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# Introduction

## Quality Check Methodology

It is the responsibility of managers to examine each item that features on a Quality Scoresheet and to mark the Quality Scoresheet accordingly.

“Below Standard” markings must be followed by corrective action.

The associated quality Score sheets under-pin the Quality of Personal Workmanship programme which is the Openreach approved method of operation.

## Quality Statement

Each person will do the job right first time in accordance with the defined quality standards. By letting our people know how well they are doing, and by coaching them where appropriate, we can help them to improve.

This ISIS is reviewed and updated annually. Between reviews changes are communicated using Access Engineering Communications (AEC) or Planning Reliability Instructions (PRI’s). Users should refer to the current AEC & PRI listings for latest information and change to this ISIS. These can be found at:

[Technical Library](https://intra.bt.com/bt/openreach/our-organisation/service-design/chief-engineer/network-evolution/interface-team/organisation-network_reliability_home_page/aei_library/Pages/index.aspx)

# Status

The procedures set out in this document are mandatory for Openreach people working in the Access Network under the requirements set out in the Openreach Quality Standards.

# Scope

This Document applies to all Openreach people working in the Access Network. The scoresheets referred to in this document are for the Quality of Personal Workmanship programme only. However the FPQ system supports scoresheets for other work areas such as the Safety System and Core Networks, all of which work on the same principle. For detailed information on other users refer to the system or project owner for the relevant work area.

# Scoresheets

Current approved Scoresheets are listed in an index on both the Network Reliability intranet site and the FPQ systems site at the following address:

[FPQ](http://dyl00509app02.nat.bt.com:61138/cdsd/www_startup.startup)

New blank copies of the latest issue of Scoresheets can be obtained directly from the FPQ system. This can be achieved by selecting “Check Management” from the menu and then selecting “Blank Scoresheet”. There is an “On screen” help assists in the selection and printing process. The FPQ system is the definitive source for all Scoresheets.

All other Scoresheets should be withdrawn from use and made waste.

1. This is currently only available to those users with an input profile.

# Principles of the System

## Types of Quality Scoresheet

Quality Scoresheets have been designed as a controlled way of assessing work against the Quality Standards. The Quality Scoresheets have been split into different types to simplify their use as much as possible. In progress and retrospective checks use different Quality Scoresheets to recognise the different items to be checked.

## Item definitions

Each item identified for inclusion in the check will be given a points grading based upon the definitions below:-

### Critical - 10 point item

Where the plant item worked on or observed at the worksite has been left in a defective or unsafe condition (as defined in relevant specifications or standards) that is likely to / will adversely affect network performance and reliability, have a potential to cause loss of customer service or compromises legislative requirements

The full contractual definition is shown below:

The term CD refers to Quality check issues where a failure to meet the required Standard would result in any of the following:

* Health & Safety of operatives and/or 3rd parties at risk
* Agreed standard compromised such that network performance is likely to be affected
* Product and/or process not compliant with customer requirements resulting in one or more of the following:
* Commercial or legislative requirement
* Openreach licence likely to be compromised

### Major - 5 point item

Where the plant item worked on or observed at the worksite has been left in a defective condition (as defined in relevant specifications or standards) that may affect the integrity of the network or quality related information has not been provided in accordance with requirements.

### Minor - 1 point item

Where the plant item worked on or observed at the worksite has been left in a defective condition (as defined in relevant specifications or standards) and is not classed as a critical or major defect and will not affect the integrity of the network.

### Data - 0 point item

Where information and data is being gathered to assess compliance. This may be at an initial assessment stage, during a notice period prior to introducing a higher graded defect or a permanently agreed state.

## Score Points for Quality

There is a point score allocation for each item checked with each item being marked “Checked OK”, “Not Checked” or “Below Standard”. Defects have been assigned as 0, 1, 5 or 10 points to reflect their relative importance, with the 10 point or Critical Defect (CD) being given against items that have a potential to cause loss of customer service. The quality score for a Quality Scoresheet is arrived at by applying the following formula:-

QS (%) = Checked OK Points /Checked OK + Below Standard Points X 100

1. “Not Checked” items are excluded from this calculation.

## Scoresheets with "Below Standard" Markings

When a scoresheet contains a “Below Standard” mark for a 10 point item, all marks for other items checked, even if they were marked “Checked OK”, will be assigned to the “Below Standard” points total by the FPQ software. In addition to this, all other Scoresheets bearing the same job number will attract “below standard” points in the same way.

The principle behind this is that a failure on a key quality item has a critical effect on network reliability or customer service. It must therefore have an equivalent impact on the quality score that is available for discussion between team member and manager.

## Defects identified on In-Progress Checks

Where managers, undertaking in progress checks, discover an item which contravenes the quality standard the Scoresheet should always be marked as “Below Standard”.

The defect or short fall should then be dealt with in an appropriate manner. The scoresheet should not be amended or completed as Checked OK even if the defect was put right at the time. This will defeat a key objective of the process in providing a true historical representation of an individual’s performance.

## Partial use of Scoresheets, and the use of the "Not Checked" Marking

Managers may wish to do a partial check, or to focus on a particular item, for instance, aspects of joint closure, without doing a full, formal check. There is no need to record checks of specific items within FPQ, although these findings should be communicated to the team member concerned. If a Quality Scoresheet is used in addition to the programmed checks, and input to FPQ, all the items on the Quality Scoresheet must be marked, or the measures will be distorted.

1. The Quality Check MIS produces reports to compare “Not Checked” levels across management units, both by the number of items checked and by points value.
2. “Not checked” is a valid mark to assign in many cases. However, management will wish to analyse and investigate unusual levels of “Not Checked”.

# Safety

Quality Scoresheets also address safety elements of a task, recognising that all jobs must be done safely. This is in addition to SMS. When a safety problem is observed, it must be captured on the “Comments” part of the Quality Scoresheet, and tracked to resolution. Safety problems must always be recorded, even if corrected at the time.

# Quality Inspection Data Recording For Manager’s

## Check Frequency

The FPQ system should be used by manager’s to record quality of personal work data collected through quality inspections carried out by manager’s or coaches.

There are no set limits on the volume or regularity of checks that should be carried out against each team member or work activity. All managers are required to undertake sufficient checks to meet their objective of improving quality of personal work in their team. Examples of scenarios where it may be appropriate to conduct a quality inspection are high repeat reports, poor/rising fault volumes, early life failures, customer contact etc.

Managers should ensure that Quality Inspections are carried out in line with agreed development plans and actions in team members 1:1’s. Where a manager recognises that it is appropriate for a Quality inspection to be conducted, the results should be recorded within the FPQ system.

* Feedback on Quality Inspection results should be shared at 1:1’s.
* Feedback on sub-standard work practices should be followed up with specific Development Actions, recorded via the 1:1 notes system on the BT Intranet.
* All identified Quality issues must have an assessment trail to demonstrate future compliance.
* Where a higher management team choose to set the volume and frequency of checks to be undertaken they should be documented in the various levels of managements Quality/Business Plan.

## Inputting Scoresheets

The managers should enter the data directly into FPQ system or complete paper copies of the Quality Scoresheet and forward them to their input duty.

1. All checks for the current month must be entered on to the system no later than 10 days after the calendar month end, as the data at the month is then locked and published as complete for the month.

# How to Complete the Scoresheet

## Which Scoresheet should be Used?

Preferably, managers should check all aspects of the work performed. A check of only part of the job will conform to requirements, but over time, all aspects of work performed should be covered.

To carry out a complete check of a job will often mean completion of more than one Quality Scoresheet. For example, a new provide, where new external cable is required from the DP and access is available, would require the following Quality Scoresheets to be used for a full in-progress check -

Quality Scoresheet No 540 - "D Side Provision O/H in progress"

Quality Scoresheet No 507 - "Internal Repair and Provision - in progress"

Should there be no dial tone at the DP, and a visit to the PCP/SCP is needed to complete the job, Quality Scoresheet No 558 "Quality Work - PCP/SCP in progress" may also be completed.

The above example shows how managers may "mix and match" Quality Scoresheets in this way if they wish to check the quality of all aspects of a job.

## Worked Example

The completion of the scoresheets is described above. Most of the items - OUC, date etc., are self-explanatory. For each quality check item you should place a tick in one of the "Checked OK"/"Not Checked"/"Below Standard" boxes as appropriate.

If an item is not checked, for instance if the fault report is not a repeat report, a tick should be placed in the "Not Checked" column. If an item is below standard, details must feature in the "Comments" area of the form. Corrective action, if indicated, must be traceable.

## POI Failures on Retrospective Checks

Where a retrospective check is carried out using Point Of Intervention (POI) notes to locate the work, and the POI is either incorrect or non-existent to the point that the exact location cannot be determined by an on-site check. No further checks should be carried out on the job. The Scoresheet is marked below standard against “Work Location Information insufficient to identify the work site” G1001 and corrective action should be taken up with team member responsible.

Where the location of the work is found despite errors in the POI, again the check sheet should be marked “Below Standard” against item code A2128 but in this case the remainder of the scoresheet should be completed as normal.

## Job Numbers

Checking managers should be sure to enter the job numbers on each page of a Quality Scoresheet. In the case of external scheme work or similar - where a job may take a week to complete - work positions may be used instead of jobs. In the case of scheme work by gangs it is necessary to enter a job number that ensures that the part of the job being checked is considered as separate for scoring purposes. If estimate numbers are used without modification, a 10 point failure by one team member would fail the entire estimate. Job numbers for that type of work should therefore be input as follows:-

e.g. “123456ABC011911”. The first six digits are the last six digits of the estimate number, or a work position identifier. In this case “123456” is from estimate number LDCB7123456, the last five digits of the team member CSS ID, in this case “ABC01” from SWABC01, and the day and month 1911 for November 19th.

A maximum of 15 characters may be used.

## Comments

Comments on checks carried out should be recorded at the foot of the form in the box provided. Managers should remember to include what was good as well as what could have been better. Both need to be recognised and discussed by the team member and manager. Use of these comments - and corrective action - is further discussed below.

# Use of Results

## Recognising Good Work - and Putting Problems Right

Team members need feedback from the checks soon after they have occurred and the Manager must ensure that balanced feedback is given.

There will be times when the example set by a team member can improve the work of all the team or times when there is a need for some sort of future action by team members to improve their Quality of Personal Workmanship. Corrective action procedures should be used if a problem is not resolved by manager and team member together.

# Control and Update of Scoresheets

The Quality Scoresheets in FPQ will be regularly updated to take account of process and practice change.

# System Assessment

To ensure that this system is being consistently applied, and to follow up suspected abuse, independent assessments of field work carried out will take place. Abuse of the quality check system has a direct effect on the quality of BT's service offering and will be treated as a serious matter.

# Enquiries & Information

Enquiries and further information on FPQ and Network Reliability can be found in the

[Technical Library](https://intra.bt.com/bt/openreach/our-organisation/service-design/chief-engineer/network-evolution/interface-team/organisation-network_reliability_home_page/aei_library/Pages/index.aspx)

Specific enquiries and document change requests relating to this document should be sent to the Author of this document.
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