

Customer Centricity: NPS Interview Report

Client	Dr. Jan Stefan Scheld, Boehringer Ingelheim
NPS	9
Engagement	ES
Interview Date	05.12.25

Interview Report

Overview	<p>Jan is the Country Managing Director for Japan at Boehringer Ingelheim, a large pharmaceutical company. They have been working with Korn Ferry for the past two years across multiple individual search projects.</p> <p>The relationship originated from an existing connection with a consultant Jan had previously worked with at another firm. When she moved to Korn Ferry, they continued the relationship. The consultant was the primary factor in selecting Korn Ferry.</p> <p>Overall, Jan's experience has been consistently positive, describing the work as professional, efficient and high quality.</p>
What Went Well	<p>Strong trust and continuity with lead consultant. The decision to choose Korn Ferry was based entirely on the existing relationship with one specific consultant: "<i>I actually knew the key consultant from a different company... it was the person herself.</i>" The experience of working with her at Korn Ferry was described as comparable in quality to the experience at her previous firm: "<i>Was there any difference? - No.</i>"</p> <p>High-quality work and professionalism. Jan described the delivery and overall engagement very positively: "<i>Very good, very professional...That's why we've been keeping working with them over the past two years.</i>"</p> <p>Quality and quantity of candidates met expectations. Candidate delivery consistently met expectations: "<i>In terms of delivering quality and quantity...Yes, absolutely.</i>"</p> <p>Strong speed of execution. Speed to hire was described as: "<i>Also very good.</i>"</p> <p>Clear communication and structured project management. Jan felt informed throughout each project: "<i>Did you feel up to date and informed? - Yes, yes.</i>"</p> <p>High likelihood to reuse. Jan confirmed they would work with Korn Ferry again: "<i>Would you use them again? - Yes.</i>"</p>
Challenges/ Pain Points	<p>Loss of value when dual-consultant model was removed. Earlier in the relationship, Jan experienced a model where two consultants (from different cultural backgrounds) attended meetings. This was perceived as a meaningful differentiator. Later, Korn Ferry informed the client that due to limited capacity, they would no longer work as a pair: "<i>We got the</i></p>

	<p>message... we have limited capacity, so now we are splitting up and working individually." While the work still met expectations, the experience was not as strong: "It still worked, but it was not the same great experience as we had at the beginning."</p> <p>Reduced richness in consultation quality. Jan noted a difference when the second partner was no longer involved: "We got different quality of the consultations because obviously the second person was adding a certain perspective and value."</p> <p>Assessment tools not needed or used. Jan received access to Korn Ferry's KF4D (or similar) assessments at no cost in some cases, but did not use them: "We got that for free in some instances, but honestly, I didn't use it." The reason was simple: "It didn't need that tool, and didn't really help me in my decision making."</p>
Gaps Identified (raised by interviewee)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dual-consultant support removed over time This affected perceived value and differentiation versus competitors. • Assessment tools provided but not useful in this context Jan did not need them and did not find value in using them. • Broader consulting services not automatically transferable Jan does not assume Korn Ferry's search capabilities translate to transformation or development work. <i>"No, because that's a different skill set... I would again pitch and see who's best."</i> <p>No other specific gaps were mentioned.</p>
Key Themes	<p>2. Dual-consultant model was a differentiator. Jan explicitly stated this created added value: <i>"That was the differentiating factor... two different individuals from two different cultures."</i></p> <p>3. Strong delivery fundamentals. Across all projects, the experience was described as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • professional • high quality • timely • communicative </p> <p>4. Additional solutions only matter if they fit the immediate hiring need. Assessments were available but unused, as they did not support Jan's decision-making for these hires.</p>
Actions & Recommendations	<p>1. Reconsider the value of dual-consultant coverage where possible <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A paired model - particularly with complementary backgrounds - was explicitly cited as a unique differentiator. • Removing it reduced the perceived quality of consultation and richness of perspective. • Explore whether dual coverage can be maintained selectively in high-value markets or key accounts. </p> <p>2. Clarify when and how assessment tools add value</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provide guidance on when assessments strongly support a search versus when they may be optional.• Offer clearer framing of how tools can meaningfully inform decisions. <p>3. Maintain consistently strong communication and project execution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continue the reliable cadence, responsiveness and professionalism that the client praised. <p>4. Recognise that broader consulting services require separate positioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Jan views search and organisational consulting as distinct capabilities requiring different people.• Ensure any broader offerings are introduced by the right experts, rather than assumed transferable.
Additional Insight	<p>What clients in this context value most</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trusted individual consultants• Consistency in who leads the work• Diversity of perspective in the consultant team• Efficiency, speed and professionalism• Clear, ongoing communication throughout the process