

# Client Satisfaction Questionnaire – HBC – TPO

Date: 30 November 2012

Auditor: [REDACTED]

Ref: M4110/12/003



In order to monitor the effectiveness and improve the service that SIAS provides, we would be grateful if you could take a few minutes to complete this satisfaction questionnaire. Please return your questionnaire to [REDACTED]

Please rate each element of the audit by placing a cross (x) in the appropriate box.

5 = excellent 4 = very good 3 = satisfactory 2 = potential for improvement 1 = unsatisfactory

## AUDIT PLANNING

	5	4	3	2	1
1. Audit purpose, objectives and process explained as necessary			x		
2. Opportunity to discuss and influence the scope of the audit		x			
3. Contacts, timing and administrative details of the audit discussed and agreed		x			
4. Auditor(s) had sufficient understanding of the service you provide			x		

## FIELDWORK

	5	4	3	2	1
5. Demand on key officer time managed effectively and kept to a minimum as far as possible		x			
6. Professionalism, courtesy and responsiveness of the auditor(s)		x			
7. Kept informed of audit progress / effective communication		x			
8. Most appropriate staff interviewed for the audit areas covered			x		

## AUDIT REPORTING

	5	4	3	2	1
9. Opportunity to discuss and comment on draft audit report, including clarity, presentation and length of the report and flexibility in addressing word changes, style and the perspective of the findings.		x			
10. Accuracy, relevance and fairness of the audit findings and practicality of recommendations		x			
11. Reasonableness of overall assurance level and audit opinion		x			
12. Timeliness of draft and final report		x			

## OVERALL

13. Value added to your operational area by the audit			x		
---	--	--	---	--	--

**Please use the box below if you were dissatisfied with any part of the audit, if you have a suggestion to improve the service or if you have any other comments, either positive or negative.**

The final audit has provided a robust assessment of the register and provides a substantial level of assurance, both of which are welcomed. Notwithstanding the unusual background to this audit, (1) additional clarity around 'what' was being audited might have been helpful and (2) perhaps it would have been useful for other officers (consultant Tree Officers, Policy and Transport Manager) to have been interviewed prior to the initial draft being produced. This has been the case for other audits in my part of the service (e.g. s106)

The priority for the Council is its statutory records and registers and so whilst the audit did need to cover 'back office' systems and address points in a series of complaints by one member of the public, there was perhaps a

## Client Satisfaction Questionnaire – HBC – TPO

Date: 30 November 2012

Auditor: [REDACTED]

Ref: M4110/12/003



disproportionate focus on the 'green folder' from the outset. At the same time, there was not the same level of focus on the Access database which arguably performs a greater role in the administration of the Register and our TPO records than the green folder.

Regarding who was interviewed, whilst it is appreciated that there was a desire to avoid burdening other staff with more work – particularly given the difficulties associated with the complaints from one member of the public - it might have been helpful to interview some other officers at an earlier stage. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] whereas the the PTM and consultants tree officers have been in the role – either here or elsewhere – for many years.