

## **Terms of Reference for a Review of the Earthquake Commission's handling of a customer satisfaction survey and associated information provided to the Minister.**

13 November 2013

### **Objective of the review**

- 1 The objective of this review is to provide advice to the Minister responsible for the Earthquake Commission (EQC) on:
  - 1.1 the reliability of the EQC's client satisfaction surveying;
  - 1.2 whether EQC knew at the time it provided information to the Minister in preparation for answering questions in the House regarding the OAG report and the associated survey results if any EQC customers had been omitted from the relevant surveys;
  - 1.3 whether EQC has suitable protocols and processes in place to ensure the reliability of information being provided to the Minister, to enable him to meet the full range of his portfolio interests and responsibilities.

### **Background**

- 2 On Wednesday 6 November 2013, there was a report in the media that a customer was excluded from a customer satisfaction survey. The media query coincided with a question in the House regarding the Minister's confidence in EQC following the release of the Auditor-General's report *Earthquake Commission: Managing the Canterbury Home Repair Programme*, which included statistical information regarding client satisfaction surveys undertaken by the EQC.
- 3 It was subsequently confirmed to the Minister that due to an automated "do not survey" flag in EQC's claim management system, over 31,000 claims were excluded from the quarterly nationwide customer satisfaction survey, undertaken by UMR Research, that is one of the surveys quoted in the OAG report.
- 4 The Minister has requested the State Services Commissioner under section 11(4) of the State Sector Act 1988 to review EQC's handling of the customer satisfaction survey and the associated advice provided to the Minister which informed his answers in the House.
- 5 The Minister also requested the Commissioner to review EQC's information protocols and processes to ensure they are suitable to enable the Minister to fulfil his full range of portfolio interests and responsibilities.

### **Scope of review**

- 6 The reviewer will provide a written report on:
  - 6.1 the engagement between EQC and OAG on the customer satisfaction information that was reported in the Auditor-General's report *Earthquake Commission: Managing the Canterbury Home Repair Programme*
  - 6.2 the reliability of results from the *Canterbury Household Repairs Programme and Claims Satisfaction: Claims Settled* customer satisfaction surveys
  - 6.3 whether EQC knew at the time it provided information provided to the Minister in preparation for answering questions in the House regarding the OAG report and the associated survey results whether any EQC customers had been omitted from these surveys
  - 6.4 whether EQC has suitable protocols and processes in place to ensure the reliability of information being provided to the Minister, to enable him to meet the full range of his portfolio interests and responsibilities.

- 7 In providing the above advice, the following questions should be considered:
- 7.1 What was the process for the provision and explanation to the OAG of EQC's customer satisfaction surveys and results?
  - 7.2 What information was available to the Minister to respond to questions in the House, when was that information provided, and was that information fit for purpose?
  - 7.3 Did the EQC omit customers from its customer satisfaction surveys and, if yes:
    - 7.3.1 is it common or acceptable practice to exclude some customers from surveys of this type?
    - 7.3.2 how many were omitted?
    - 7.3.3 what was the reason for the omission?
    - 7.3.4 did the omission materially affect the survey results?
    - 7.3.5 did the EQC know at the time the information was provided to the Minister that EQC customers had been omitted from the surveys?
    - 7.3.6 when did EQC know about the omission and who within EQC knew of the omission?
    - 7.3.7 what protocols and processes does EQC have in place to ensure the information it provides to support the Minister's full range of portfolio interests is timely, reliable and accurate, and are these adequate?
    - 7.3.8 are there any improvements EQC could make to its processes and protocols to ensure the reliability of information to the Minister, claimants, and the public?

#### **Deliverables**

- 8 The deliverable will be a report to the State Services Commissioner recording the reviewer's findings and the reasons for them, including, but not limited to, any recommendations associated with the customer satisfaction survey and improvements to EQC's processes.
- 9 Any other matters that arise during the course of the review should be brought to the Commissioner's attention separately.

#### **Timeframe**

- 10 The reviewer will present his or her report to the State Services Commissioner by 6 December 2013.