

QSP007 - Procedure for Complaints Issue 05

1. Introduction

For the purposes of this procedure a complaint is defined as;

“An expression of dissatisfaction, however made, by one or more clients about Adrian Thomas Building Control Ltd, lack of action or about the standard of the service”

This definition will cover complaints such as:

- * Failure to provide a service at the right time or to the standard expected
- * Failure to fulfill statutory responsibilities
- * Failure to implement a decision
- * Failure to comply with the Code of Conduct for Approved Inspectors
- * Failure to comply with the Building Control Performance Standards
- * Failure to comply with ATBC Internal policies or procedures
- * Failure to take proper account of relevant matters in coming to a decision
- * Dissatisfaction with an answer to a query or a response to a request for a service
- * Discourtesy or unacceptable behaviour by a member of staff or consultant
- * Harassment, bias, or, unfair discrimination

This Complaints Procedure does **NOT** deal with:

- * A Building Regulation technical assessment
- * A misunderstanding or dissatisfaction with the minimum standard set by the Building Regulations
- * A decision of an ATBC where regulatory powers are being exercised
- * Unsubstantiated criticisms of the scope or context of the ATBC service
- * Criticisms of quality of workmanship (outside Building Regulation requirements for materials and workmanship) or Building Warranty items
- * Criticisms which constitute a disagreement with or a refusal to accept a rule of law which the ATBC is applying
- * Complaints and / or claims made against the warranty where the building control complaints process has not been exercised
- * Criticism of decisions made by the planning authority

2. Responsibility

In the first instance the responsibility is with the Director or in his absence the Company Secretary. A register of complaints must be formulated on receipt of a complaint from any expression of dissatisfaction by a client.

3. Process

3.1 How to Make a Complaint – Stage 1

Complaints can be made verbally, by telephone, email, or, by arranging a meeting with the Director. Telephone 07515 907, 217 or 07905 846 499, buildingcontrol@me.com or buildingcontroladmin@icloud.com, post – Ellenville, Scocles Road, Minster, Sheppey, Kent. ME12 3SD.

3.2 Response to Complaint – Stage 2

At the point a complaint is received by ATBC the register must be filled in whether substantiated or not. The complaint will then be acknowledged within five working days. The complaint will be investigated, and the complainant informed of the results within ten working days. If the matter is likely to take longer to resolve than the time period specified above, the complainant will be informed in writing within the 10 day period.

3.3 Monitoring Complaints

All complaints will be entered on the complaints register. The register will contain details of response times and the result of all investigations.

4. Confidentiality

All complainants have the right to have their complaint dealt with confidentially to ensure that their privacy is protected. This is mandatory when dealing with all complaints. Customers should be advised that their complaints will be handled in a confidential manner, that they will be dealt with impartially, objectively, and, that they will suffer no adverse treatment as a result of making a complaint.

5. Outcome – Stage 3

Should a customer be unsatisfied with the resolution of a complaint then the customer shall be provided with a copy of the "Code of Conduct for Approved Inspectors as issued by the Construction Industry Council Approved Inspector Register, (CICAIR). The complainant can then pursue the complaint by referring the matter to CICAIR at 26 Store Street, London, WC1E 7BT. The decision of the CICAIR shall be final and binding on the parties involved. This Complaints Procedure does not prohibit the complainant following the procedure laid down by the RICS if required.

6. Review

Our complaints process provides for a final review of your concerns by the Director. We aim to provide a final written response to your complaint within 20 working days from the date of escalation.

A copy of all relevant details relating to your complaint will be held in a separate complaints file that we are required to maintain for a period of not less than five years.

ATBC regularly reviews its complaint data as a mechanism to improve our procedures and prevent future occurrences of the same nature.

7. Root Cause Analysis

Analysis of the root cause must now be identified by ATBC. This will enable future situations of similar nature to be avoided and prevented from a recurrence. A time line of events must be formulated.

7.1 What is a Root Cause?

- * Root causes are underlying causes
- * Root causes are those that can reasonably be identified
- * Root causes are those management has control to fix.
- * Root causes are those for which effective recommendations for preventing recurrences can be generated.

7.2 Root causes are underlying causes

The goal should be to identify specific underlying causes. The more specific ATBC can be about why an event occurred, the easier it will be to arrive at recommendations that will prevent recurrence.

7.3 Root causes are those that can reasonably be identified

Occurrence investigations must be cost beneficial. It is not practical to keep valuable staff members occupied indefinitely searching for the root causes of occurrences. Structured Root Cause Analysis (RCA) helps ATBC get the most out of the time they have invested in the investigation.

7.4 Root causes are those over which management has control

ATBC should avoid using general cause classifications such as operator error, equipment failure or external factor. Such causes are not specific enough to allow management to make effective changes. Management needs to know exactly why a failure occurred before action can be taken to prevent recurrence. We must also identify a root cause that management can influence. Severe weather is not controlled by management.

7.5 Root causes are those for which effective recommendations can be generated

Recommendations should directly address the root causes identified during the investigation. If ATBC arrives at vague recommendations such as, "Improve adherence to written policies and procedures," then they probably have not found a basic and specific enough cause and need to expend more effort in the analysis process.

7.6 Root Cause Analysis Template Data Driven Review

QSP007 – Procedure for Complaints

The following template is designed to assist in determining the underlying cause(s) of an operational failure. Asking “why” something happened, or did not happen, is the best place to start. In many cases, the most obvious cause is the “direct cause”. To determine contributing factors, ask “why” the direct cause occurred. For example, the boat sank because it had a hole in the bottom. In this example, the hole in the boat is the direct cause. In a root cause analysis, asking why is the next step. In this example, the boat had a hole because the repairperson did not know the boat had a hole that needed to be fixed. This would be a contributing factor. Asking why the repairperson did not know the boat had a hole to be fixed, we learn the root cause of the problem. The boat repair company does not have a system to track required repairs and the need to repair the hole was forgotten. Fill in the blank sections below for each category. In some cases, an individual category may not be involved. If that occurs, leave the section blank and move to the next set of questions. When complete, review your work to identify the root cause(s) for the event. The root cause(s) will become the basis for your Quality Improvement Plan.

Contributing Factor – Human Error

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	What was the human error?	
Why did that happen?	Was staff performance in the process addressed? Was staff properly qualified?	
Why did that happen?	Can orientation and training be improved?	

Contributing Factor – Staffing Levels

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	Was the staffing level appropriate? If no, did staffing issues contribute to the event?	
Why did that happen?	Did actual staffing deviate from planned staff levels at the time of the event or during times leading up to the event?	

QSP007 – Procedure for Complaints

Why did that happen?	Were there any unexpected issues or incidents that occurred at the time of the event or during key times that led up to the event? If yes, did the unexpected issue impact staffing or workload for staff? If yes, did staff believe this change in staffing or workload contribute to the event?	
----------------------	---	--

Contributing Factor – Staffing Communications

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	Was all necessary information available: when needed accurate, and complete?	
Why did that happen?	Is communication among participants adequate?	
Why did that happen?	Are there barriers to communication? Is prevention of adverse outcomes considered a high priority?	

Contributing Factor – Equipment

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	How did the equipment fail? What broke?	
Why did that happen?	What is currently being done to prevent equipment failure?	

QSP007 – Procedure for Complaints

Why did that happen?	What is currently being done to protect against a bad outcome if an equipment failure does occur?	
----------------------	---	--

Contributing Factor – Environmental

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	What environmental factors directly affected the outcome?	
Why did that happen?	Was the physical environment appropriate for the process to be carried out?	
Why did that happen?	Are systems in place to identify environmental risks? Are responses to environmental risks planned and tested?	

Contributing Factor – External Causes

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	Were there any uncontrollable external factors?	
Why did that happen?	Are they truly beyond the organizations control?	
Why did that happen?	How can we protect against them?	

Contributing Factor – Uncategorized

Level of Analysis	Questions/Factors Involved	Findings and Opportunities to improve
Why did it happen?	Were there other factors that directly influenced the outcome?	

6.7 Root Cause Analysis Template Data Driven Review

At the conclusion of the root cause analysis, the organization may start to develop a Quality Improvement Plan that addresses each identified root cause. Below, indicate the root causes that you have identified:

7. Review

This policy shall be reviewed annually unless deemed otherwise necessary.

References:

The Building (Approved Inspector) Regulations 2010

The Building Regulations 2010

Building Control Alliance Mediation Scheme Document

CICAIR Code of Conduct 2017