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## Introduction

## Developing BCPSAG's work in support of Building Control Service delivery

Welcome to the latest Building Control Performance Standards Advisory Group (BCPSAG) Report for the survey conducted during 2013.

The primary purposes of BCPSAG are to monitor and review the effectiveness of the Performance Standards and Guidance used by Building Control Bodies, to collect performance based evidence related to those Standards such that an assessment can be made that current and future performance outcomes will meet the needs of customers and provide information to support self -improvement, and to report annually to all stakeholders.

2013 has been a year of three significant areas of work and change for BCPSAG in addition to the norm and I want to place on record my thanks to all the individual members, who are unremunerated, for their commitment of considerable time and expertise; and where appropriate also to their supporting organisations.


Last year I reported that, to make it easier for Building Control Bodies to complete the survey and to increase response rates, revised Performance Indicators had been developed which in turn had brought more topicality to the BCPSAG Annual Survey questions and provided simpler mechanisms for reporting and would enable longer term trend analysis to inform actions necessary for performance improvement. This set of indicators and relevant questions have been utilised for the 2012/13 Survey upon which this report is based and this will also be the case for the upcoming 2013/14 survey.

We also committed last year to undertaking a full review of the Performance Standards and Guidance (last reviewed in 2006) to take account of not only the changing nature of Building Control activities and innovation in building technology, practices and regulations but also expectations of Government, customers and the Building Control sector.

This review and consequent redrafting is now complete and I anticipate that the new Performance Standards and Guidance will be published at the same time as this report.

We have endeavoured to "future proof" the Standards to the extent possible, to simplify the structure (in doing so have reduced the number of standards from 12 to 9) and ensure that the guidance recognises current and anticipates future best practice in the sector whilst recognising customer expectations. In the coming year we will review whether additions to the current performance indicators are necessary to reflect these changes, but I repeat there will be no changes to the next survey period.


The third area has concerned the membership and reporting structure of BCPSAG, in part reflecting the changing interests of participant bodies but also the devolution of Building Control functions within the United Kingdom. As a consequence it has been agreed that BCPSAG becomes a sub- committee of the separate Building Regulations Advisory Committees for England and for Wales; this has necessitated agreement of new Terms of Reference including revised membership a copy of which is appended to this report for information.

BCPSAG members warmly welcomed these changes. This will provide more robust support and secretariat which will enable future survey and analysis to provide more detailed information and feed back to contributors. For example dis aggregation of data will allow closer peer review, comparison and benchmarking on the basis of size, work load and profile, location etc whilst still maintaining absolute confidentiality.

The 2012/13 Survey analysis of course constitutes the main purpose and body of this Report and I want to thank all those Building Control Bodies who submitted their data. Disappointingly the 141 respondents who returned this year's BCPSAG survey was a significant reduction on the 199 last year, and sadly not every respondent returned data for every part of the survey. Overall this response rate represents only approximately a third of the total number of BUILDING CONTROL BODYs, and in particular a low response rate from those in the Local Authority sector. It was also necessary to extend the response period by nearly 3 months to secure this level.

Hopefully the future intentions detailed above will encourage an improved response rate in respect of 2013/14.


The Report I believe illustrates the key areas where performance is at satisfactory levels but more importantly those where improvement is clearly required. The Summary of Findings on page 13 provides a comprehensive overview, such that no further comment is necessary from me other than one area which I believe continues to be, and perhaps increasingly, of major concern to Building Control Bodies
and BCPSAG ie, the Age Profile data. This must raise questions as to whether Building Control Bodies will have the right people in sufficient volume with experience, competencies and specialist knowledge to match future customer and industry needs and to perform in all sectors. We know from research that this concern is shared by many other bodies within the Built environment sector.

We will endeavour to continue in 2014 and succeeding years to refine our data and analysis for the benefit of Building Control Bodies and all stakeholders. The intention is to continue to utilise more input and help from external organisations to enrich and broaden our understanding.

We are extremely grateful to the Building Control Alliance (BCA), its constituent members Local Authority Building Control (LABC) and The Association of Consultant Approved Inspectors (ACAI) in particular, and others who have contributed to the work and the data which forms the basis of this report, and of course to RJB Consulting and TW Consult for their very professional analysis and report.

I know you will find this year's report interesting and informative, and I commend it to you

Alan Crane CBE, FCIOB, C.Eng, FICE, FCMI.
Chair, BCPSAG

## Data collection process and reporting

Data were submitted to BCPSAG from July until October 2013, using the same spreadsheet as the previous year. Local authorities and Approved Inspectors were invited to complete the survey. RJB Consulting with TW Consult was appointed by BCPSAG to analyse the submissions received. Our work has involved four stages:

- data preparation - combining the data from individual spreadsheets into a single database.
- data validation - this was focused on resolving obvious errors and inconsistencies.
- data analysis - this involved calculating measures of the distribution of each indicator (median, quartiles and deciles - see page 8 for a technical explanation of these measures), as well as other statistical manipulations of the data so that they could be presented graphically in the report.
- reporting - finally, we have produced this report for BCPSAG to feed back the results of our analysis and also to enable BCPSAG to publish the report so that participants can identify their comparative position on the indicators.


## Confidentiality

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) and BCPSAG were keen to ensure that all organisations could submit data without fear that their data could be identified. To meet this requirement, we have done our best to ensure that there is no way any individual organisation can be identified from this report. We have done this by:

- removing all reference to organisation names and instead, inserting a code for each participant. The codes were assigned in no particular order
- removing any data that would enable readers to identify any participant.

A full list of the unique codes for participating Building Control Bodies has been supplied to the Secretary of BCPSAG for the sole purpose of being able to inform participants which code represents them. Participants will therefore be able to benchmark their performance with that of other organisations.

Those Building Control Bodies that participated in the 2007/8, 2008/9, 2009/10, 2010/11 and/or 2011/2012 survey have retained the same code for the 2012/2013 analysis.

## Statistics presented

In this report the main statistics presented are the mean and median.
The mean is calculated as the sum of all response values divided by the number of responses; this average can be skewed by a small number of 'outlying' values which are much higher or lower than the majority of results.

Some performance indicators are calculated as a ratio of another measure, so that results are not unduly influenced by a few large Building Control Bodies; for example the complaints performance indicators is calculated as the number of complaints received per building control application. In these cases this percentage is calculated for each respondent, and the 'mean proportion' is the mean percentage achieved by Building Control Bodies. This is rather than calculating overall total complaints received by respondents divided by total applications received.

The median value is the middle value in the distribution of scores, and therefore in some cases provides a better representation of a 'typical' Building Control Body.

On measures where the majority of responses take the same value, the median is not the best measure. For example the median value of staff turnover is zero, because over half of respondents had not replaced a member of staff in the 12 month period. In this case the mean gives a more accurate reflection, with the mean staff turnover being $4 \%$.

The main body of the report shows the distribution of the results from all participants, and the data annex shows the individual data for each participant. Both the main report and the data annex make use of certain measures of the distribution of results. These are:

| Measure | Explanation |
| :--- | :--- |
| Lowest decile | $10 \%$ of results fall below this figure |
| Lower quartile | $25 \%$ of results fall below this figure |
| Median | This is the mid-point - half of results fall below this figure |
| Upper quartile | $75 \%$ of results fall below this figure |
| Highest decile | $90 \%$ of results fall below this figure |

Readers should note that we have calculated the measures of distribution on a purely mathematical basis - we have not made assumptions about the 'polarity' of
indicators (ie whether a high figure is good or bad). The 'average' has often been used instead of 'mean' in the text.

## Limitations

In analysing these results, readers should bear in mind:

- Whilst we have made efforts to ensure the validity of the data, our work in this regard has been limited, and the data are made up of unaudited returns made by individual participants. There is always a danger that individual participants have submitted incorrect data, either by accident or by design.
- Whilst the number of responses received is reasonable, the overall response rate is about one third. There is therefore the possibility of 'response bias' that is to say that the responses received are not representative of the population as a whole.
- Readers should be aware that some Building Control Bodies' figures are derived from relatively few responses, which could affect the results. This is more likely where there are small sample sizes.



## Participation in the 2012/13 survey

Submissions were received from 141 separate organisations, comprising 59 approved inspectors and 82 local authorities. This represents a response rate of around $85 \%$ for approved inspectors and around $24 \%$ for local authorities.

The overall response rate is down from last year, but still the third highest overall. A detailed breakdown of the total responses can be seen in the table below:

|  | Local Authorities | Approved Inspectors | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2007 / 8$ | 107 | 39 | 146 |
| $2008 / 9$ | 68 | 36 | 104 |
| $2009 / 10$ | 60 | 36 | 96 |
| $2010 / 11$ | 45 | 40 | 85 |
| $2011 / 12$ | 146 | 53 | 199 |
| $2012 / 13$ | 82 | 59 | 141 |

Though there were 141 respondents who returned this year's BCPSAG survey, not every respondent returned data for every part of the survey. The table below sets out the response rate for data used in the calculation of the Performance Indicators. Each section of the report also notes the number of respondents to that part of the survey.

| Performance Indicator | Number of responses |
| :---: | :---: |
| Best Practice Process Management | 128 Respondents with system in place |
| Complaints | 80 respondents received at least one <br> complaint |
| Staff make-up | 139 |
| Staff training | 137 |
| Respect for <br> People$\quad$ Sickness Absence | Staff Turnover |
|  | Investors in People |

## Performance Indicators 2012-2013 (2011-2012)

| PI Name | Description | Mean Score | Median Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Best Practice Process Management | Rating out of 100 based on coverage and operation of management system | $\begin{gathered} \hline 86.1 \\ (84.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 90 \\ (88) \end{gathered}$ |
| Complaints | Number of complaints received as a proportion of building control applications | $\begin{gathered} 0.37 \% \\ (0.42 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \% \\ (0.27 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| of which: |  |  |  |
| Technical issues | Technical complaints received as a proportion of building control applications | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \% \\ (0.19 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \% \\ (0.14 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Service issues | Service complaints received as a proportion of building control applications | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \% \\ (0.23 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \% \\ (0.15 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Satisfactorily resolved | Proportion of complaints resolved to customers satisfaction | $\begin{gathered} 62 \% \\ (67 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 75 \% \\ (80 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Staff turnover | Number of direct employees replaced during the year divided by number of direct employees | $\begin{gathered} 4.0 \% \\ (2.9 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - |
| Sickness Absence | Average number of days lost per employee | $\begin{gathered} 2.7 \\ (3.5) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.6 \\ (2.3) \end{gathered}$ |
| Training | Average number of training days given per direct employee | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \\ (3.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.6 \\ (2.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Investors in People (liP) | Proportion of direct employees covered by liP commitment \& recognition | $\begin{gathered} 35 \% \\ (47 \%) \end{gathered}$ | - |
| Staff make-up: |  |  |  |
| Proportion under $24$ | Employees aged under 24 as a proportion of workforce | $\begin{gathered} 2.6 \% \\ (3.2 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0 \% \\ (0 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Proportion over 55 | Employees aged over 55 as a proportion of workforce | $\begin{gathered} 24.0 \% \\ (22.6 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20 \% \\ (20 \%) \end{gathered}$ |
| Women | Female employees as a proportion of workforce | $\begin{gathered} 24.6 \% \\ (24.0 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 25 \% \\ (25 \%) \end{gathered}$ |

## Summary of findings

- 141 Building Control Bodies participated this year, down from last year, but well up on the 85 who provided data in 2011. Of these, 9 respondents took part in the survey for the first time.
- The Age profile of Building Control Bodies suggests that Building Control Bodies will face significant problems replacing experienced staff as their workforce approaches state pension age. Twenty-four per cent (24\%) of the average Building Control Bodies' work force are aged over 55, compared to $11 \%$ who are under 30 and just $2.6 \%$ under 24.
- Performance in the Process Management Performance Indicator (PI) was good, with the majority of respondents covering 12 or more of the 14 areas questioned. Three areas were identified as having possible room for improvement; pre-application advice, checks on dormant jobs, and certification before completion.
- Responses to the Complaints Handling Process Performance Indicator (PI) showed complaints rates were very low, with the average Building Control Body receiving only one complaint per 268 applications. This suggests that in the vast majority of cases, Building Control Bodies are providing a good service to customers.
- However Building Control Bodies did not perform as well in terms of dealing with complaints that did arise. On average just $62 \%$ of complaints were Resolved Satisfactorily, a decline from last year's survey. Nineteen per cent ( $19 \%$ ) of complaints were sufficiently severe to be escalated to Local Authority Building Control (LABC), The Association of Consultant Approved Inspectors (ACAI), Construction Industry Council Approved Inspectors Register (CICAIR), Building Control Alliance (BCA) or the Local Government Ombudsman.
- The Building Control Work indicator clearly shows that whilst domestic alterations, extensions and improvements made up on average $74 \%$ per cent of applications this represented only $61 \%$ of fees, while on the other hand for other types of project the percentage of fees was mostly higher than the percentage of projects.
- Responses to the Building Control Staff questions showed an improvement in the skill level of Building Control Bodies workforces, continuing a trend established in previous BCPSAG research. On average $59 \%$ of staff were fully qualified with corporate membership of relevant professional bodies, up from $55 \%$ in 2011-12.
- Over the past year more Building Control Bodies lost employees than gained, but the majority of respondents reported no change. This suggests a slight reduction in the size of Building Control Body workforces over the last 12 months.
- Performance on the Respect for People indicators is roughly in line with last year's survey. Encouragingly, levels of sickness absence have fallen, however coverage of employees by Investors in People recognition has also fallen.


## Analysis

## 1. Process Management of Building Control Compliance Operations

The survey asked if there was a process or quality management system in place, and if so whether it was accredited and audited by an external QMS or ISO company or their own system. It then asked a series of yes/no questions within the five sections of building control compliance and process management:

- development stages
- resource management
- process management
- customer management
- record keeping

The full detailed questions can be found in figure 1.1 overleaf, as well as in the data annex.


Based on the responses to the 16 questions a score out of 100 was calculated for the Building Control Body, with 6 points awarded for each 'yes' answer and an additional 10 points if the system was externally accredited rather than internally. This number was displayed as one of the PI scores in the respondent's own survey.

Of the 141 returns received, 128 had a process or quality management system in place. Of these, $51 \%$ were externally accredited and $48 \%$ had their own system.

The following table shows high 'yes' response rates for questions which are shown in more detail in figure 1.1 overleaf:

| Over 90\% | 7 | $1.1 .4,1.1 .5,1.1 .7,1.1 .8,1.1 .9,1.1 .11,1.1 .14$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'yes' | questions | $1.1 .15,1.1 .16$ |
| Over $80 \%$ <br> 'yes' | 4 <br> questions | $1.1 .3,1.1 .6,1.1 .10,1.1 .13$ |

The three questions that had the lowest 'yes' response rate were:

- certification before completion (65\%)
- pre-application advice (80\%)
- customer feedback processes (82\%).

Even the lowest response rate to any of the questions was still almost two thirds 'yes' answers.

Looking at the PI scores for the Building Control Bodies, 33 out of the 141 achieved a score of 100 which means that their system is externally accredited and audited and covers all of the points questioned regarding process management and building control compliance. This shows an improvement on 2011/12.

Figure 1.2 below shows the distribution of scores:


Based on data from 128 respondents

The scores are skewed towards the higher end of the range, with the vast majority achieving a score of over 70 .

The median score was 90 and the mean was 85.5 due to a small number of very low scores.

A score of 90 corresponds to an internal system covering all 14 of the areas questioned, and a score of 88 corresponds to an externally accredited system covering 12 out of 14 of the areas questioned.

In general 'yes' responses were high for all the questions with three areas which could be improved; certification before completion (65\%) pre-application advice ( $80 \%$ ), and customer feedback processes (82\%). There was a significant improvement in checks on dormant jobs this year up from $76 \%$ last year to $85 \%$.

This is overall a very good performance for the Best Practice Process Management PI.

## 2. Complaints Handling Processes

Respondents were asked to state the total number of complaints they had received in the last 12 months, they were then asked to state how many of these were:

- resolved satisfactorily for the customer
- taken no further by the customer despite continuing concerns
- escalated to Local Authority Building Control (LABC), The Association of Consultant Approved Inspectors (ACAI), Construction Industry Council Approved Inspectors Register (CICAIR), Building Control Alliance (BCA) or the Local Government Ombudsman.

They were also asked to state how many of these complaints were either Technical or Service related. To account for the differing sizes of Building Control Bodies, information from part 3 of the survey is used to calculate these measures as a proportion of total building control applications.

Out of 141 respondents to this section of the survey, $80(57 \%)$ responded that they had received at least one complaint in the last 12 months. We cannot be sure as to whether other respondents had received zero complaints or did not have the information available, so only the 80 Building Control Bodies with non-zero complaints are included in our analysis. As such the data presented is likely to be an overestimate of the prevalence of complaints; nevertheless the rate of complaints is very low.

Figure 2.1 - Technical and Service Complaints


Figure 2.1 presents the mean proportion of complaints as a percentage of applications. These figures are very low, indicating that for the average respondent a complaint was received for one in every 268 applications. These complaints were evenly split between service and technical issues. ${ }^{1}$ To put this into context, the median respondent to this year's survey received 902 building control applications, so a 'typical' Building Control Body would be expected to have received between 3 or 4 complaints in the year 2012-13.

The number of complaints reported was typically very low; this means care must be taken when calculating 'percentage of complaints resolved to customer's satisfaction'. In many cases the percentage is based on just one complaint; due to this there is a large variation in performance.

Figure 2.2 below shows the distribution of resolved complaints across the 80 Building Control Bodies that reported having more than zero complaints for the last 12 months.


The median of $75 \%$ means that half of respondents resolved over $75 \%$ of complaints to customer's satisfaction, with 33 (41\%) resolving all complaints to customer's satisfaction. However 19 (24\%) respondents resolved no complaints to customer's satisfaction. The mean of $62 \%$ presented in figure 2.3 means that on average

[^0]respondents resolved just over three out of every five complaints satisfactorily. The mean is lower than the median, reflecting the wide variation and a large number of low percentages.

Disappointingly, Building Control Bodies' performance in this measure has slipped compared to last year's survey. Last year the median proportion of complaints resolved satisfactorily was $80 \%$, with a mean of $67 \%$. The percentage of Building Control Bodies resolving no complaints to customer's satisfaction rose from 19\% last year to $24 \%$.

Figure 2.3 below presents the mean proportions of outcomes of complaints.


This chart shows that on average 19\% of the complaints received were serious enough to be escalated to an official body, and nearly a quarter of complaints were not satisfactorily resolved but were taken no further by the customer. This distribution of non-satisfactorily resolved claims is not significantly different to last year's survey result. Note: the percentages are arithmetical, so do not sum to $100 \%$. They would have to be weighted to do so.

## 3. Breakdown of Building Control Work

The survey asked for the number of building control applications received in the last 12 months, how many of these had started construction and of those, how many were still incomplete. The total building control fees charged in the last 12 months was also asked for in £ sterling.

Finally the breakdown of building control projects in terms of percentage of total projects was asked for, as well as the percentage of the total fees that were charged for that type of project. There were 6 types of projects defined:

- domestic alterations, extensions and improvements
- new build homes including new homes created by conversion or change of use
- commercial/retail/industrial/hospitality alterations or extensions
- education/health/justice/community/public building alterations and extensions
- new build commercial/retail/industrial/hospitality
- new build education/health/justice/community/public building

Of the 141 returns received, 133 provided a figure for the number of building control applications received in the last 12 months. The distribution of these results is displayed in figure 3.1 below. In total 161,036 applications were received by respondents to the survey.

Figure 3.1 - Distribution of Total Number of Projects


Based on data from 133 respondents

The median number of applications was 902, and the mean was higher, at 1,211 due to a small number of Building Control Bodies having a very large number of applications received. This can be seen from the distribution in figure 3.1: 8 Building Control Bodies received 3,000 or more applications. The vast majority of Building Control Bodies received less than 2,000 applications in the last 12 months.

The median number of projects which had started construction was 633 which is $70 \%$ of the total number of applications received. On average, $54 \%$ of these projects which have started construction in the last 12 months are still uncompleted.

Overall the mean building control fee charged per application was $£ 627$. However as figure 3.2 below shows, average fees varied depending on the size of Building Control Body. These calculations include data from the 120 returns that had responded with answers to both the questions required.


As the chart shows, by far the highest average fees were earned by Building Control Bodies that received less than 500 applications in the year 2012-13. Average fees charged then decrease consecutively for each size band, with the lowest fees for Building Control Bodies that received between 1500 and 2499 applications. However the largest Building Control Bodies, receiving over 2500 applications per year, earned above average building control fees.

Figure 3.3 below shows the median percentages of projects for 112 responses to this part of the survey.


Figure 3.3 shows that the majority of projects were domestic alterations but that in general these projects earned lower building control fees, and that there were relatively smaller numbers of new build homes, commercial and public building alterations, and commercial and public new builds but these earned higher building control fees.

This is much the same as was seen in the 2011/12 report.

## 4. Building Control Staff

This part of the report is split into 4 sections:
People and Skills (4.1),
Specialist Experience (4.2),
Age and Gender profile (4.3), and
Respect for People (4.4).

### 4.1 People and Skills

The survey asked respondents to give their total number of staff in 11 categories, which covered:

- direct and contract employees
- full time and part-time employees
- employees' qualifications.

The specific questions are set out underneath figure 4.1.2.
For part-time workers respondents were asked to provide full-time equivalent values, for example an employee working two days a week would be denoted as 0.4.

141 respondents provided information for this section. The median total number of employees was 9.7, with a mean of 13.2. Figure 4.1.1 shows the distribution of Building Control Bodies by total staff numbers. The mean is higher than the median as it is influenced by a few Building Control Bodies with very large workforces.

Figure 4.1.1 - Distribution of Total Number of Staff


The majority (59\%) of Building Control Bodies responding to the survey had 10 employees or fewer, and $79 \%$ of respondents had 15 employees or fewer. Figure 4.1.2 overleaf shows Building Control Bodies' mean number of staff by qualification and employment type, with the categories detailed underneath.

Of the 13.2 mean total number of employees, 6.58 (50\%) were full time directly employed fully professionally qualified with corporate membership, with a further 1.34 (11\%) full time directly employed graduates without corporate membership. The two other relatively large proportions are full and part time direct employees with no qualifications, which are presumed to be mainly administrative staff. Building Control Bodies tend to employ a smaller proportion of trainees than of part-qualified staff who are not undertaking further study.

Figure 4.1.2 - Staff Classification

4.1.1 Full-time directly employed \& professionally fully qualified with Corporate membership (RICS, ABE, CIOB)
4.1.2 Full-time directly employed graduate or post-graduate but not a corporate member of a professional body
4.1.3 Full-time contract employed (agency/freelance/self-employed) \& professionally fully qualified with Corporate membership (RICS, ABE, CIOB)
4.1.4 Full-time directly employed unqualified (not undertaking study for qualification eg technical support and dedicated BC process administrators)
4.1.5 Full-time directly employed part-qualified (not undertaking study for qualification)
4.1.6 Full-time directly employed (studying for qualification - Trainee)
4.1.7 Full-time contract employed (agency/freelance/self-employed) \& unqualified)
4.1.8 Part-time directly employed \& professionally qualified (RICS, ABE, CIOB)
4.1.9 Part-time contract employed \& professionally qualified (RICS, ABE, CIOB)
4.1.10 Part-time contract employed (agency/freelance/self-employed) unqualified
4.1.11 Part-time unqualified (eg technical support staff and dedicated BC process administrators)

Including those working on a contract basis or part time, professionally qualified staff with corporate membership made up 59\% of the average Building Control Bodies workforce. As figure 4.1.3 below shows, this is an improvement in this performance indicator, compared to $55 \%$ in last year's survey.


There are higher mean numbers of direct and full time employees than part-time and contract employees, which can be seen in fig 4.1.4 below.


The use of contract staff seems to have increased this year, in 2012-13 the mean number of contract staff employed was 1.2. This is double the number reported in last year's survey, while the overall mean number of staff has risen only slightly. This may imply that in the face of economic uncertainty Building Control Bodies are increasingly looking to meet demand with flexible contractors rather than permanent staff. Three quarters of contract employees were fully qualified with corporate membership, equally split between part-time and full-time.

Part time workers are more likely than full time workers to be unqualified (eg technical support staff and dedicated BC process administrators); over half of part time staff were in this category. Around $40 \%$ of part time workers were professionally qualified, with equal proportions employed directly or on a contract basis.

### 4.2 Specialist Experience

The survey asked for the Building Control Bodies to input how many of their staff had extensive experience in each of 9 specialist areas of building control, as well as an 'other' category if staff have extensive experience in an area not mentioned.


Figure 4.2.1 uses data returned from 137 Building Control Bodies. It shows the mean percentage of staff who have each type of specialist experience.

The data shows that staff have the highest level of experience in fire engineering and risk assessment, followed by the second highest in educational buildings expertise.

The weakest area appears to be acoustics, as only $4 \%$ of staff had extensive experience in this.

### 4.3 Age and Gender profile

The survey asked respondents to give the number of male and female staff within the following age ranges:

- Under 24
- 24-30
- 31-40
- 41-50
- 51-54
- 55-60
- 61+

Respondents were asked to include direct, full time, part time and contract staff.
Figure 4.3.1 overleaf summarises the performance indicators from section 4.3 of the survey. 139 respondents provided data for this section of the survey.


Overall performance on these indicators is mixed. The mean proportion of staff under 24 has fallen to just 2.6\%, a deterioration from last year's poor result on this measure. The mean proportion of the workforce who are 55 or above has increased slightly. This shift is concerning and suggests that across the industry not enough young staff are gaining the experience to be able to replace older staff heading for retirement.

The mean proportion of women in the workforce was 0.6 percentage points higher than in last year's survey, this small change represents stability on this measure.

The mean proportion of women is less than a quarter (24.0\%); this is below the UK average of $47 \%$, according to the Office for National Statistics. The BCPSAG survey methodology asked respondents for information on staff based on full time equivalent numbers ${ }^{2}$. Across the UK as whole, women have a greater likelihood of working part time. Estimates of the female proportion of the UK workforce in terms of full time equivalent figures are closer to $40 \%$. This is still some way above respondents' average figure of $24 \%$.

[^1]Figure 4.3.2 shows a more detailed breakdown of staffing profiles ${ }^{3}$.

Figure 4.3.2 - Mean proportion of total staff by Age and Gender


Figure 4.3.2 illustrates that employees' ages are heavily weighted around the 41-60 age ranges: the mean proportion of workers between these ages being $62 \%$. There is a sharp drop in workforce proportion when the 61+ age group is reached.

This chart also illustrates the proportion of women in each age group; this diminishes steadily as age increases. Women on average make up nearly half of employees under the age of 30 . For employees between the ages of 30 and 50 , this proportion falls to around a quarter. Women account for just a sixth of the 51-60 band and less still of those over 60.

[^2]Given the demographic importance of the over 50 age group, figure 4.3 .3 gives a more detailed distribution of the aggregated groups.


The proportion of employees in the bands closest to retirement age, over 61 and over 55, has increased. More encouraging is the fall in the mean proportion of employees aged 51-54. Figure 4.3.3 above shows that if the current trend continues, Building Control Bodies will have to replace their workforce at an accelerating rate over the next decade, and of course accommodate the issue of relative dilution of experience in the workforce.

### 4.4 Respect for People

The survey asked for the Building Control Bodies to input the number of employees that left, the number that were recruited, and the number of employees that left and were replaced in their specific role. This was all for the defined period of the last 12 months.

The survey then asked for the total number of days that were lost due to sickness absence across all directly-employed staff, and the total number of training days provided for direct employees. Finally the number of direct employees covered by Investors in People recognition was requested.


As shown in figure 4.4.1, more Building Control Bodies showed an overall loss in the number of employees than those that showed an increase. However the majority of Building Control Bodies recorded no overall change in the size of their workforce. So in general numbers of employees have fallen slightly, this could be due to the continuing recession or some other unknown factors.

The mean level of staff turnover, defined as the number of direct staff who left and were replaced divided by the total number of direct staff was $4 \%$. This is low, but has increased compared to the $2.3 \%$ mean in last year's survey. This small upturn in staff turnover could be a result of increased staff movement between Building Control Bodies, or an accelerating need to replace retired workers. 107 of 138 Building Control Bodies that responded had not replaced any direct staff during the last 12 months.

Figure 4.4.2 below shows the distribution of sickness absence per employee, a Performance Indicator. It includes data from the 138 Building Control Bodies that responded to it.


The distribution is weighted towards lower sickness absences which is an encouraging result. The median is 1.6 days per direct employee, and the mean is higher at 2.7. This performance indicator has shown a strong improvement since last year's survey, with sickness absence rates down from a median of 2.3 and a mean of 3.5.


Figure 4.4.3 above shows the distribution of the mean number of training days provided for each employee. One hundred and thirty-seven (137) Building Control Bodies returned data for this Performance Indicator.

This distribution shows that $79.6 \%$ of Building Control Bodies gave their employees between zero and 4 training days each. The median number of training days given was 2.6, and the mean was higher at 4.2 due to a few reports of 11 or more training days being given.

## Investors in People

Of 140 Building Control Bodies, 44 had $100 \%$ of direct employees covered by the Investors in People recognition programme, 6 covered some direct employees, and 90 did not cover any employees with the programme.

## Explanations of the Performance Indicators

## Process Delivery

## Best Practice Process Management

Measure: Ranking score of the building control of the coverage and organisation of the body's process management system.

The aim of this performance indicator is to assess the coverage and depth of the Building Control body's process management system. A ranking score for the process/quality management system in place is calculated based upon whether the system covers:

- the extent of the building control process covered by the system,
- appropriate resource allocation
- customer feedback
- record keeping
- third party accreditation \& audit


## Staff Skills

Measure: Proportion of staff in a building control office role that are fully qualified with corporate membership (RICS, ABE, CIOB).

This is a headline indicator of the building control body's ability to deliver a quality service by ensuring that the advice provided to applicants has a sound basis and that regulation is consistent and well-grounded through the use of appropriately skilled staff.

The new BCA questions for Building Control Bodies also includes a detailed suite of staffing profile questions that can used to provide a more detailed assessment of the staff skill base.

## Customer Satisfaction

## Complaints

Measure: Number of complaints received as a proportion of building control applications

This headline indicator is calculated using total number of complaints during the last 12 months as a proportion of the number of building control applications received during the same period.

Bodies can also derive subsidiary indicators from the survey data to assess split complaints between technical and service issues and the proportion that were 'satisfactorily' resolved for the customer.

It should be noted that as projects will run across the year end, any complaints received will not necessarily relate to building control notices issued during the year. In addition the number of active projects during the year is likely to be greater than the number of applications, while it is possible that multiple complaints could be lodged against one project. Accordingly, whilst the Performance Indicator is a valuable management tool for assessing a body's relative performance, it does not provide a definitive calculation of the proportion of projects against which complaints are lodged.

## Respect for People

Staff turnover and sickness absence are valuable indicators of staff morale. They are Respect for People Pls included in the UK Construction Industry KPIs as:

- they provide insight into staff morale
- the Pls have implications for the delivery of an effective service to customers. High rates of staff turnover or sickness absence could potentially adversely affect the quality of service or even technical advice provided
- the data is readily available to managers.

The measures cover training and Investors in People are indicators of the organisations commitment to and investment in developing its staff resources that can have implications for the long term performance and success of the organisation. The measures on staff make-up provide indicators of social inclusiveness that also have potential implications for the longer term success of the organisation.

## Staff turnover

Measure: Number of direct employees that left the company during the year as a proportion of all direct employees.

## Sickness absence

Measure: Number of working days lost due to sickness absence per direct employee.

## Training

Measure: Average number of training days provided by the Building Control Body across all direct employees.

## Investors in People:

Measure: Proportion of direct employees covered by Investors in People recognition.

## Staff Composition

Measures: The collected data on staff profile question provides a suite of indicators on staff make-up:

- women as a proportion of the workforce
- people under 24 as a proportion of the workforce
- people over 55 as a proportion of the workforce.


## Data Annex







| S4 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| E5 | 1.29\% | 0.3\% | 1.00\% | 16 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| T1 | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 5 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 60\% |
| Z8 | 0.07\% | 0.1\% | 0.00\% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| K1 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| H7 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ZE6 | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50\% |
| Y9 | 0.14\% | 0.1\% | 0.00\% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| T2 | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0\% |
| ZG2 | 0.21\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 5 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 100\% |
| ZD7 | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| H9 | 0.21\% | 0.1\% | 0.14\% | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 67\% |
| ZC2 | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 33\% |
| R7 | 0.66\% | 0.0\% | 0.66\% | 6 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 83\% |
| V9 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ZH2 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ZG4 |  | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| J3 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| P7 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% |
| L6 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| E4 | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0\% |
| S2 | 0.31\% | 0.2\% | 0.12\% | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 40\% |
| H3 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| ZH8 | 0.27\% | 0.3\% | 0.00\% | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0\% |
| ZH9 | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 33\% |
| ZD8 | 0.13\% | 0.0\% | 0.13\% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| Z13 | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 8 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 0\% |
| V8 | 0.48\% | 0.2\% | 0.24\% | 8 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 75\% |
| Z11 | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0\% |
| ZD1 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ZD4 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| W6 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| D6 | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| ZA8 | 0.00\% | 0.0\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| V3 | 0.13\% | 0.06\% | 0.06\% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| N7 | 0.24\% | 0.24\% | 0.00\% | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 100\% |
| E3 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ZB4 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| K3 | 0.00\% |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| S8 |  | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| C6 | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0.00\% | 0 |  |  |  |  |
| ZH1 | 0.42\% | 0.21\% | 0.21\% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50\% |
| ZJ7 | 0.15\% | 0.15\% | 0.0\% | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0\% |
| Z18 | 0.08\% | 0.25\% | 0.08\% | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 100\% |
| D5 | 0.1\% | 0\% | 0.1\% | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 50\% |
| T7 | 0.00\% |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |


| Participant | 3. Breakdown of Building Control Work |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3.1 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.4 | .5 Breakdown of Projects |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.1 |  | 5.2 |  | 5.3 |  | 5.4 |  | 5.5 |  | 5.6 |
|  | Number of building control applications received in the last 12 months | Of these, number that have started construction in the last 12 months | Of those in 3.2, percentage that are still uncompleted | Total value of building control fees charged in the last 12 months | Domestic alterations, extensions \& improvements |  | New build homes including new homes created by conversion or change of use |  | Commercial/retail/ industrial / hospitality alterations or extensions |  | Education / health / justice / community/ public building, alterations \& extensions |  | New build commercial /retail/industrial / hospitality |  | New build education / health/justice / community / public building |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | \% of Projects | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Total Fee } \end{gathered}$ | \% of Projects | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Total Fee } \end{gathered}$ | $\%$ of Projects | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Total Fee } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \text { of } \\ & \text { Projects } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Total Fee } \end{gathered}$ | \% of Projects | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% of } \\ \text { Total Fee } \end{gathered}$ | \% of Projects | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \text { Total Fee } \end{gathered}$ |
| Lowest 10\% | 225 | 153 | 25\% | £ 146,007 | 12\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 2\% | 2\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Lowest 25\% | 526 | 318 | 34\% | £ 217,000 | 46\% | 29\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 5\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Median | 902 | 633 | 54\% | £ 419,716 | 74\% | 61\% | 5\% | 8\% |  | 9\% | 3\% | 4\% | 1\% | 3\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| Highest 25\% | 1474 | 1137 | 66\% | £ 669,000 | 84\% | 75\% | 9\% | 14\% | 21\% | 23\% | 5\% | 8\% | 4\% | 6\% | 2\% | 5\% |
| Highest 10\% | 2365 | 1696 | 78\% | £ 1,229,551 | 90\% | 85\% | 13\% | 20\% | 45\% | 48\% | 10\% | 14\% | 8\% | 10\% | 5\% | 8\% |
| \# of observations | 133 | 118 | 113 | 121 | 112 | 110 | 112 | 110 | 112 | 110 | 108 | 107 | 108 | 105 | 104 | 102 |
| Mean | 1211 | 889 | 102\% | £673,105.53 | 63\% | 53\% | 6\% | 9\% | 16\% | 18\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 4\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| x5 | 175 | 115 | 78\% | £ 155,545 | 48\% | 30\% | 13\% | 18\% | 4\% | 3\% | 32\% | 43\% | 3\% | 6\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Q6 | 198 | 156 | 55.0 |  | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 42\% | 0\% | 36\% | 0\% | 14\% | 0\% | 6\% | 0\% |
| x3 | 75 | 61 | 10\% | £ 98,500 | 35\% | 28\% | 25\% | 20\% | 25\% | 35\% | 0\% | 0\% | 10\% | 12\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Z12 | 260 | 181 | 54\% | £ 160,888 | 87\% | 85\% | 4\% | 6\% | 6\% | 5\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 2\% |
| J8 | 2712 | 2522 | 29\% | £ 1,216,647 | 67\% | 53\% | 12\% | 12\% | 9\% | 16\% | 3\% | 9\% | 4\% | 4\% | 5\% | 6\% |
| E1 | 888 | 795 | 49\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| K6 | 1468 | 1248 | 15\% | £ 678,000 | 0\% | 72\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 24\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% |
| L3 | 877 | 626 | 54\% | £ 687,897 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 83\% | 64\% | 2\% | 19\% | 11\% | 9\% | 4\% | 8\% |
| D8 | 569 | 498 | 80\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| 14 | 294 | 203 | 31\% | £ 503,000 | 8\% | 11\% | 5\% | 8\% | 79\% | 70\% | 3\% | 2\% | 4\% | 6\% | 1\% | 3\% |
| H6 | 4476 | 3000 | 90\% | £ 2,100,000 | 80\% | 80\% | 6\% | 6\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2\% | 2\% | 6\% | 6\% | 3\% | 3\% |
| G7 | 103 | 93 | 30\% | £ 417,000 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 93\% | 93\% | 0\% | 0\% | 7\% | 7\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Z19 | 38 | 18 | 72\% | £ 35,579 | 76\% | 52\% | 13\% | 21\% | 8\% | 24\% | 3\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| R5 | 332 | 197 | 33\% | £ 147,805 | 72\% | 47\% | 3\% | 4\% | 20\% | 18\% | 2\% | 10\% | 1\% | 5\% | 2\% | 17\% |
| U9 | 411 | 330 | 40\% | £ 185,524 | 76\% | 59\% | 12\% | 22\% | 6\% | 8\% | 1\% | 3\% | 4\% | 8\% | 1\% | 0\% |
| ZG1 | 218 | 163 | 445\% | £ 150,000 | 55\% | 45\% | 8\% | 8\% | 12\% | 15\% | 5\% | 7\% | 15\% | 18\% | 5\% | 7\% |
| P9 | 1005 | 719 | 29\% | £ 410,708 | 69\% | 49\% | 6\% | 8\% | 22\% | 35\% | 2\% | 4\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Z11 | 269 | 260 | 67\% | £ 162,223 | 75\% | 56\% | 13\% | 26\% | 5\% | 6\% | 3\% | 5\% | 3\% | 6\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| ZF9 | 90 | 86 | 63\% | £ 73,843 | 93\% | 86\% | 3\% | 4\% | 3\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 6\% |
| X2 | 512 | 325 | 60\% | £ 247,000 | 88\% | 82\% | 4\% | 10\% | 4\% | 5\% | 2\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| x9 | 2000 | 1500 | 60\% | £ 1,200,000 | 65\% | 70\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| Q4 | 3920 | 2605 | 78\% | £ 2,695,809 | 78\% | 65\% | 14\% | 24\% | 5\% | 5\% | 1\% | 2\% | 1\% | 3\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| A7 | 223 | 147 | 43\% |  | 16\% | 8\% | 2\% | 2\% | 57\% | 62\% | 21\% | 20\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| 29 | 934 | 771 | 59\% | £ 1,241,103 | 31\% | 22\% | 12\% | 17\% | 43\% | 42\% | 11\% | 14\% | 1\% | 2\% | 2\% | 3\% |
| J4 | 1643 | 1130 | 49\% | £ 1,000,200 | 93\% | 86\% | 3\% | 9\% | 3\% | 4\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| V2 | 119 | 103 | 65\% | £ 199,660 | 27\% | 23\% | 2\% | 2\% | 38\% | 32\% | 32\% | 39\% | 1\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| zF3 | 954 | 839 | 75\% | £ 444,848 | 85\% | 73\% | 1\% | 2\% | 12\% | 25\% | 1\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| F3 | 1071 | 802 | 40\% | £ 417,286 | 88\% | 83\% | 6\% | 8\% | 6\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| A1 | 8787 | 6327 | 63\% | £ 5,200,000 | 42\% | 26\% | 9\% | 17\% | 36\% | 34\% | 10\% | 11\% | 3\% | 12\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| X8 | 1106 | 767 | 63\% | £ 850,000 | 38\% | 38\% | 1\% | 1\% | 61\% | 61\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| ZA1 | 864 | 583 | 45\% | £ 610,000 | 70\% | 60\% | 2\% | 5\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 3\% | 10\% |
| S9 | 561 | 449 | 53\% | £ 429,087 | 48\% | 29\% | 11\% | 16\% | 32\% | 32\% | 4\% | 7\% | 3\% | 9\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| G6 | 8309 | 4717 | 28\% | £ 4,425,536 | 76\% | 64\% | 5\% | 8\% | 13\% | 17\% | 2\% | 3\% | 3\% | 7\% | 1\% | 1\% |
| z13 | 490 | 332 | 76\% | £ 121,000 | 83\% | 73\% | 10\% | 3\% | 3\% | 4\% | 4\% | 20\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| D5 | 2595 | 2066 | 20\% | £ 1,963,000 | 12\% | 16\% | 1\% | 1\% | 83\% | 74\% | 3\% | 5\% | 1\% | 2\% | 0\% | 2\% |
| P8 | 2671 | 1666 | 66\% |  | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| X4 | 311 | 0 | 0\% | £ 660,930 | 99\% | 99\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 1\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| A2 | 708 | 372 | 38\% | £ 208,000 | 57\% | 39\% | 3\% | 4\% | 32\% | 41\% | 4\% | 4\% | 2\% | 5\% | 2\% | 7\% |
| G1 | 2698 | 2003 | 24\% | £ 2,835,284 | 36\% | 27\% | 7\% | 13\% | 47\% | 47\% | 6\% | 5\% | 1\% | 1\% | 3\% | 7\% |
| H8 | 517 | 486 | 65\% | £ 470,000 | 10\% | 13\% | 0\% | 0\% | 30\% | 32\% | 30\% | 32\% | 10\% | 8\% | 20\% | 15\% |
| C4 | 917 | 659 | 28\% | £ 1,612,208 | 27\% | 24\% | 3\% | 5\% | 49\% | 44\% | 1\% | 0\% | 20\% | 27\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| H4 | 235 | 145 | 45\% |  | 33\% | 18\% | 12\% | 28\% | 36\% | 23\% | 12\% | 9\% | 4\% | 13\% | 3\% | 9\% |
| Z3 |  |  |  | £ 450,000 | 65\% | 65\% | 5\% | 5\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| U7 | 423 | 326 | 51\% |  | 49\% | 0\% | 5\% | 0\% | 34\% | 0\% | 8\% | 0\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| F7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E9 | 300 | 250 | 15\% | £ 200,000 | 30\% | 30\% | 5\% | 5\% | 40\% | 40\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 5\% |
| K2 | 646 | 563 | 80\% | £ 279,897 | 83\% | 70\% | 7\% | 18\% | 8\% | 9\% | 0\% | 0\% | 2\% | 3\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| S7 | 312 | 247 | 73\% | £ 133,140 | 71\% | 60\% | 12\% | 18\% | 14\% | 18\% | 3\% | 3\% | 0\% | 1\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| G4 | 937 | 483 | 46\% | £ 762,654 | 57\% | 38\% | 4\% | 5\% | 35\% | 53\% | 4\% | 4\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| M6 | 3406 | 2420 | 64\% | £ 5,143,339 | 20\% | 15\% | 4\% | 10\% | 51\% | 39\% | 15\% | 17\% | 6\% | 11\% | 4\% | 8\% |
| ZF6 | 208 | 182 | 60\% | £ 149,472 | 55\% | 35\% | 10\% | 10\% | 12\% | 7\% | 8\% | 8\% | 5\% | 5\% | 10\% | 35\% |
| Y1 | 1100 | 675 | 45\% | £ 590,000 | 70\% | 50\% | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 23\% | 5\% | 9\% | 7\% | 11\% | 5\% | 4\% |






| W6 | 11 | 6 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D6 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 8.4 |
| ZA8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 |
| V3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0.4 | 0 | 0 | 1.3 | 15.7 |
| N7 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| E3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 |
| ZB4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| K3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3.1 |
| S8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| C6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1.2 | 0 | 0 | 1.4 | 7.6 |
| ZH1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| ZJ7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.2 | 6.2 |
| Z18 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| T7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Participant \& \begin{tabular}{l}
4.2 Building \\
Number of staff \\
4.2.1 \\
Structural / \\
Geotechnical \\
Engineering
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Control Staff: Sp \\
ff (including full t \\
4.2 .2 \\
Fire Engineering / Fire Risk Assessment
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
pecialist E \\
ime equiva
4.2.3
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
Experience \\
lent numbers \\
4.2.4 \\
Thermal / \\
Environmental \\
(BREEAM, SAP, \\
SBEM, CfSH etc)
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
4.1.8 to 4.1. \\
4.2.5 \\
Accessibility
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
10) havin \\
4.2.6 \\
Towers and high rise
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
additional
4.2.7 \\
Educational
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
ualification \\
4.2.8 \\
Hospitals
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
s or extensive exp \\
4.2.9 \\
Safety of sports grounds, public or crowd safety
\end{tabular} \& \begin{tabular}{l}
rience in: \\
4.2.10 \\
Other
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Lowest 10\% \\
Lowest 25\% \\
Median \\
Highest 25\% \\
Highest 10\% \\
\# of observations
\end{tabular} \& 1
117 \& \[
1
\]
\[
125
\] \& \[
0
\]
\[
111
\] \& 1
\[
121
\] \& 1
118 \& 1
112 \& 1
119 \& 1
120 \& 1
122 \& 0

103 <br>
\hline X5 \& 4.8 \& 4.4 \& 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 1 \& 4.4 \& 4.4 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline Q6 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline X3 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline Z12 \& 1 \& 2 \& 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 2 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline J8 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline E1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline K6 \& 1 \& 2 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 2 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline L3 \& 0 \& 23 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 11 \& 18 \& 8 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline D8 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline L4 \& 2 \& 3 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 3 \& 4 \& 3 \& 2 \& 0 <br>
\hline H6 \& 1 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0 <br>
\hline G7 \& 0.4 \& 3 \& 1 \& 1 \& 2 \& 3 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 5 <br>
\hline Z19 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline R5 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline U9 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline ZG1 \& 0.8 \& 1.5 \& 0 \& 0.5 \& 1.5 \& 1 \& 2.5 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0.5 <br>
\hline P9 \& 4 \& 5.8 \& 3 \& 5.8 \& 5.8 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0 <br>
\hline Z11 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline ZF9 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 2 \& 2 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline X2 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline x9 \& 3 \& 3 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 5 \& 4 \& 3 \& 3 \& 0 <br>
\hline Q4 \& 6 \& 5 \& 2 \& 5 \& 3 \& 8 \& 8 \& 3 \& 3 \& 0 <br>
\hline A7 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0.6 \& 0 <br>
\hline Z9 \& 1 \& 5 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 3 \& 4 \& 3 \& 2 \& 1 <br>
\hline J4 \& 3 \& 2 \& 2 \& 2 \& 4 \& 2 \& 3 \& 3 \& 2 \& 0 <br>
\hline V2 \& 1 \& 3 \& 0 \& 2 \& 3 \& 0 \& 3 \& 3 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline ZF3 \& 0 \& 4 \& 0 \& 0 \& 3 \& 0 \& 3 \& 3 \& 2 \& 0 <br>
\hline F3 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline A1 \& 6 \& 17 \& 3 \& 9 \& 9 \& 11 \& 19 \& 14 \& 11 \& 23 <br>
\hline X8 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline ZA1 \& 1 \& 3 \& 2 \& 3 \& 3 \& 3 \& 3 \& 2 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline S9 \& 4 \& 7 \& 0 \& 2 \& 2 \& 3 \& 4 \& 4 \& 3 \& 0 <br>
\hline G6 \& 4.0 \& 12.0 \& 2 \& 13 \& 11.0 \& 8 \& 13 \& 10 \& 6 \& 5 <br>
\hline Z13 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline D5 \& 0 \& 12 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 4 \& 4 \& 0 <br>
\hline P8 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline X4 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0 \& 2 \& 0 \& 5 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline A2 \& 2 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 6 \& 2 \& 3 \& 2 \& 2 \& 0 <br>
\hline G1 \& 1 \& 9 \& 0.5 \& 8 \& 5.5 \& 7 \& 9 \& 9 \& 3 \& 10 <br>
\hline H8 \& 1 \& 2 \& 0 \& 2 \& 3 \& 2 \& 4 \& 3 \& 2 \& 3 <br>
\hline C4 \& 3 \& 8 \& 2 \& 2 \& 4 \& 7 \& 16 \& 10 \& 5 \& 0 <br>
\hline H4 \& 1 \& 0.6 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0.8 \& 1 \& 3 \& 3 \& 0 \& 0 <br>
\hline Z3 \& 1 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 0 \& 2 \& 1 \& 1 \& 0 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

| U7 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F7 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| E9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| K2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| S7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| G4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| M6 | 1 | 17 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 15 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 21 |
| ZF6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Y1 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| ZA2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| G5 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 6 | 2 | 0 |
| T3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z4 | 0.2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| K4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ZB4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| S1 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| ZB8 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| D3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Z12 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| ZJ4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| ZJ5 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Y2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0.0 |
| W4 | 1.0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| ZD2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| P3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| R2 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| P6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| M4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ZG8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ZC7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| N4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| X1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 |
| B9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| V1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 2.0 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3.0 | 1 |
| X7 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 |
| ZE9 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| ZJ6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| T8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| D7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 0 |
| S3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| C2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZB3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| U1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| ZG9 | 2 |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Z1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| ZA4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| ZH3 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Z16 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| B3 |  |  |  | 6 |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |
| G3 |  | 3 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |
| D1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| Y8 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| N6 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  |
| S4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| E5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Z8 |  | 3 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 1 | 1 |  |
| K1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  |
| H7 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| ZE6 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| Y9 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 |  |




| zB8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1.4 | 0 | 1.4 | 9.6\% | 51.9\% | 9.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.0\% | 27.3\% | 27.3\% |
| Z12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% |
| z2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% |
| z15 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7.1\% | 28.6\% | 35.7\% |
| Y2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0\% | 21.0\% | 34.3\% |
| w4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0.0\% | 41.2\% | 17.6\% |
| ZD2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 44.4\% | 22.2\% |
| P3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 25.0\% |
| R2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8.3\% | 25.0\% | 33.3\% |
| P6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 33.3\% |
| M4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| ZG8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% |
| ZC7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 23.1\% | 30.8\% |
| N4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 30.4\% | 19.0\% |
| x 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 41.7\% |
| B9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |
| v1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% | 28.0\% | 40.0\% |
| X7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 13.3\% |
| ZE9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 30.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Z16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% |
| T8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 13.0\% | 8.7\% |
| D7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 12 | 1 | 13 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 0 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.0\% | 26.7\% | 15.6\% |
| S3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.0\% | 38.9\% | 27.8\% |
| C2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% |
| ZB3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 40.0\% | 30.0\% |
| U1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 43.8\% | 25.0\% |
| ZG9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0.0\% | 46.2\% | 7.7\% |
| Z1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 40.0\% |
| ZA4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 22.7\% | 54.5\% | 31.8\% |
| ZH3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 27.3\% | 9.1\% |
| Z16 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% |
| B3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 27.5\% | 31.4\% |
| G3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 22.2\% |
| D1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 30.0\% |
| Y8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0.0\% | 30.0\% | 35.0\% |
| N6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 41.7\% |
| S4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.5\% | 15.9\% | 40.9\% |
| E5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0.0\% | 54.5\% | 18.2\% |
| T1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 9.1\% | 18.2\% |
| z8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 22.2\% |
| K1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 12.5\% | 50.0\% | 31.3\% |
| H7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 57.1\% |
| ZE6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 33.3\% |
| Y9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 14.3\% |
| T2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.1\% | 18.8\% | 28.1\% |
| ZG2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 30.8\% | 30.8\% |
| ZD7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 41.7\% | 29.1\% |
| н9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 33.3\% |
| ZC2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 60.0\% | 20.0\% |
| R7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 11.1\% |
| v9 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.2\% | 12.9\% | 19.4\% |
| ZH2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 50.0\% |
| ZG4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 15.4\% | 38.5\% |
| J3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 33.3\% |
| P7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 12 | 4 | 16 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 32.1\% |
| L6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% |
| E4 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 4.4 | 15.4 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 4.8\% | 12.1\% | 20.3\% |
| S2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 12.5\% | 31.3\% |
| H3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 41.2\% | 32.7\% |
| zH8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 51.7\% | 48.3\% |
| ZH9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% | 34.1\% | 28.6\% |
| ZD8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 42.1\% | 21.1\% |
| 213 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 19.0\% | 9.5\% |
| V8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 33.3\% |
| Z11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 22.2\% |
| ZD1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0.0\% | 44.4\% | 44.4\% |
| ZD4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% |
| w6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0.0\% | 30.8\% | 11.5\% |
| D6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 44.4\% |
| ZA8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 46.4\% |
| V3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4 | 0.0\% | 23.5\% | 35.3\% |
| N7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 10.0\% | 20.0\% |
| E3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% |
| zB4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 20.8\% |
| к3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.0\% | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |


| S8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 57.1\% | 28.6\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 22.2\% |
| ZH1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% |
| 217 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 28.6\% |
| ป8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 15.4\% | 7.7\% |
| T7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 60.0\% | 0.0\% |


| Participant | 4.4 Buildin In the last <br> 4.4.1 <br> Direct employees that left | g Control Sta <br> 12 months th <br> 4.4.2 <br> Direct employees left and were replaced | ff: Respect <br> at data wa <br> 4.4.3 <br> Number of <br> direct <br> employees <br> hired | for People <br> available: <br> 4.4.4 <br> Total number of working days lost due to sickness absence across all direct employees | 4.4.5 <br> Total number of training days provided for direct employees | 4.4 .6 <br> Number of direct employess covered by Investors in People recognition | Staff turnover <br> Number of direct employees replaced during the year divided by number of direct employees | Sickness absence <br> Average number of days lost per employee | Training <br> Average number of days per direct employee | Investors in People <br> Proportion of direct employees covered by liP commitment \& recognition |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lowest 10\% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0 | 2 | 0.0 | 0\% | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0\% |
| Lowest 25\% | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 5 | 6 | 0.0 | 0\% | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0\% |
| Median | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 15 | 21 | 0.0 | 0\% | 1.7 | 2.6 | 0\% |
| Highest 25\% | 1.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 45 | 48 | 6.8 | 0\% | 3.9 | 4.0 | 100\% |
| Highest 10\% | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 90 | 117 | 11.1 | 13\% | 6.7 | 8.2 | 100\% |
| \# of observations | 139 | 138 | 139 | 138 | 137 | 139 | 140 | 138 | 137 | 140 |
| mean | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.9 | 35.6 | 47.4 | 4.1 | 4.0\% | 2.7 | 4.2 | 35.0\% |
| x5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 52 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.50 | 13.0 | 0\% |
| Q6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.25 | 0.8 | 0\% |
| x3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| Z22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.25 | 0.8 | 0\% |
| 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| E1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 14.5 | 41 | 0 | 13.0\% | 1.88 | 5.3 | 0\% |
| K6 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 0 | 25.0\% | 1.00 | 0.8 | 0\% |
| L3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 54 | 120 | 0 | 11.5\% | 2.08 | 4.6 | 0\% |
| D8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.5 | 20 | 5.0 | 0.0\% | 1.25 | 3.3 | 83\% |
| L4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 58 | 0 | 0.0\% | 7.08 | 8.9 | 0\% |
| H6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 50 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.50 | 2.5 | 0\% |
| G7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 26.5 | 0 | 16.7\% | 1.83 | 4.4 | 0\% |
| 219 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| R5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 2.0 | 0\% |
| U9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 0.8 | 0\% |
| ZG1 | 0 | 1 | 2.6 | 1.5 | 120 | 0 | 29\% | 0.44 | 35.3 | 0\% |
| P9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 21.75 | 0 | 0\% | 0.74 | 3.2 | 0\% |
| Z11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| ZF9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0\% | 0.00 | 2.5 | 0\% |
| x2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0\% | 0.00 | 1.3 | 0\% |
| $\times 9$ | 1 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 7.1\% | 1.07 | 1.7 | 0\% |
| Q4 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 142 | 235 | 0 | 2.4\% | 3.38 | 5.6 | 0\% |
| A7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0\% | 1.64 | 1.6 | 0\% |
| Z9 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 82.5 | 48 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4.58 | 2.7 | 0\% |
| 14 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 20 | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 2.00 | 0.5 | 0\% |
| V2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.40 | 0.4 | 0\% |
| ZF3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.0 | 72 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.40 | 7.2 | 0\% |
| F3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 58 | 0 | 0\% | 2.88 | 7.3 | 0\% |
| A1 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 24 | 417 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.65 | 11.3 | 0\% |
| X8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0\% | 0.70 | 0.1 | 0\% |
| ZA1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.50 | 1.8 | 0\% |
| S9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.50 | 0.5 | 0\% |
| G6 | 8 | 6 | 13 | 74 | 36 | 0 | 11.3\% | 1.40 | 0.7 | 0\% |
| 213 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| D5 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 164 | 0 | 50.0\% | 1.50 | 16.4 | 0\% |
| P8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| x8 | 10 | 10 | 12 | 4 | 86 | 0 | 100.0\% | 0.40 | 8.6 | 0\% |
| A2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.33 | 1.0 | 0\% |
| G1 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 111.5 | 52 | 0 | 6.8\% | 2.90 | 1.4 | 0\% |
| H8 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 22.2\% | 1.00 | 0.8 | 0\% |
| C4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 86.0 | 23 | 0 | 4.0\% | 3.44 | 0.9 | 0\% |
| H4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 48.07 | 0 | 0.0\% | 2.82 | 4.4 | 0\% |
| z3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 1.0 | 0\% |
| U7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 35 | 0 | 33.3\% | 0.89 | 3.9 | 0\% |
| F7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.43 | 0.6 | 0\% |
| E9 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 0 | 33.3\% | 0.00 | 3.3 | 0\% |
| K2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.00 | 3.0 | 0\% |
| S7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 1.1 | 0\% |
| G4 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 17 | 18 | 0 | 11.1\% | 1.89 | 2.0 | 0\% |
| M6 | 5 | 4 | 12 | 110 | 200 | 0 | 5.6\% | 1.55 | 2.8 | 0\% |
| ZF6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 2.0 | 0\% |
| Y1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 25 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.44 | 2.8 | 0\% |
| ZA2 | 0 | 0 | 2.5 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 2.5 | 0\% |


| G5 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 45 | 455 | 0 | 4.9\% | 0.74 | 7.5 | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T3 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  | 0\% |
| Z4 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 48 | 18.7 | 0.0\% | 1.60 | 2.6 | 100\% |
| K4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.70 | 1.4 | 0\% |
| ZB4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 4.8 | 0.0\% | 5.83 | 4.2 | 100\% |
| S1 | 8.5 | 1.5 | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 3.6\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| ZB8 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  | 6 | 0.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| D3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 24 | 0 | 20.0\% | 1.20 | 2.4 | 0\% |
| Z12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.56 | 3.0 | 0\% |
| Z14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 4.0 | 0\% |
| Z15 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 28 | 10 | 20.0\% | 0.80 | 2.8 | 100\% |
| Y2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 108.5 | 45 | 14.3 | 0.0\% | 7.59 | 3.1 | 100\% |
| W4 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 6 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.18 | 0.4 | 0\% |
| ZD2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.67 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| P3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 35 | 12 | 8.3\% | 0.58 | 2.9 | 100\% |
| R2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 215 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.25 | 17.9 | 0\% |
| P6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 102 | 5.82 | 0.0\% | 1.03 | 17.5 | 100\% |
| M4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 5.25 | 1.3 | 0\% |
| ZG8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 | 25 | 6.2 | 0.0\% | 5.65 | 4.0 | 100\% |
| ZC7 | 4 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 178.5 | 13.5 | 0 | 20.0\% | 14.28 | 1.1 | 0\% |
| N4 | 0.5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 3.95 | 0.0\% | 0.51 | 3.8 | 100\% |
| X1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 80 | 50 | 0 | 8.3\% | 6.67 | 4.2 | 0\% |
| B9 | 0.33 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 17 | 3.33 | 0.0\% | 8.41 | 5.1 | 100\% |
| V1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 71 | 24.8 | 0.0\% | 3.19 | 2.9 | 100\% |
| X7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.44 | 0.9 | 0\% |
| ZE9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 120 | 11.63 | 0.0\% | 6.28 | 10.3 | 100\% |
| Z]6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 2.50 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| T8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 90 | 12 | 0.0\% | 1.91 | 7.8 | 100\% |
| D7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 200 |  | 42 | 0.0\% | 4.76 |  | 100\% |
| S3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 32 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4.22 | 1.8 | 0\% |
| C2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 42 | 6.0 | 0.0\% | 3.00 | 7.0 | 100\% |
| ZB3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 18 | 9 | 8 | 0.0\% | 2.14 | 1.1 | 100\% |
| U1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0.0\% | 0.00 | 0.4 | 100\% |
| ZG9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 100 | 50 | 0 | 6.9\% | 6.90 | 3.4 | 0\% |
| Z1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0.0 | 16.7\% | 2.33 | 0.0 | 0\% |
| ZA4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.70 | 0.7 | 0\% |
| ZH3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 102 | 15 | 9 | 0.0\% | 11.33 | 1.7 | 100\% |
| 216 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 10 | 3.0 | 0.0\% | 1.40 | 2.0 | 60\% |
| B3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 40 | 10 | 0.0\% | 1.18 | 3.9 | 100\% |
| G3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 15 | 9 | 0.0\% | 1.67 | 1.7 | 100\% |
| D1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 19 | 11 | 0.0\% | 1.45 | 1.7 | 100\% |
| Y8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151.0 | 30 | 0 | 0.0\% | 9.74 | 1.9 | 0\% |
| N6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 89 | 0.0 | 0.0\% | 5.00 | 7.4 | 0\% |
| S4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 126 | 150 | 22 | 0.0\% | 5.73 | 6.8 | 100\% |
| E5 | 2 |  | 1.0 | 63 | 5 | 8 | 0.0\% | 8.40 | 0.7 | 100\% |
| T1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 12 | 11 | 0.0\% | 1.36 | 1.1 | 100\% |
| 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 8 | 0 | 0.0\% | 2.20 | 0.8 | 0\% |
| K1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 112 | 14.1 | 7.1\% | 0.57 | 7.9 | 100\% |
| H7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 26 | 9.4 | 0.0\% | 3.40 | 2.8 | 100\% |
| ZE6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 17 | 10 | 0.0\% | 4.50 | 1.7 | 100\% |
| Y9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 408 | 0.0 | 0.0\% | 1.64 | 60.9 | 0\% |
| T2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 223 | 72 | 25 | 0.0\% | 8.97 | 2.9 | 100\% |
| ZG2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 26 | 25 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.99 | 2.0 | 0\% |
| 2D7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 115 | 10 | 0.0\% | 7.67 | 11.2 | 100\% |
| н9 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6.0 | 16.7\% | 0.00 | 0.0 | 100\% |
| ZC2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 30 | 10 | 0.0\% | 1.56 | 3.1 | 99\% |
| R7 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 51.5 | 30 | 0 | 12.5\% | 6.44 | 3.8 | 0\% |
| v9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 60 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.60 | 4.8 | 0\% |
| zH2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22.0 | 40 | 10 | 0.0\% | 2.20 | 4.0 | 100\% |
| ZG4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 7 | 0.0\% | 1.85 | 2.3 | 100\% |
| 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 23 | 9.0 | 0.0\% | 2.44 | 2.6 | 100\% |
| P7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 57 | 400 | 28 | 0.0\% | 2.05 | 14.3 | 100\% |
| L6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 20.0 | 21 | 7.00 | 0.0\% | 2.86 | 3.0 | 100\% |
| E4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 547 | 178 | 41 | 0.0\% | 13.21 | 4.3 | 100\% |
| S2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 56 | 48 | 0.0 | 0.0\% | 3.50 | 3.0 | 0\% |
| H3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 18 | 0 | 0.0\% | 5.88 | 2.4 | 0\% |
| zH8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 22 | 6 | 0.0\% | 2.07 | 2.5 | 68\% |
| ZH9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 27 | 9 | 0.0\% | 0.59 | 3.0 | 100\% |
| ZD8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 10 | 9.0 | 0.0\% | 1.67 | 1.1 | 100\% |
| Z13 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 4.8\% | 0.71 | 0.5 | 0\% |
| V8 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 47 | 32 | 0 | 0.0\% | 3.92 | 2.7 | 0\% |
| Z11 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 49 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4.75 | 4.9 | 0\% |
| ZD1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 14.3\% | 0.29 | 0.3 | 0\% |


| ZD4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 14 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.00 |  | 2.8 | 0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| W6 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 98 | 68 | 26 | 3.8\% | 3.77 |  | 2.6 | 100\% |
| D6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 30 | 8 | 0.0\% | 4.52 |  | 3.6 | 95\% |
| ZA8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4.91 | , | 3.6 | 0\% |
| V3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 32 | 20 | 0 | 12.7\% | 2.04 |  | 1.3 | 0\% |
| N7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 16 | 10 | 0.0\% | 5.80 |  | 1.6 | 100\% |
| E3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 82 | 0 | 0.0\% | 9.00 |  | 13.7 | 0\% |
| ZB4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 20 | 0 | 0.0\% | 5.83 |  | 4.2 | 0\% |
| K3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4.00 |  | 2.0 | 0\% |
| S8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 186 | 7.0 | 0.0\% | 2.57 | , | 26.6 | 100\% |
| C6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 | 6 | 8 | 0.0\% | 4.93 |  | 0.8 | 99\% |
| ZH1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 20 | 5.0 | 0.0\% | 9.40 |  | 4.0 | 100\% |
| Z77 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 25 | 6.2 | 0.0\% | 2.26 |  | 4.0 | 100\% |
| Z18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 | 30 | 13 | 0.0\% | 10.38 |  | 2.3 | 100\% |
| T7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.80 |  | 1.2 | 0\% |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The mean proportions of service and technical complaints sum to slightly less than the mean proportion of total complaints, this is due to complaints that were not classified as being relating to service or technical.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ For example: A part time employee who worked 3 days a week would be counted as 0.6 .

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ Age bands 51-54 and 55-60 have been combined to aid visual comparison.

