a warranty question, for example, there is no single point of accountability. There is a finger-pointing exercise between the equipment manufacturer, the service provider, and whomever sold the original contract.

The administrative cost accumulates quietly. The accountability gap is worse.

These are not equipment problems. They are structural problems built into how the operation was set up. The benchmarks in Section 2 measure how exposed your operation is to each one.

FIVE BENCHMARKS + SELF-ASSESSMENT

Rate your operation. Score each benchmark from 1 to 5.

These five benchmarks cover the variables that most reliably determine waste equipment performance at scale. Score honestly on each. Your total is out of 25. The interpretation guide follows.

Score based on your operation today, not the one you are planning to build.

A score of 3 means partial capability with real gaps. A score of 5 means the described standard is fully in place and consistent across your footprint.



Service Consistency Across Locations

Can you guarantee the same response time and service standard at every location, regardless of geography?

Score What It Looks Like

5

Single provider, national SLA, consistent response standards in primary and secondary markets alike. The service experience in a low-volume market is identical to a high-priority metro.

4

Primary national provider with occasional subcontracting in remote markets. SLA is largely consistent; minor variances at the edges.

3

Two or three regional providers with different SLAs. Response time varies by market. Some locations are routinely underserved.

2

Multiple vendors across markets with no unified SLA. Response time is negotiated separately by region. Corporate has limited visibility into actual field performance.

1

No unified service standard. Providers are managed location by location. Response is ad hoc and inconsistent. No cross-location performance data.

YOUR SCORE: / 5

Service inconsistency is the most expensive problem most operators never measure directly. A three-hour average response time variance across a 200-location footprint, multiplied by annual service frequency, is a material amount of unplanned downtime and most of it is structural, not situational. The equipment is the same. The vendor model is different.

Parts Supply Chain Control

When equipment breaks down, where do your parts come from and how long does it take to get them?

Score What It Looks Like

5

Parts sourced directly from the equipment manufacturer. Same-day or next-day availability across all US markets is common, depending on the issue being addressed.

4

Manufacturer parts available in most markets. Third-party sourcing is the exception. First-call resolution rates are high.

3

Mix of manufacturer and third-party sourcing depending on market and equipment type. Multi-day lead times are common in secondary markets. Repeat visits occur regularly.

2

Primarily third-party supply chain. Resolution time varies significantly based on distributor availability.

1

No parts sourcing standard. Each service event is individually resourced. Repair duration depends on the technician's local relationships.

YOUR SCORE: / 5

The gap between a four-hour repair and a three-day repair is almost always the parts, not the technician. Parts sourced directly through the factory are stocked against specific models, fit correctly, and do not void warranties. The difference rarely appears on a service report. It appears in downtime hours, repeat visits, and accelerated component wear.

Equipment Visibility

How much do you know about your equipment's operational status before something goes wrong?

Score What It Looks Like

5

Real-time IoT monitoring active across the fleet. Fullness optimization / hauling data represented in a single dashboard.

4

Monitoring active on newer equipment. Older units remain reactive. Fleet visibility is partial but growing.

3

No live monitoring. Equipment status understood through service history and technician reports. Some predictive scheduling based on usage estimates.

2

Equipment status known only after technician assessment. Service history exists but is not used to inform maintenance scheduling.

1

No visibility. Issues discovered when employees report them. Entirely reactive.

YOUR SCORE: / 5

For multi-location operations, the visibility gap compounds. Without monitoring, a fleet of 200 compactors is 200 separate unknowns. Any one of them could be trending toward failure right now. You would not know until someone called it in.

Total Cost of Ownership Awareness

Do you know the true cost of your waste equipment operation including service, parts, downtime, and vendor management overhead?

Score What It Looks Like

5

Full TCO model in place. Equipment, service, parts, downtime hours, and vendor overhead tracked and aggregated. Capital replacement decisions are made on data, not equipment age.

4

Equipment and service costs tracked at portfolio level. Downtime estimated. Vendor overhead understood but not formally quantified.

3

Equipment and service invoices tracked. Downtime noted when significant but not converted to cost. No aggregate TCO view.

2

Service invoices tracked. No consolidated view of total operational cost.

1

Equipment purchase price is known. Total operational cost is not tracked. Budget conversations happen reactively after a failure.

YOUR SCORE: / 5

Most organizations optimize for acquisition price and do not anticipate the service cost that accumulates over a machine's lifespan, which can be three to five times the original capital expenditure, depending on service model. Without TCO visibility, procurement decisions based on purchase price can drastically misrepresent the real financial impact to an organization.

First-Call Resolution Rate

When a technician is dispatched to your equipment, how often does a single visit fully resolve the problem?

Score What It Looks Like

5

First-call resolution is tracked and consistently at or above 85% FCR. Technicians arrive with the right parts, right training, and right access to close the job on the first visit in nearly all instances.

4

First-call resolution is tracked and generally strong. Repeat visits occur in a minority of cases, typically in secondary markets or for non-standard equipment.

3

Resolution rates are not formally tracked, but repeat visits are a known occurrence. Root cause is typically parts availability or technician familiarity with specific models.

2

Repeat visits are common and accepted as normal. No data on first-call resolution. Downtime often extends across multiple dispatch events.

1

No tracking of resolution rates. Repeat visits and extended repair timelines are the default experience. No visibility into why jobs require multiple visits.

YOUR SCORE: / 5

The repeat visit is the most visible symptom of an underperforming service model and one of the easiest to quantify. Each additional dispatch carries labor cost, parts sourcing time, and continued equipment downtime. The gap compounds across a large fleet.

Score Interpretation

TOTAL SCORE: _____ / 25

21 – 25 OPTIMIZED

Your operation is running at or near best in class. A walkthrough will identify where marginal gains remain and what it takes to protect that standard at scale.

15 – 20 FUNCTIONAL GAPS

A working operation with identifiable vulnerabilities. Two or three benchmarks represent real risk as costs and failure points compound as the footprint grows.

10 – 14 STRUCTURAL RISK

Multiple gaps are driving cost and compressing your margin for error. A walkthrough will prioritize which to address first based on exposure and leverage.

BELOW 10 HIGH EXPOSURE

The operation is running reactively across most dimensions. The cost is real even when it does not show up on a single invoice.

Most operations that complete this benchmark honestly score between 11 and 17. That range is not failure, it is a normal accumulation of decisions made over time by different people under different constraints. What it surfaces is where the leverage is: which gaps are structural, which ones are compounding, and which ones can be addressed without a vendor overhaul.

If you scored below 20, a benchmark walkthrough will identify which gaps are driving cost in your operation, what closing each one looks like in practice, and what the realistic path from your current tier to the next one involves. No product pitch. Just the patterns from 85,000 service calls applied to your specific situation.

Ready to go deeper on your score?

Book a 30-minute benchmark walkthrough with a Komar service specialist.

We review your scores, identify your highest-priority gaps, and show you what operations at the next tier do differently.

BOOK A BENCHMARK WALKTHROUGH



WHAT 85,000 SERVICE CALLS REVEAL

Four patterns that explain the benchmark results

These benchmarks were not constructed theoretically. They reflect what consistently separates high-performing multi-location waste equipment operations from ones that are managing well enough but paying more than they should. In our experience, the same four patterns emerge regardless of equipment type, facility, category, or geography.

Pattern 1: The service model predicts downtime more reliably than equipment quality

The most persistent assumption in waste equipment procurement is that quality is the primary driver of uptime. Buy better equipment and it breaks less. That assumption is not wrong, it's just incomplete.

In practice, service model is a stronger predictor of downtime than equipment quality. Operations running factory-direct service with consistent technician training experience significantly fewer unplanned downtime events than comparable operations using subcontracted or regional providers, regardless of equipment brand or age. The same compactor, maintained by a factory-trained technician with direct manufacturer parts access, outperforms the identical unit maintained by a regional shop sourcing parts from a distributor.

The equipment quality conversation happens when you're buying. The service model conversation determines what you experience for the next 10 years.

**4
HRS**

**SLA IN PRIMARY
METRO MARKETS**

Pattern 2: Preventive maintenance significantly reduces maintenance calls

Operations on structured preventive maintenance programs significantly reduce emergency service calls than comparable operations running reactive break-and-fix models. The range reflects differences in equipment age, usage intensity, and facility type. The direction is consistent. The emergency call is the most expensive service event in a waste equipment operation. It carries a response premium, involves a technician dispatched under time pressure who may not have the required parts, and produces unplanned downtime that cascades into operational disruption. It is disproportionately expensive not because the labor rate is higher, but because everything downstream of the unplanned event costs more.

A PM program does not eliminate service calls. It converts emergency calls into scheduled ones, and that conversion only holds if the service organization running the program is consistent, trained, and accountable. An independent provider subcontracting in secondary markets does not run the same PM program in Atlanta as it does in a smaller market. The labor cost of a scheduled visit versus an emergency call may look similar on paper. The consistency of execution is not.

85K+

**SERVICE CALLS
ANALYZED PER
YEAR**

72 HRS

**EQUIPMENT
DOWN, RECORD
SAYS RESOLVED**

Pattern 3: Parts origin is the variable nobody tracks

Ask a facilities manager how their service provider sources parts and most cannot answer. They know who to call when something breaks. They do not know where the part that fixes it comes from.

This matters because first-call resolution rates diverge sharply between operations where parts come from the manufacturer and operations where they come from third-party distributors. The gap is not primarily about part quality, it is about availability. Factory parts are stocked against specific models. Third-party parts require the technician to identify an equivalent, verify compatibility, and wait on distribution. The service report does not capture this: it records dispatch date, close date, and resolution status. It does not record the two days the machine sat waiting, or the follow-up visit because the aftermarket component failed under load.

Benchmark 2 is consistently the lowest-scoring benchmark for operations that have never audited it. Most operators do not know their score until they ask the question for the first time

Pattern 4: IoT monitoring changes the shape of the cost curve

Operations with real-time equipment monitoring do not just respond faster. They experience a fundamentally different cost profile: higher baseline maintenance activity, sharply lower emergency event frequency, and meaningfully fewer downtime hours over the course of a year.

The mechanism is direct. Equipment that transmits performance data surfaces problems in their early stages, when a fault is a trending anomaly rather than a failure. A compactor motor drawing higher current than its baseline is not a broken compactor. It is a compactor that will become a problem in the near future if nobody acts. With monitoring, that trend triggers a scheduled maintenance visit. Without it, it triggers an emergency call.

For multi-location operations, the visibility function is as valuable as the predictive one. A single dashboard showing equipment health across the full portfolio allows a national facilities director to identify which locations are trending toward service events and which equipment is approaching end-of-life without waiting for regional escalations or quarterly service reports.

This does not require an IT project. The monitoring is an optional add-on with the equipment. The shift from reactive to predictive is a function of having the information, not of organizational change.

12+ HRS

**ACTUAL RESPONSE
IN SECONDARY
MARKETS**

**The shift from
reactive to
predictive is a
function of having
the information,
not of
organizational
change.**



What Happens After You Score Yourself

The benchmark is a diagnostic. It tells you where your operation stands and what separates your tier from the next one. It does not tell you what it would take to close your specific gaps, what the sequence looks like, what comparable operations have done, or where the highest-leverage intervention is.

That is what the walkthrough is for.

The Benchmark Walkthrough

A benchmark walkthrough is a 30-minute working session with a Komar service specialist. It is not a product demo. There is no prepared slide deck about equipment. You bring your score. We apply it.

What the walkthrough covers:

- Which benchmark gaps are built into your current vendor arrangement versus situational and addressable without changing providers
- What the data from comparable operations shows about cost profile for each gap: what it is likely costing you now and what closing it is typically worth
- Sequence and priority of which gaps to address first based on exposure and leverage, not based on what we sell
- What operations that moved from your current tier to the next one did differently, and how long it took

Most walkthroughs surface two or three gaps that account for the majority of the cost in the operation. The highest-scoring operations we work with are not perfect across all five benchmarks. They are optimized on the two or three that matter most for their footprint and operational pattern.

The goal is to leave with a clear picture of which gaps are driving cost and what a realistic path to closing them looks like. Whether Komar is part of that path is a separate conversation.



Book a Benchmark Walkthrough

30 minutes to go through your score and what it means for your operation.

BOOK A BENCHMARK WALKTHROUGH

ABOUT KOMAR INDUSTRIES

Komar brings together the industry's most comprehensive portfolio of waste and recycling equipment solutions under a single engineering, manufacturing, and service organization. More than 165 factory-trained technicians handle 85,000+ service calls annually across North America, delivering consistent service levels, direct parts access, and a single point of accountability for equipment performance and uptime.

iSMART™, Komar's IoT monitoring platform, provides real-time equipment visibility, predictive maintenance alerts, and cross-location performance analytics, helping organizations reduce downtime, improve operational efficiency, and make more informed equipment decisions.

Learn more at komarindustries.com

