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User satisfaction – why should we care?

Typical objective of Corporate Real Estate:
- Attractive,
- cost-efficient and
- flexible workplaces

Cost and flexibility are easy to measure and visualize.
But what about „Attractive“?

Attractive workplaces support
- Identification, branding
- Productivity
- Innovation

Target groups
- End users
- Stakeholders
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Expected benefits

1. Evaluate FM team performance
2. Convey message: RE cares
3. Understand needs and priorities of users
4. Trigger improvements actions and actually increase user satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attractive</th>
<th>Cost efficient</th>
<th>Flexible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measurement methods

- Helpdesk
  - Personal interviews
  - Online surveys
- User groups at selected sites
- Focused surveys at selected buildings
### Personal interviews - example

**Objectives**
- Improve understanding of RE and business
- Turn feedback into actions
- Measure satisfaction

**Findings**
- Faster project decisions and delivery
- Improve office environment
- Demonstrate RE improvements

**Questions**
- How is business doing?
- How can RE support business?
- How to cooperate?
- Satisfaction rating from 1 to 5

**Messages**
- New awareness for RE function
- Update on our business understanding
- Global follow up on main findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder interviews</th>
<th>RE interviewers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Participation rate**
- 76%

**Satisfied stakeholders**
- 71%

**Actions**
- 260 actions have been implemented, incl. 108 actions with regional/global reach

**Next steps**
- Continue cooperation as agreed in interview
- Improve interview process based on Lessons Learned
- Prepare next round of personal interviews

**Feedback experiences**
- New awareness for RE function
- Update on our business understanding
- Global follow up on main findings

---
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## Challenges of current methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>User groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|               | - Often low, difficult to steer  
|               | - Too many surveys  
|               | - Participation decreases if no actions are visible | Few attendants at site, often helpful input |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preparation</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>User groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|             | Global surveys require lengthy alignments  
|             | Difficult selection of relevant questions | Dependent on local FM  
|             | Training required to trigger engagement |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>User groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|        | Rating questions offer averages: difficult to derive useful actions  
|        | - few questions: only general feedback  
|        | - more questions: too long | Dependent on local FM  
|        | Often useful hints for local actions  
|        | Very difficult to derive any general feedback or rating |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback to participants</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>User groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                          | - Average ratings and global thoughts after two months  
|                          | - Rarely any local actions | Immediate to attendants  
|                          | seldom notes on actions  
|                          | few meeting minutes, but not very engaging |
### Comparing approaches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Online survey</strong></th>
<th><strong>User groups</strong></th>
<th><strong>Focused survey</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequency</strong></td>
<td>annually</td>
<td>quarterly</td>
<td>As required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Invited</td>
<td>All colleagues globally</td>
<td>All local colleagues 2-8%</td>
<td>All local colleagues 20% and more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Actual rate</td>
<td>10 – 30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Some 20 rating questions + comments (5%)</td>
<td>Discussing current topics</td>
<td>One rating question + one comment question (85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Global rating overviews, comments for local FM</td>
<td>By host, focus on concrete local issues</td>
<td>80% automatic + manual word cloud+ relevant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feedback to participants</strong></td>
<td>Average numbers and global insights after two months, seldom local</td>
<td>Immediate to attendants, few meeting notes</td>
<td>Word cloud + relevant issues within a week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing value add

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected benefits</th>
<th>Online survey</th>
<th>User groups</th>
<th>Focused survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate FM team performance</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convey „RE cares“</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Globally</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- At local level</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- General satisfaction</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Satisfaction per service line</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local topics</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trigger improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- general global actions</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Local actions</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example of focused surveys

Building 1

Building Technology
Service
Building Staff
Facade
Air
Circulation
IT
Pest Control
Acoustics
Security
Waste Disposal
Reception Service

Cleaning
Parking
Working Area
Management
Outdoor Area
Sanitary
Light
Kitchen and Catering
Social Area

Building 2

Sanitary
Working Area
IT
Light
Wardrobe
Building Technology
Location
Temperature
Building
Social Area
Management
Space
Water
Design
Kitchen and Catering
Furniture
Cleaning
Service
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## Improving satisfaction – Action & communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Communication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpdesk</td>
<td>Response time in line with priority level</td>
<td>Short message when done Action overview by site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interviews</td>
<td>Four steps: suggested, agreed, implemented, communicated</td>
<td>action-specific feedback and overview on process and results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>General improvements and guidance for team</td>
<td>Demonstrate benefits to ensure future participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User groups</td>
<td>Ideally agreed at meeting Involve attendants</td>
<td>Feedback to attendants and all users at site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused surveys</td>
<td>Specific, in line with comments</td>
<td>Quick feedback on survey results Summary on actual improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implementation – who takes the lead?

Many players ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Largest benefits for</th>
<th>Typical lead by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpdesk</td>
<td>Users and FM team</td>
<td>Service provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal interviews</td>
<td>Stakeholders and RE function</td>
<td>RE function – effort?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>RE function and CFO</td>
<td>RE function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User groups</td>
<td>Users and FM team</td>
<td>RE, FM, ... competence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused surveys</td>
<td>Users and FM team</td>
<td>RE or Site head</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation – how?

- Start with objective and benefits - Who will do what with the results?
- Select method and plan whole process - From data gathering to actions & communication
- Involve all partners – What is in for each player?
Networking for Corporate Real Estate

centraleurope.corenetglobal.org

www.munichoffices.de
User satisfaction matters

Viel Erfolg!
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