

Message

From: Customer Satisfaction [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CUSTOMER SATISFACTION (UK)]
Sent: 01/08/2008 09:31:30
To: Courtley David [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=COURTLEYD]; Stares Mike [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=STARESM]; Bailey Clive [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CLIVE.BAILEY]; Terblanche Ian [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=TERBLANCHEI]
CC: Davies Paul (P&PM) [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DAVIESP2]; Baker John [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BAKERJ]; Sadler Julie [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=JEGERTON]; Painter Ruth [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=PAINTERR]; Silvester Juliet [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WAKEFIELDJ]; Oliver Philip [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=OLIVERP2]; Rousselet Vincent [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ROUSSELETV]; Olney David [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=OLMEYDM]; Humphries Ian [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=HUMPHRIESI]; France Nicole [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FRANCEN]; Sinclair Ann [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=HOSFORDA]; Burgess Bev [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BURGESSB]; Rowley Peter [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ROWLEYP]; Camrass Roger [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CAMRASSR]; Swain Caroline [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SWAINC]; Gilbert Roger [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GILBERTR2]; Smith David M [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SMITHD13]; Young Lester [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=YOUNGRL]; Gilbey Colin [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=GILBEYC]; Wardrop Alan [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WARDROPA]; Campbell Colin(S&AM) [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=CAMPBELLC3]; Heyer Brinder [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=HEYERB]; Sheath Nigel [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=SHEATHN]; Green Jon [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=DEFERRARSGREENJ]; Cooper David (PBU) [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=COOPERD2]; Holloway Paul (PBU Operations) [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=HOLLOWAYP2]; Roberts David (LON22) [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=ROBERTSD2]; Freeth Nigel [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=FREETHN]; Warham Wendy [/O=EXCHANGE/OU=ADMINGROUP1/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=WARHAMW]
Subject: CSIP REPORT : Royal Mail Group
Attachments: RMG_200508.doc

FUJITSU SERVICES EYES ONLY

Please find attached the report following a recent interview with the Project Light Programme Manager when an overall satisfaction score of 5 was awarded.

KEY POINTS:

RMG is the parent customer of Royal Mail, Post Office Ltd and Parcelforce Worldwide.

This report focuses on the delivery of a digital media network (Project Light) and early stages of on-going service provision for 2,500 screens in RMG back office locations. The network, which was due to go live in February 2007, was delayed until August 2007 after escalation and a long period on red alert.

Understanding of business requirements 5 – slightly dissatisfied

The respondent expected more in terms of coaching his business in getting the best out of the technology to drive future usage:

“...But I don't think that Fujitsu offered a great deal either... they weren't driving the need.”

Proactivity/Innovation – 5 – slightly dissatisfied

We are seen as reactive and not proactive.

Relationship management/Account management – 7 – satisfied

The relationship, perceived as difficult to begin with, has now improved. “Their relationship management was actually quite stressful... Across the project and across multiple levels within the project, relationship management was not one of the strong points... That’s a combination of attitude and poor performance in terms of delivery.”

The respondent is more optimistic that performance will improve following recent changes on the account.

Value – 6 – slightly satisfied

The respondent considers this “not great.” He would like to see more involvement from us to drive the usage of the digital media network to ensure that RMG gain the best value from the solution and their investment.

Day-to-day managed services – 5 – slightly dissatisfied

The service team are admired although the respondent is not convinced that RMG is receiving the contracted level of service. He asks that all non-working screens are fixed and that we properly analyse the data we collect.

Project Management – 1 – totally dissatisfied

The respondent acknowledges that the project was hurried in conception with unrealistic timescales but he describes our project management as ‘rubbish’. Areas for improvement are control and governance, project planning and problem resolution reporting.

Programme and account management were considered poor at the outset and subsequent changes in personnel at different points of delivery meant control and process were lost.

The respondent has been impressed however by the determination and commitment to succeed of our staff and the hard work put into the project: “The strength is the people and the commitment that the people had... absolutely outstanding.”

The respondent would never provide a reference in relation to digital media networks or project management. He does however believe that we can perform very well – our provision of content on demand was the best delivery of the Programme - and that we could be awarded new business based on our recovery and work with the Post Office.

Attributes selected were flexible, innovative and creative.

IAN TERBLANCHE, ACCOUNT MANAGER’S RESPONSE:

This report is a fair reflection of Fujitsu’s performance on project Light (DMN). Mike’s comments are fair, although RMG had their own share of problems within their project team and senior stakeholders. Even if Fujitsu had delivered this project on time and to budget, it was very unlikely to be a total success, as the underlying strategy of project Light is wrong. The average RMG employee does not want the screens and the content even less.

In hindsight, Fujitsu should not have signed this contract. The timelines were never achievable, the requirements were not clear and the senior RMG stakeholders were not committed.

In the early stages Fujitsu’s project delivery, architectural design and basic governance was very poor, this resulted in project Light being on Red Alert some a number of months!

We do now have an improving relationship with RMG.

Lessons learned:

- Don’t move to contract without clear and documented requirements
- Have a clear and shared project plan before contracting and reflect realistic timelines and delivery
- Own up to issues as soon as they arise and work through them together with the client
- Ensure the account team maintain close engaged with the project throughout it’s lifecycle.

Kind regards,
Bridget

Bridget Ware
Customer Satisfaction Manager
Business Assurance
FUJITSU
Mob: **GRO**