

Date of Audit	10/06/2010
DWQR Staff Present	Vicky MacDougall, Matt Bower, Colin Clements (DWI NI), Elaine O'Rourke
Scottish Water Staff Present	Kenny Laing, Siobhan Rose, Iain Ogilvie, James Simmonette

Summary of Audit

Overall Summary

Overall, this year's audit showed significant improvements from 2009. The main areas of improvement were the quality of customer information gathered, the follow up action of NSO's and the consumer experience received.

Call agents were gathering information correctly, empathising more with customers and using available resources more including using the Public Health Team for more complex water quality calls. The NSO notes on promise were on the whole clear and detailed, which allowed the history of the call to be followed easily. This had been a deficiency noted in previous audits.

There were also some areas where improvements could be made. Call agents should be listening to the consumer more and giving them the opportunity to talk about their water quality problem. Call agents are not always escalating calls when handling more difficult or complex calls, also agents are not always taking the opportunity to reassure consumers about their issue.

More detail on the positives, negatives and recommendation from the audit can be found in the summary below.

Number of Individual Call Recommendations: 35

Score (out of 6)

<1.5 = Unsatisfactory
1.5 - 2.5 = Weak
2.5-3.5=Adequate
3.5-4.5=Good
4.5-5.5=Very Good
>5.5=Excellent

Quality of Customer Information Gathered	3.85	Good
---	-------------	-------------

Positives

The quality of customer contact information gathered by call agents was good in the majority of cases. In general call agents correctly obtained customers details, categorised the type of water quality complaint and gave out service request numbers.

Negatives

Categorisation of calls was satisfactory but call agents could have given the customer more opportunity to discuss the problem and/or asked further questions to narrow down the water quality problem.

Recommendations

Call agents to listen to customers more.

Quality of Water Quality Information Gathered	3.55	Good
--	-------------	-------------

Positives

The quality of information gathered in this section was good. The majority of call agents used their decision trees well and asked enough questions to gather sufficient water quality information. There were calls where agents asked additional questions. This was an improvement on last year's audit.

Negatives

The majority of call agents did not give customers the opportunity to talk about the problem they were experiencing. There were instances where the minimum questions were not asked.

Recommendations

Call agents should take more time over calls and give the customer the opportunity to talk about the problem.

Quality of Water Quality Information/advice Given	3.21	Adequate
--	-------------	-----------------

Positives

Call agents were frequently using available resources to try and help customers by using decision trees, consulting the ops log and checking the customers call history. Call agents also seemed more aware of the Public Health Team and when to use them.

Negatives

There were calls where agents should have sought advice or escalated calls. One call in particular was a customer with an ongoing water quality issue which should have been escalated. There was another call regarding organisms, there was a clear health issue but the call agent did not refer to the Public Health Team. The agent did not help reassure the customer and did not give a professional image.

Recommendations

Call agents need to escalate calls to either the Public Health Team or their manager when there is a potential health issue or the call is more complex.

Follow Up Action of Call Agent	3.45	Adequate
---------------------------------------	-------------	-----------------

Positives

For the majority of calls the agents notes on promise were adequate. For one call an agent showed real initiative and escalated the matter to the field team as issue was ongoing and customer had called several times.

Negatives

No follow up action was taken to try and resolve a complaint from an angry customer with an ongoing problem. Although it was eventually escalated by the following call agent the matter could have been resolved sooner had the first agent taken appropriate follow up action.

Recommendations

Where a customer has an ongoing water quality issue, call agents should take action to escalate the matter.

Follow Up Action of NSO	3.65	Good
<p><u>Positives</u></p> <p>There was a clear improvement in this section from last year. In general the NSO notes on promise were updated to a good standard, the information was detailed, sample results were included and further action/escalation was recorded.</p> <p><u>Negatives</u></p> <p>There were calls where little or sometime no information was recorded on promise.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>NSO's need to ensure they are updating promise and also need to include whether the problem has been resolved.</p>		
Customer Experience	3.55	Good
<p><u>Positives</u></p> <p>Majority of call agents had a good manner, tried to help customers and advise as best they could.</p> <p><u>Negatives</u></p> <p>Call agents in general were very dependent upon decision trees which prevented some agents from being able to give advice and reassurance.</p> <p><u>Recommendations</u></p> <p>Call agents should be encouraged to provide customers with more advice and reassurance.</p>		