

Scrutiny Panel Final Report on THCH Customer Contact

Scrutiny conducted April-August 2018

This report produced 01 November 2018

CONTENTS

page	
2	Introduction and scope of the scrutiny
3	How the scrutiny was carried out
3	Findings
7	The standard of service residents would like in future
8	Recommendations table with management responses and SP comments
13	Action Plan agreed with management
15	Acknowledgements

INTRODUCTION

Scrutiny panels conduct reviews of areas of Housing Association (HA) operation and provide assessments of performance and value for money, independently of HA staff. They report to the Board.

Scrutiny panels have become a common and important element of HA oversight. They usually consist of resident volunteers, and contribute to satisfying government requirements on tenant and resident involvement and empowerment. See the following document from the government regulator (HCA) for HAs:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/725831/Tenant_Involvement_and_Empowerment_Standard.pdf.

About the THCH Scrutiny Panel (SP)

We are 4 unpaid residents who responded to a request from THCH for volunteers to participate. We comprise residents from different areas geographically, male and female, and different ethnic backgrounds. Three of us are tenants, and one of us is a leaseholder. We are particularly interested in the resident experience of the service, but also interested in the value for money aspect and any opportunities there might be for THCH to reduce costs while maintaining or improving the service.

As this scrutiny panel is still a relatively new experience for residents and THCH, THCH paid for the assistance of a mentor from HQN, who had previously provided great support throughout the first scrutiny. This was very helpful.

How the area for this scrutiny was chosen

Normally, scrutiny panels should choose the area to review for each scrutiny by negotiation with the HA. In this case THCH did not agree with the Panel's proposal to scrutinise the repairs service, and instead offered the panel to scrutinise "Customer **First** Contact". THCH proposed this area because of concern about poor KPI's on answering telephone calls. The Panel questioned whether it was useful to scrutinise only the **first** contact that a resident makes about a particular issue. If the matter is not resolved by a single contact, the panel wished the scrutiny to include follow-up contacts and the reasons for them. The scope was agreed to include follow-up contacts.

SCOPE OF THE SCRUTINY

The initial focus was the current experience of residents of Customer Contacts with THCH and any recommendations the Panel could make to improve the experience of Customer Contacts or improve the efficiency (in the sense of value for money) of contacts with Customer Service.

However, partway through the scrutiny, the panel learned that THCH had rejected the scoping document produced on 21 May 2018 because they wanted to limit the scrutiny to the Customer Service Team. This would exclude the SP's request in June to interview other staff about how they make information available to the Customer Service team, and exclude contacts that originated with estate housing officers.

THCH produced a revised scoping document on 28 June 2018. This was more restrictive than the earlier scoping document which had never been signed. The SP objected and the matter was discussed at a meeting on 14 August 2018. The matter was not resolved to the SP's satisfaction. One panel member intended to withdraw from the scrutiny as a result, and continued only because the performance manager supplied additional detailed and useful data from Orchard logs. There was failure on both sides to ensure the scope was agreed, understood and signed prior to starting the scrutiny.

READERS OF THIS REPORT

This report is designed to be read by residents, staff, board members and anyone who is interested in THCH.

OVERVIEW OF HOW THE SCRUTINY WAS CARRIED OUT

Since the Scrutiny Panel operates independently of THCH, THCH arranged that we could ask the THCH Resident Engagement Officer for THCH information that we needed. Some confidential and legally-protected information was excluded.

- We started with orientation presentations by Lily Tripathi, Head of Housing, Diane Lander, Customer Service Team(CST) manager, and Nick Tutt, Head of IT.
- THCH provided some relevant documents: Telephone Queue performance spreadsheet and KPI monthly averages, A List of other HA's for possible comparison, THCH Voluntas resident survey results, Average tenant satisfaction scores from a Housemark Star Survey, A log of emails to CST handled during April, A list of comments on Facebook, A log of CST team contacts for a 4-month period.
- We interviewed THCH Customer Service staff and attended a demonstration of the "Dashboard/Orchard" software THCH provides for them to use.
- We also attempted to obtain an overview of the Customer Contact arrangements of other HAs of similar size.
- We took note of the 1-page "service offer" document that THCH publish to residents, but our scrutiny was not only about whether THCH achieves those promises in respect of customer contacts. It was a wider look at how customer contacts work in practice from a resident perspective, and what could be done to improve service and cost-effectiveness.

To coordinate our activities we used email as much as possible and met when necessary.

We have included many of the documents THCH supplied as appendices to this report. Some were too large or contained non-public information, and for those we have provided summaries and commentaries instead.

FINDINGS FROM OUR SCRUTINY

We would like to thank THCH staff for their help. The interviews with CST staff, including sitting with them to see them in action, and the detailed logs of telephone answering performance were very helpful. In particular we thank the performance manager for extremely useful documents, including the logs of customer contacts recorded using dashboard.

Here are our findings.

1. The basic working of the Customer Service Team

The CST provide the telephone answering service and staff the reception desk. The CST service is available from 8am until 6pm Monday to Friday. There is a carefully constructed rota so that no staff are required to cover the full 10 hours, and more staff are available during the peak lunch-time period.

The team is currently seven full-time staff, and there are two part-time staff employed specifically to cover the lunch-time peak period.

Staff on reception can go with customers to an interview room if privacy is a concern.

The CST staff are required to give priority to telephone answering, but, according to the rota, some are required to read and reply to email contacts during certain hours. An example rota is given in

2. Findings from informal interviews with THCH customer service staff, and a visit to observe the CST at work

We found that the CST manager and the CST staff that we met had good attitudes and were very helpful. The problems we observed seemed to come mainly from problems with missing or confusing data in the Dashboard/Orchard system.

The CST have been operating with many temporary and short-term staff. The longest-serving customer Service agent (CSA) that we interviewed had been in post only for 5 months.

Every email and telephone contact is logged on Dashboard/Orchard, the computer system database that THCH use.

The CST manager sets a General Policy to deal with each telephone contact completely and not try to terminate calls quickly to “improve” Performance Indicators.

One CSA had assembled his own dossier of useful documents about THCH properties, THCH team structure, useful contact numbers, etc.

The largest problem that we observed, and observed repeatedly, was that the Dashboard/Orchard database did not have data that the CST needed to deal with follow-up contacts.

We observed that the CSAs would try to fulfil the “deal with completely” policy by leaving their seat to speak to other team members. However in every case we observed, the CSA was not able to obtain the information necessary to answer the contact’s query.

The CST have an aim of clearing the email inbox each day. They aim to exceed the THCH offering of a 72-hour response. However, performance on email has been uneven and even the 72-hour promise is not always achieved.

The CST manager confirmed her understanding that the telephone performance logs do not list customer waiting times. They only list the waiting times for the caller at the head of the call queue to be picked up by a CSA.

3. Findings from telephone performance logs

We noted that the average telephone waiting times, even at peak times, in the log we saw seemed to be surprisingly small. There seemed to be a discrepancy between the data in the example log we saw, and anecdotal experiences from many residents, plus personal experiences of the panel members themselves, reporting long wait times for the phone to be answered.

We were told at the meeting on 1 May, and by the CST manager on 28 June, that the telephone logs do not list the total caller waiting time. They list the waiting times for the caller at the head of the call queue to be picked up by a CSA. The customer at the head of the caller queue could have been waiting for several minutes or even longer. This would explain the discrepancy between residents complaining of long waits for a phone call to be answered and the telephone answering performance that THCH publish.

4. Findings from a log of emails for the month of April

Email volumes are relatively low compared to phone calls – an average of 13 emails per day during April. Nevertheless the response times averaged 4 days for that month, and a few were two or three weeks. This contrasts hugely with telephone handling for which the policy is to try to handle the contact completely within the time the caller is on the phone.

5. Findings from an analysis of a contacts log for the period April-August

This was important and highly helpful information. We applaud the attempt to log all customer contacts in a coherent way.

However, at the time of the data presentation (August 2018) there were many problems requiring substantial improvements. We have been told that several of them have been addressed from August 2018.

Email contacts were mostly not being logged, though they should have been – we are told they will be logged from August 2018.

“expressions of dissatisfaction” aka “grumbles” are not being identified with a code to distinguish them from routine contacts and formal complaints.

Codes/Descriptors for Stage-1 Complaints are not being used correctly.

71% of contacts were about repairs needed, and 60% of those were follow-up/chasing contacts after the original repair-needed report. The proportion of follow-up/chasing contacts is a long way from the THCH aspiration to have “one contact per issue”.

6. Findings from the resident surveys of customer satisfaction

The main data on customer contact satisfaction comes from the Voluntas survey which is an ongoing survey. The SP looked at the statistics for the 4-month period April-August 2018. Here are the main percentages in the survey reports:

57% of issues were resolved by a single contact	43% required follow-up or chasing contacts
59% responders felt THCH had made it at least fairly easy to get what they needed	41% felt that it wasn’t satisfactory
59% were satisfied with the person they contacted	41% were dissatisfied
45% felt that THCH had been satisfactorily flexible in dealing with the contact issue	55% were dissatisfied

The percentages above are taken from the Voluntas charts in Appendix 1.

The SP regards the Voluntas survey as very important information and sufficiently good quality that the SP did not ask to run a survey with separate questions chosen by the SP (as had been done for the previous scrutiny).

The 40+% dissatisfaction rate is a concern.

There were over 1000 responses to open-ended questions about why residents were dissatisfied and what they would like THCH to improve. THCH provided a spreadsheet listing them. This was very useful information, but the SP had no means to filter the responses into categories, and 1000 texts is

too many to examine individually. From a partial informal scan we observed the following issues about customer contact to have very many complainants:

Issue	Example lines
No call back after promise	50,116,155,200,209,252,267,272,299,308,403,407,423,431,470,492
Too long to answer phone	35,56,89,152,157,163,171(10 mins wait!),255,312,316,367
Repeated chase calls needed	5,55,64,83(47 calls)175,200,217,219,252,328,386,551,557,564
Advisor didn't know about previous calls or actions	7,48,100,123,217,248,285,300,428,463,564
Caller not put in contact with appropriate person or message not passed on	39,95,216,320,324,485,595,485

The SP was also provided with a Housemark Star Survey Satisfaction chart sheet. However, this did not include leaseholder responses, and was from May 2016, before the closure of local offices and before the repairs system was centralised. The SP did not regard this information as sufficiently up-to-date to inform our scrutiny, but is a useful historical reference point. We note that the more-recent Voluntas survey is reporting much lower satisfaction levels.

7. Findings from a survey of customer contact arrangements of other HAs

Several HA's were contacted via email and telephone and were asked to provide information regarding their customer contact. We obtained responses from three HAs, summarised below.

What are your office opening hours? Do you offer Saturdays?

All three associations were open Mon-Fri 9-5. One had piloted and abandoned Saturday opening.

What methods does your HA provide for resident contact? For example, most HAs provide for Phone, Email, In person at a reception desk, and Website. Other potential methods include "Webchat", visits by Housing Officers, and perhaps a separate provision for complaints?

All three provide phone, email and in-person at reception, and via a website. One provides webchat, and another is planning to. One provides a Facebook page and twitter account. The two that provide sheltered/supported housing arrange routine visits by housing officers.

Of the different ways of resident contact, do you have any statistics on how many contacts occur by each method? If you don't have statistics, do you have any informal assessment of the popularity of each type of contact?

The two HAs with numeric data indicated 80-85% telephone, 10-15% email, a few at the office reception and at most 1% by webchat, Facebook or Twitter.

Of the different ways of resident contact, do you have any statistics on how many are follow-up contacts about a previous issue (e.g. chasing a repair which has not yet been done)? If no statistics, do you have any informal assessment on how many contacts are chasing existing issues?

One stated a “high percentage”, one had no data, and one estimated 25% of calls were related to follow up enquiries about existing issues raised.

Has your HA done any resident surveys about "customer contact"? Are you able to share any results from such surveys?

One HA reported 82% satisfaction, and 72% resolution at first contact. The other two didn't have data.

Does your HA have a formal complaints system? How does that work? How many days does the HA promise to reply within? Is there a system for a second opinion if the resident is not satisfied? Does your HA have a separate way of allowing informal complaints (elsewhere called "grumbles"), and how are those handled?

They all had a 2-stage complaints system. Typically 10-day response for stage 1, and 15-day response for stage 2. One HA reported customer satisfaction with their complaints system at only 54% and that will be the next scrutiny for their scrutiny panel. They all reported that informal complaints are handled by a team leader.

Do any issues with security or lack of affect your CST?

Generally, there was no need for security guards or processes, but two HA's had a panic alarm fitted in reception and meeting rooms for the safety of their staff.

THE STANDARD OF SERVICE RESIDENTS WOULD LIKE IN FUTURE

This scrutiny considered the standard of service residents would like going forward. The scrutiny panel identified the following features, that in theory are already present, but most of them need improvement:

1. Most contacts should only require the one contact to resolve the issue.
2. Where follow-up contacts are necessary, the CSA should have full details of the earlier contact to conduct the follow-up efficiently.
3. The CS team should have full details available wherever issues have been acted upon by other THCH teams.
4. Telephone calls should not have long waits to be answered.
5. Value for money (i.e. performance should be obtained by efficient internal working, not expensive solutions).
6. Excellent Customer Care.
7. An effective system that logs, and addresses, resident feedback in the form of “grumbles” and official complaints under the THCH Complaints Policy.

RECOMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

CST members should be given an information pack when they join. This should include the type of information that the enterprising CST member had assembled on his own initiative.

Reason and Information Source

The SP thought that an information pack would be good practice.

Management response: Agreed

An information pack is currently being collated for new and existing staff. This will include information on processes, policies and "how to" guides.

Recommendation 2

The information pack in recommendation 1 should include a document containing a suitable explanation of what the Dashboard/Orchard database contains, and how to use it.

Reason and Information Source

The SP were given different explanations by different THCH personnel about Dashboard and how it worked.

Management response: Agreed

All staff have an electronic user guide for using the Dashboard, but this needs refresher training as there has been staff turnover in both CSC and other teams.

Recommendation 3

All staff should be given more training on Dashboard/Orchard, and the importance of entering all contacts and all actions by all teams and all users should be stressed.

Reason and Information Source

The SP observed multiple queries that could not be dealt with due to lack of up-to-date information.

Management response: Agreed

We will look to develop in-house champions that can provide desk-side training. And offer regular refresher training.

Recommendation 4

The CST staff schedule should give more attention to incoming email than at present. The rota could include many more periods in which staff have a secondary task of email handling. One small contribution to achieving this would be to make the task of staffing the reception desk include handling email.

The SP recommend that the THCH service promise for email be improved from a 72-hour response

to a 24-hour response (by human, not automated acknowledgments) to email.

Reason and Information Source

There is currently a huge discrepancy between the “deal with it while caller on line” policy and the 72-hour response promised for email. The SP believe it is not appropriate for queries and repair reports sent by email to be subject to more than a few hours delay before being read by the CST.

Management response: Partially Agreed

This is already in place as one of the reception duties. However generally performance has improved, as the new team has settled in. Emails are now responded to within 72 hours and sometimes even earlier. The CSC now manages both repairs and customer services inboxes. We do not agree to 24 Hours response targets. Resident consultation took place in 2017 on the service offer and 72 hours was set. We feel 72 hours is good performance, most social landlords service promise is between 3 and 10 days. We advise that urgent requests should not be sent via email.

SP comment on management response:

The SP think that a 72-hour response to email no longer appropriate for the 21st century. The comment that some HAs are even worse is not a good justification. The issue was discussed at the meeting on Oct-17, and the SP acknowledged that some emails may require time to prepare a response, but commented that all emails can at least be responded to with a statement that identifies which department or staff will give the full response. THCH could promise that simpler emails, where, if the information had been conveyed by telephone, would have been actioned at the time of the phone call, will receive action within 24 hours.

Recommendation 5

The telephone logs should be upgraded to include customer *total call waiting times* as well as times related to CST internal performance. It is also desirable for the logs to include *worst-case* waiting times for each period as well as the average.

Update 24 Oct 2018:

We seem to have been misinformed about the times used for the logs. Apparently the times used *are* total waiting times, so the first part of the recommendation is not needed.

Regarding the second part, that worst-case times should be logged, we are told the existing system cannot provide that. However, it remains our recommendation to log that if that statistic becomes available in the future.

Reason and Information Source

What matters to residents is the time they wait on the phone not the internal performance of the CS team. This is a vital statistic for customer satisfaction.

Management response: Already in place

The telephone log does include the customer total call waiting times. A separate report can show the worst case waiting times for each period this is the abandoned calls and queue ring reports.

Recommendation 6

The customer contact logs on dashboard need to be improved by expanding some contact codes and training all staff in all teams (not just CST) to take care to label all contacts correctly.

The following recommendations 7-10 address particular cases of this that affect the performance of the customer service team or the monitoring of customer contacts.

Reason and Information Source**Management response: Agreed**

We have reviewed the contact codes and briefed the CSAs, this is closely monitored. New modules have also been introduced, e.g. complaints. As stated earlier, we agree further regular refresher training should be provided to all staff that use the dashboard.

Recommendation 7

The customer contact logs on dashboard should have a code to distinguish communal repairs from internal dwelling repairs

Reason and Information Source

This would help to identify multiple contacts from different residents contacting about the same repair, and also be useful for performance statistics later on. The SP noted problems with tracking communal repairs during their observation of the CST at work.

Management response: Already in Place

Dashboard has separate codes for communal repairs and individual repairs.

Recommendation 8

The customer contact logs on dashboard should be improved by expanding the re-arrangement code. The code should at least distinguish between appointment re-arrangements due to contractor no-show and appointment re-arrangement due to resident needs

Reason and Information Source

This would help the CST deal appropriately with follow-up customer contacts, and help the contract manager monitor contractor reliability.

Management response: Agreed

We will arrange for the additional codes to be created.

Recommendation 9

When a customer contact raises more than one issue, it should be recorded as more than one contact with the same time and location. The SP thinks this would be a better procedure than an alternative suggestion to flag the contact record as a multiple-issue contact.

Reason and Information Source

This ensures that subsequent contacts about just one of the issues can be related to the earlier

contact by tracking the specific issue, and does not rely on a CSA discovering that a previous contact had more than component.

Management response: Not Agreed

The dashboard is a contact management system, designed to record the contact from the customer. From which we then process activity. E.g. raise a repair order, raise a request for the Housing Officer to call back, etc. We can log multiple issues on one contact. And we will as part of dashboard refresher training remind all staff.

Recommendation 10

THCH should establish a code/descriptor for customer contacts that are “expressions of dissatisfaction” (aka “grumbles”) to distinguish them from routine contacts and formal complaints

Reason and Information Source

This would help CSAs respond appropriately to follow-up contacts and help in performance analysis using the dashboard logs.

Management response: Already in Place

This facility is already in place - Feedback Manager which is part of the Orchard system is designed to manage all complaints and went live in August 2018.

Recommendation 11

Improve communication between CST and contractors in both directions. All details given by residents should always be given to contractors, and contractors need to notify completion or outstanding problems to THCH on the same day.

Reason and Information Source

There were multiple reports of contractor issues such doing the wrong work, or failing to resolve the problem, in the Voluntas survey. This inflates the number of customer contacts that the CST have to deal with.

Management response: Partially Agreed

Noted, this has improved, the Customer Services Manager attends contractor meetings with the Repairs and Asset Manager. We will ensure the Service Improvement Plan for Repairs and Customer Services are also in sync. Resident information will only be passed on where relevant. We believe updates on the same day maybe difficult to achieve by contractors but we will explore how this could be better achieved.

Recommendation 12

Future repairs contracts should consider the level of subcontracting involved and seek to minimise subcontracting.

Reason and Information Source

CST members reported that they couldn't get timely information from contractors during a

customer contact because the job was handled by a subcontractor.

Management response: Agreed

See response to Recommendation 11 which will apply here. For future contracts we will look to include this as part of the procurement process.

Recommendation 13

THCH should re-consider whether it is most cost-effective to have ALL contacts go through a Customer Service team. This often entails information going through at least one extra intermediary. Direct contact by some residents with some staff other than the CST on some issues would be more efficient. It is always more efficient when contact is made directly between parties, rather than via intermediaries.

Reason and Information Source

The customer contact log shows the difficulty of ensuring sufficient and accurate recording of all actions and communications to a level sufficient to avoid problems when going through the CST as intermediaries.

Management response: Not Agreed

The CSC was put in place to deal with customer contact at first point of contact to allow officers to be out more and have the capacity to deal with more complex cases. We continue to invest in CSC so they are able to resolve the majority of queries on first contact or have the relevant knowledge to be able to partially resolve queries. This includes ensuring all staff hold information and notes within Orchard.

Recommendation 14

The repairs team should ensure that all email contacts that they receive are added to the dashboard so that CST know the history when follow-up contacts occur.

Reason and Information Source

The SP observed lack of this information in the dashboard log.

Management response: Partially Agreed

This does happen most of the time, but there have been occasions where the information has not been added to Orchard in a timely fashion. A new team of Property Co-ordinators are being recruited, which will help achieve the above.

Recommendation 15

Review the provision of panic alarms for reception staff

Reason and Information Source

Other HA's felt this was necessary to protect staff and make them feel safe. If they are not currently provided THCH should consider the installation of a panic alarm in the private interview rooms and at the reception desk.

Management response: Already in Place

We have panic buttons in all interview rooms and reception which rings into the main office to alert office staff to respond. This is subject to regular testing and review.

NEXT STEPS

In accordance with Scrutiny Panel good practice, we will provide a copy of our report to THCH Senior Management in advance of our submission to the THCH Board’s Operations Committee. After we receive their feedback, the table above will record any disagreement by senior management with any of our recommendations. In the event of significant disagreement that the Operations Committee would like to resolve, the Scrutiny Panel members will be happy to participate in a subsequent meeting to discuss a way forward. The Action Plan table below lists those actions that THCH commits to taking after the review by senior management. The Panel will periodically meet to track progress on those commitments and keep everyone informed of developments.

THCH CUSTOMER CONTACTS ACTION PLAN

No	Recommendation	Action	Lead Officer	Target Date	Completion Date
1	CST members should be given an information pack when they join. This should include the type of information that the enterprising CST member had assembled on his own initiative.	We will look to create an “e-book” with all relevant information included.	Diane Lander Customer Services Manager	January 19	
2	The information pack in recommendation 1 should include a document containing a suitable explanation of what the Dashboard/ Orchard database contains, and how to use it.	Some guides are in place. And this will be refreshed and added to the reference guide at point 1. We will also look to include any other tutorial information that is generally available.	Diane Lander Customer Services Manager	January 19	
3	All staff should be given more training on Dashboard/Orchard, and the importance of entering all contacts and all actions by all teams and all users should be stressed.	This will be discussed at the next IT steering group and a plan developed for on-going Orchard training. We will also develop Orchard champions to provide desk side training.	Lily Tripathi Head of Community Housing David Sheehan Head of IT	January 19	
4	SEE THE RECOMMENDATION TABLE – the SP do not agree with THCH management response				

5	Already in Place				
6	<p>The customer contact logs on dashboard need to be improved by expanding some contact codes and training all staff in all teams (not just CST) to take care to label all contacts correctly.</p> <p>Recommendations 7-10 address particular cases of this that affect the performance of the customer service team or the monitoring of customer contacts.</p>	<p>We have reviewed the contact codes and briefed the CSAs, this is closely monitored. New modules have also been introduced, e.g. complaints.</p>	<p>Diane Lander Customer Services Manager</p>	<p>January 19</p>	
7	Already in Place				
8	<p>The customer contact logs on dashboard should be improved by expanding the re-arrangement code. The code should at least distinguish between appointment re-arrangements due to contractor no-show and appointment re-arrangement due to resident needs</p>	<p>We will review the codes and reconfigure these in Orchard.</p>	<p>Diane Lander Customer Services Manager</p>	<p>January 19</p>	
9	Not agreed				
10	Already in Place				
11	<p>Improve communication between CST and contractors in both directions. All details given by residents should always be given to contractors, and contractors need to notify completion or outstanding problems to THCH on the same day.</p>	<p>The CSM already attends contract meetings, and will monitor progress in getting contractors to help us update Orchard on the same day. All details supplied by residents that may be relevant to the contractor will be passed on. Any concerns will be reviewed through contract meetings and 1:1 staff meetings.</p>	<p>Diane Lander Customer Services Manager</p> <p>Chris Wait Repairs & Asset Manager</p>	<p>April 19</p>	

12	Future repairs contracts should consider the level of subcontracting involved and seek to minimise subcontracting.	This will be considered as part of any future procurement of contracted services in repairs.	Paul Monforte Head of Property		
13	Not agreed				
14	The repairs team should ensure that all email contacts that they receive are added to the dashboard so that CST know the history when follow-up contacts occur.	A new team of Property Co-ordinators are being recruited. We will review how best the Property Co-ordinators can update Orchard on a daily basis.	Chris Wait Repairs & Asset Manager Diane Lander Customer Services Manager	April 19	
15	Already in Place				

Acknowledgements

The Scrutiny Panel would like to thank all those who gave time to speak to the panel:

Jacqui Airey (Performance and Policy Manager, THCH)

Diane Lander (Customer Service Manager, THCH)

Lily Tripathi (Head of Community Housing, THCH)

Nick Tutt (Head of IT, THCH)

THCH Customer Service Team members

Liaison with THCH was handled by Halima Islam, Resident Engagement Officer.

Scrutiny Panel:

Don Beal

David Donoghue

Lana Turner

Hasanul Hoque

Independent mentor to the Scrutiny Panel: Kevin Farrell, HQN

