

Customer Centricity: NPS Interview Report

Felix	Felix Roth, Metro
NPS	7
Engagement	Consulting
Interview Date	25.11.25

Interview Report

Overview	<p>Felix is the Compensation & Benefits Director at Metro, responsible for global compensation frameworks, expat policies, executive rewards, and setting group-wide compensation guidelines. They engaged Korn Ferry for its job evaluation methodology and market data, having selected them over other large firms based on colleague familiarity with the system and its global use.</p> <p>Overall, the methodology itself is viewed as workable, and the relationship with the Korn Ferry team has been positive - with strong responsiveness and a good working rapport. However, aspects of the engagement were made difficult by internal project changes, which Felix acknowledged were driven by Metro's own shifting plans rather than by Korn Ferry.</p> <p>Some limitations were noted with the market data outputs, particularly relating to how bonus-paying versus non-bonus-paying companies are shown in benchmarking. Felix also expressed a desire for more modern or interactive training and tools. They would consider using Korn Ferry again depending on context.</p>
What Went Well	<p>Positive working relationship and responsiveness. Felix described strong rapport and trust with the Korn Ferry team. <i>"With the colleagues of the team... I get very well... they are very responsive, and I don't have feelings that... you cannot trust them."</i></p> <p>Methodology broadly acceptable and workable. The job evaluation approach itself is considered functional for most use cases. <i>"Grading methodology is fine for me, so it's okay. You can deal with it."</i></p> <p>Team met expectations despite changing internal requirements. Korn Ferry continued to support the project even as Metro substantially altered scope and responsibilities. <i>"We changed the project goals many times... it was very, very complicated to Korn Ferry... I cannot say something bad... it was more our chaotic project style."</i></p> <p>Contact praised for service quality. One individual was singled out for highly responsive and up-to-date delivery. <i>"My contact... I [find] extremely responsive and very up to date on the point."</i></p>
Challenges/ Pain Points	<p>Benchmarking outputs lacked specific filters Felix needed. Felix found limitations in how market data could differentiate companies that pay bonuses from those that don't. <i>"I miss... very specific aspects... I cannot say"</i></p>

	<p><i>I don't want to see only companies who pay a bonus... sometimes I'm not happy with this kind of data submission."</i></p> <p>Difficulty benchmarking roles with functional vs hierarchical leadership. Certain organisational structures were harder to reflect within the methodology. <i>"Many people have functional leadership roles in comparison with hierarchical... can be difficult."</i></p> <p>No suitable or affordable grading tool provided. Felix created their own tool due to dissatisfaction with available options. <i>"I've also created a grading tool by ourselves, because they don't provide one which is very useful or not too expensive."</i></p> <p>Desire for more modern or interactive training. Felix felt the learning materials could be more contemporary or engaging. <i>"I would wish to have something like more interactive... a nice movie and e-learning would also be helpful... could be a bit more modern."</i></p>
Gaps Identified (raised by interviewee)	<p>Ability to filter market data by bonus-paying vs non-bonus-paying companies, described as a significant gap for accurate benchmarking.</p> <p>More modern and accessible training formats, e-learning or multimedia preferred.</p> <p>Availability of a practical, cost-effective grading tool, currently missing.</p> <p>Methodological limitations for project organisations and mixed reporting structures.</p>
Key Themes	<p>Methodology is acceptable, but improvements would increase usability. The system works but has clear limitations for specific organisational contexts.</p> <p>Data flexibility is a key need. The ability to customise benchmarking groups, especially regarding bonus practices, is important and currently insufficient.</p> <p>Service experience was positive despite internal complexity. Responsiveness and trust were strong, even when Felix's own shifting project requirements made delivery more difficult.</p> <p>Training and tools feel outdated. There is appetite for more modern, user-friendly learning and tooling.</p> <p>Brand reputation was not a decisive factor. Selection was driven more by familiarity and global usage than by brand perception.</p>
Actions & Recommendations	<p>Enhance market data configurability. Introduce clearer filters for bonus-paying vs non-bonus-paying companies.</p> <p>Develop more modern training formats. Consider e-learning, short videos, or interactive modules to improve accessibility.</p> <p>Explore offering a practical, affordable grading tool. Address the gap that led Felix to build their own internal version.</p>

Provide guidance addressing functional vs hierarchical leadership complexities. Offer examples or advisory notes on how to handle such roles within the methodology.

Continue strong responsiveness and relationship-building. This was a highly valued aspect of the experience and should remain consistent.