

# Appendix 4 KPI 5 Client Feedback Analysis

## Client Feedback Interviews Scores (CFI)

Scoring for: October 2018 to March 2019

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	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	8	7	8	7	8	8	N/A	7.64	1. Generally satisfied, however have raised issue with lack of technical lead. 2. N/A 3. View to tighter / more accurate monitoring. 4 - 14. N/A. OVERALL. Key issues to prioritise - quicker turnaround on technical checks and increase 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	9	8	9	8	9	8	9	9	9	8	9	9	Same	8.71	Overall Comments/ Key Issues to Prioritise Major Changes in personnel that will need to be addressed to ensure a good level of service within the team. Some knowledge has been lost from the team on the tender contract side due to retirement. Need to ensure knowledge is retained in office or throughout the group for contract queries or re-tendering service. Q1 Experiences staff. good local knowledge and understanding of current traffic signal systems. Q2 Good understanding of teh Shropshire Council requirements which is upheld with the thuird party. Q4 Overall schemes of programme at start of the year. involvement of contractors early on. Q5. Satisfied no issues to raise. Q6. relationship with contractors very good, enables work to progress without hinder. Q7. Very Good. Customer service response very personable and prompt. Q9. Overall very satisfied as a small team that cover a lot of ground. Widening scope to incorporate electronic signs. Q10. Supervision of a high level on site, backed up by good clear designs for contractor to work on. Q11. Two members of staff with different experience that fit in well covering all aspects of signal requirements. Q12. always look pragmatic approach, taking on board any new innovations in the market. Q13. been well established team which works well with oth client and contractor. Q14. N/a
5	SA5-Highways (Andy Wilde)	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	9	10	10	10	10	10	10	same	9.93	Q1. n/a Q2. Delivered against programme. Fulfilled clients requirements. Q3. N/a. Q4. Exceeded expectations on delivery of the programme for the DFT Pothol funding. Q5. CDM requirements being met. Q6. Client feels part of the team, good collaborative working. once keir intergration is implemented, this will streamline things further. Q7. all expectations met by everyone on the team. Q8. Snagging and additional site instructions very well documented can easily refer to register when needed. again keir intergration will improve this area.
6	SA5-Major Projects (Matt Johnson)	8	9	9	8	10	9	9	8	9	8	10	8	10	7	n/a	8.71	Q1. OLR successful planning submission. SITP - dealing with Casey contract. WSP provided commercial/legal advice support. Welcome support from GD during meetings. Q2. Exceptional support during unforeseen circumstances. Q3. Not sticking to original budget but managing variance. lot of good work done on NEC Settlement figures with CAsey. Q4. ONLY thing that impacted the programme is 3rd party - Casey, Cadent S. Hughes managed sites to open up for the weekend events. Q5. Actively managed any risks. Q6. Running parallel commision with MAtt Johnson and Economic Development on OLR. Used wider WSP team for environmental work. Q7. S Hughes- public liason on SITP with stakeholders, Businesses. Q7. No issues to raise. Q9. Deadlines met, submissions of required quality. Q10. A few design details on town walls phase - needed to go back and tweak some kerbs lines. more snagging. nothing done with out client approval. Q11. Scott, Gary, Kirsteen, Emma - no issues at all. Q12. Flexibility- OLR resolved as planning app but willingness to re-look as it in terms of affect of NWRR. Culture of not going easy wins NWRR- bridge design. Q13 n/a Q14 Local authority working with private company - different time scale for finances etc. Cultures - not people. Q15. Justifiable reliance on scott- personalities are key- weak link with him leaving, possibly have some input into agreeing his replacement/looking at short-list
7	SA5-Traffic (Victoria Merrill)																	n/a
8	SA6-Transport Planning etc (Victoria Merrill & Matt Johnson)																	n/a
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	Q1. As usual - happy with all of marks work Q2. Fully understand SC's needs. Q3. Mark keeps to & understands the budget. Q4. mark does our programming for us. Q5. No issues Q6. Mark is a team player. Q7. Mark deals with service requests very well. Q8. Mark sorts out issues for us. Q9. Top quality work. Q10. Top Quality work. Q12. N/a for our type of routine work. Q13. I would recommend Mark. Q14. Mark is easy to deald with. Q15. Wish to Continue working in the same way.
12	SA10-Asset Management (Steve Brown)																	
13	SA 11- Business & Enterprise (Chris Hill)																	NO WORK THROUGH THIS SA IN-PERIOD
14	SA 14 – Road Safety (Kevin Aitkin)	8	8	7	9	9	9	10	7	9	9	9	9	9	9	worse	8.64	No Comments Q1-12. Q13. Kevin feels that this pearticular service area is better fitted as a client role as the road safety projects don't fit into WSP's core business functions and is not a consultancy role. Q14 N/a Q15. In order to get most value for his budget, kevin would like to investigate different methods of delivery and management for the road safty schemes and associated resources. this could included returning all service to be delivered and amanged "in-house" by Shropshire Council.
Number of CFI		6																
Total Average		8.67	9.00	8.67	8.67	9.33	9.00	9.00	8.33	9.17	8.83	9.33	8.40	9.33	8.83		8.91	Total score for April 2018 - March 2019 for KPI 5 = (8.91 + 8.12)/2 = 85.05%
Highest Score		10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10			
Lowest Score		7	8	7	7	8	8	7	7	8	7	8	7	8	7			
Difference		3	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	3	2	3			