

Appendix 4 KPI 5 Client Feedback Analysis

Client Feedback Interviews Scores (CFI)

Scoring for: April 2018 to September 2018

Ref.	Name	1 Overall Satisfaction with WSP	2 Understand Your Needs	3 Budget Management	4 Programme Management	5 Health, Safety & Environment	6 Teamwork & Collaboration	7 Serving your Customer	8 Impact of Defects/ Resolution of Issues	9 Quality of Service	10 Quality of Product or Outcome	11 Quality of our People	12 Approach to Innovation	13 High likely to Recommend WSP	14 How Easy is WSP to do Business with?	Better Same Worse Comparison with Competitors	Average Score	Overall Comments/ Key Issues to Prioritise
Shropshire Council																		
Service Area/ Name																		
1	SA1-Contracts (Hugh Dannatt) - Blue Collar Procurement																	HD ON LEAVE / OFF SICK
2	SA2-HDC (Gemma Lawley/ Mark Wootton)	7	9	9	9	N/A	9	8	8	7	7	8	7	9	9	SAME	8.15	1. Overall satisfied - issue with level of staff / resourcing. 2. N/A 3. Greater level of support on budget management. Positive improvement made. 4. N/A 5. N/A 6. Continued good working relationship 7. Response to DM enquiries good 8. Reinstate regular catch-up meeting (is desirable) 9. Lack of resources 10. Generally satisfied 11. N/A 12. N/A 13. Recommended recently 14. N/A. Overall comments - resource for staff, set workshop for planning responses. Happy with site supervision.
3	SA3-Flood Water Man (Tim Sneddon)																	TIM SNEDDON OFF WORK - HD ON LEAVE / OFF SICK
4	SA4-Street Lighting & Traffic Signals (Jason Hughes)	9	9	8	9	8	9	8	9	8	7	8	10	9	8	N/A	8.50	1. N/A 2. WSP have on occasion gone above and beyond what is expected and show they understand our needs completely. Examples are Jeff Upex suggesting alternative locations for street furniture as he understood the context of the scheme, which resulted in a net improvement. 3. Where necessary budgets are revised. For the score to improve, significant savings would need to be achieved by WSP by value engineering and innovative solutions. 4. If schemes prolong it is through no fault of WSP. Graham Moore provides information to the client in a timely manner. 5. Anything identified as a risk is dealt with quickly and efficiently. Nothing over and above expected but nothing below standards. 6. Excellent. The interface WSP technical and project staff have with the client, Kier and their subcontractors is exceeds expectations, this includes providing information a contractor has lost. 7. Some complaints come through to the client that should really have been dealt with by WSP staff in the first instance. An example are repeat complaints that should be escalated to WSP's technical lead rather than the client. 99% of the output is of a good standard. 8. Where contractors have caused defects WSP provides comprehensive reports that allow a quick resolution. 9. The quality of service can, on occasion, suffer as some members of the team are part-time but appear to have a full-time workload. There is a political understanding in the team that allow them to tailor their service to the client understanding the backdrop of a request. 10. All outcomes are met. Client would like to see more context-sensitive engineering judgment on drawings to fit in with the existing situation on site (i.e. avoid cutting down trees if possible). 11. Members of the team are very professional and extremely knowledgeable. Improvement would be design capacity in-house with local knowledge would be beneficial. 12. Excellent. Examples are innovating to generate cost savings (e.g. 30k) - through contacting alternative providers and recommending alternative products on the market. 13. Overall very satisfied and happy to recommend. 14. Interaction with WSP Project Manager is superb and makes business very easy. Client happy he can contact PM for any issues; understands client needs and their role. Professionalism demonstrated is excellent and has added value to the service provided by WSP. OVERALL: Non-competitive contract so no ability to compare to competitors. Seen improvements to the innovation side which has provided savings to the authority. Client hopes that this continues.
5	SA5-Highways (Andy Wilde)	9	9	9	8	8	10	9	8	8	8	8	7	8	8	SAME	8.36	Overall comments: Excellent performance overall. Really pleased with how high standards have continued in new Kier contract. Attitude toward partnering / collaboration sets the standard. Targets for 12 months going forward are deliver same standard on surface dressing and push tar recycling.
6	SA5-Major Projects (Matt Johnson)	9	10	9	9	9	8	8	9	7	8	8	8	10	10	N/A	8.71	1. N/A 2. Needs set out in OBC. On target to meet requirements on both. Dealing with dateholders - S Hughes has dealt with members of the public businesses and SC staff (A Wigley - cellar on Town Walls) very effectively. 3. SITP - had to re-adjust the yearly budget, then the LEP spend profile. OLR - G Dymond has worked with the LEP on the spend profile. G Dymond has also been involved in the CIL working group submissions. 5. M Lake's CDM overview is MJ's safety net. WSP has complied with all HS&E requirements. Town Walls cellar - team is engaging with SC structures client (G Singh) and is dealing with working in confined space. 6. Project management - convening periodic meetings, secretariat role, ensuring project keeps on moving when client isn't available - all good 7. External customers (residents, businesses) - S Hughes has gone above and beyond. Internal customers (Economic Growth team) - dealt with well. Would still like an additional resource to help Scott, but it has been problematic trying to identify someone suitable with the right skills / experience. 8. Through no fault of WSP, a poor contractor has been taken on for Pride Hill. The issues have been dealt with excellently. F Beech's role should also be noted. 9. Exceeded what is required to do job, e.g. MJ unable to attend Members' meeting, G Dymond stood in to front meeting instead. However, lack of resource to support S Hughes still an issue. 10. High score on Pride Hill for concept and design. Outcome - nothing compelled in the last 6 months so unable to comment. mid-term progress excellent. OLR - very high quality planning submission. 11. Everyone involved 10 out of 10, but need more help for S Hughes. 12. Flowers on heras fencing during Britain in Bloom, G Dymond meeting with judges, working with BID. 13. Marches LEP TOG group have let PH 2 of freight study. Scheme prioritisation framework - WSP put forward for that based on previous work. Also in frame for undertaking join Marches cross-border working group. 14. Co-location, availability great. Lack of shared systems / diaries still an issue. S Hughes and H Owen have dropped into site work well. OVERALL: Don't know competitors so can't comment. Main issues are lack of resource to assist S Hughes with stakeholder management, lack of shares systems / diaries.

7	SA5-Traffic (Victoria Merrill)	4	5	7	3	10	2	7	4	5	5	4	3	3	3	N/A	4.64	<p>1. N/A 2. There was poor communication from both sides with regards to a number of traffic schemes during the relevant period. The client has asked for scheme cost estimates from WSP and there has been a reluctance to put estimates next to schemes; there has been little to no information given by technical staff on the estimated costs and early notice of any anticipated uplifts or variations as a result of new contract rates (i.e. Kier). This is in contrast to other WSP teams (e.g. Highways / Ben Corfield) as an example of good practice. 3. Symptomatic of the quality of the brief provided to WSP. Cannot be too critical due to what we have been asked to do. Sometimes this gives rise to variations after the brief has been agreed to accommodate additional works. 4. Client would like to see profiling against the list of jobs provided at the start of the year and how this fits in with the capital delivery teams. There is an issue with programming within scheme (e.g. streetworks noticing) and technical staff undertaking audits of schemes that are not yet completed on site. Whilst there is no designated client project manager in post pushing compliance to programme there appears to be lax adherence to milestones, if any are agreed. 5. N/A 6. WSP traffic staff do not work together as a team either within themselves (e.g. auditing schemes still in progress), within the WSP office (e.g. not picking up on other schemes that may affect their works) & do not seem to work as a team with the client officers (e.g. not keeping the client up to date with comments from external stakeholders i.e. the police). 7. Since August, Kiri Hatton has done a sterling job of communication with customers, especially with other teams - such as maintenance divisions - within Shropshire Council. The client has observed that communication with members and other organisations has been excellent. The general feeling of WSP's approach to consultation could be simplified for the customer - what we are doing, why we are doing it and how it will affect them. There is no need for technical drawings and comprehensive correspondence. 8. There are occasions where the client was not informed of issues on site until they were contacted by external stakeholders (for example, Upton Crossroads & the police). The client has observed that when an issue is raised with the traffic team, it is harder to resolve than it needs to be and the team can come too defensive at the detriment of resolving the issue. 9. See responses to previous questions for a narrative.</p> <p>10. There has been technical work provided by the WSP traffic team that has been given to the client containing multiple errors. Examples include errors with sign design. There is an element of trust placed in WSP as to the QA processes of the technical work as there is currently no technical project management on the client team; this raises uncertainty over the quality of the design throughout the construction period.</p> <p>11. There is not a lot of enthusiasm within the traffic team and little to no drive to get the work done 'right first time' and to a high standard. Some of the traffic team do not appear to understand how the contractors and the construction elements of scheme delivery work - examples being the production and contents of supplied pre-construction information.</p> <p>12. There is a distinct lack of innovation within the traffic team and a tendency to over-engineer rather than interpret the context of a scheme and adapt accordingly. 13. The client may recommend WSP's traffic team to others but would provide strong cautionary words to any prospective party approaching the team to undertake work. 14. The traffic team are difficult to do business with as they can be over-defensive, opinionated, and disorganised. Early warnings are seen by the team as confrontational and received negatively.</p> <p>OVERALL: The service that WSP implied they would deliver in that they can bring in resources to cover any shortfall has not been demonstrated within the traffic team. Any additional requirement or shortfall of traffic engineers has been communicated to the client as a problem that the client needs to resolve; this should not be the case. This has been demonstrated in the recent traffic support brief sent to WSP in August, that asked for two engineers that the team stated they could not resource. As a result, the brief needed to be modified.</p> <p>Comparison with competitor cannot be answered as there is not competition.</p>
8	SA6-Transport Planning etc (Victoria Merrill & Matt Johnson)	8	8	10	8	10	9	7	3	7	7	8	5	8	7	N/A	7.50	<p>1. N/A 2. Martin Withington understands what the client requires before there is a requirement; however, sometimes this can over and above what is needed. 3. No concerns. Particularly with LTP4, the client is always kept informed of any work that may have a budgetary implication. 4. No concerns with programme management and the client is kept informed through project updates. There has been one occasion where drift has caused an issue - the annual monitoring surveys was delivered late which may have caused an issue if the client wanted to proceed with the work. 5. N/A 6. Level of interaction is appropriate for the level of work required from the client. 7. Overall this is o.k. However, during the LTP4 engagement event the client noticed that some of the facilitators lacked the skills to appropriately handle the tables to which they were assigned to get the required outcomes. 8. There were a number of meetings the client had to attend in order to resolve the issues within the phase 2 accident cluster site report produced by the traffic team. There was a fundamental misunderstanding of what the client required although there has been a willingness to try to get it right. The GIS files for phase 1 are still outstanding. 9. The score has been brought down due to the performance on the accident cluster site commission. The work conducted outside of the Shrewsbury office has been really good so far. 10. As Q9 11. Overall very good, however there are some WSP staff that are not forward thinking. This lack of self-reflection has caused problems for the client, e.g. the accident cluster site report. 12. No real examples where innovation has been suggested or required.</p>
9	SA7-Bridges (Tim Sneddon)																	TIM SNEDDON OFF WORK - HD ON LEAVE / OFF SICK
10	SA8-Divisional Highway Maintenance – Central (Ian Walshaw)																	NO WORK THROUGH THIS SA IN-PERIOD
11	SA9-Inspections (Chris Fisher) - Mark Holmes	10	10	9	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	10	N/A	10	10	SAME	9.85	<p>1. As Usual - Happy with all of Mark's Work. 2. Fully Understands SC's needs 3. Mark Keeps to & understands the budget 4. Mark does our programming for us 5. No issues 6. Mark is a team player 7. Mark deals with service requests very well 8. Mark sorts out issues for us 9. Top Quality Work. 10. Top Quality Work 11. Mark is always easy to work with & gives 100% all the time 12. N/A 13. I would recommend Mark 14. Mark is easy to deal with</p> <p>OVERALL: Wish to continue working in the same way.</p>
12	SA10-Asset Management (Steve Brown)	9	9	9	9	N/A	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	10	9	BETTER	9.54	<p>OVERALL: Extremely pleased with the service + support from WSP/Emma on this work stream. No concerns or reservations to raise. High quality + professional support.</p>
13	SA 11- Business & Enterprise (Chris Hill)																	NO WORK THROUGH THIS SA IN-PERIOD
14	SA 14 – Road Safety (Kevin Aitkin)	7	8	8	9	9	7	7	9	9	9	9	7	9	3	WORSE	7.86	<p>Client put no comments aside from Q14 - 'In relations to changes to service provision'</p>

Number of CFI

10

8.12 Carry over into Oct 18 - Mar 19 figures

Total Average	7.60	8.20	8.50	7.70	9.25	7.60	8.00	7.40	7.50	7.60	7.70	6.67	7.90	7.00
Highest Score	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Lowest Score	4	5	7	3	8	2	7	3	5	5	4	3	3	3
Difference	6	5	3	7	2	8	3	7	5	5	6	7	7	7