### **Correlation Heatmap – Operational Metrics vs CSAT / ASAT / FCR**

**Key Insights**

* **Agent productivity metrics are highly interrelated:**
  + **Occupancy ↔ Utilization = 0.99** (almost perfect).
  + **Hold Time ↔ Occupancy = 0.85**, **Hold Time ↔ Utilization = 0.90** → long holds happen when agents are heavily loaded.
  + **SLA ↔ ACW Time = 0.92**, **SLA ↔ Hold Time = 0.43** → service level performance depends on wrap-up and hold durations.
* **Customer experience linkage:**
  + **CSAT ↔ ASAT = 0.77 (strong positive).**
  + **CSAT ↔ FCR = 0.73 (strong).**
  + **ASAT ↔ FCR = 0.70 (strong).** → Satisfied, well-supported agents and higher first-call resolution strongly lift customer satisfaction.
* **AHT (Average Handle Time):**
  + Shows **little to negative** correlation with CSAT (≈ –0.15) and ASAT (≈ –0.23).  
     → Longer calls don’t automatically drive satisfaction; efficient resolution matters more.
* **Operational load vs satisfaction:**
  + **Occupancy/Utilization show near-zero correlation with CSAT/ASAT/FCR.** → High workload alone doesn’t predict satisfaction — quality of resolution is the key driver.

**Recommendations**

* **Focus on FCR and agent enablement** rather than just reducing AHT — resolving on first call is a stronger lever for CSAT/ASAT.
* **Optimize wrap-up & hold times** to improve SLA without harming satisfaction.
* **Use high ASAT performers as role models:** strong link between ASAT and both CSAT/FCR suggests coaching & engagement drive better outcomes.
* **Monitor workload but don’t equate high utilization with quality** — invest in knowledge tools & better processes rather than simply pushing productivity.

💬 **Talking point for the client:**

“This heat