

# Fictitious CLIENT INTERVIEW RESPONSES

*Below is a fictitious 50% project complete interview. Interviews are often conducted at multiple phases from 25% complete through 100%.*

Client: PZNG, Inc.  
Contact: Alfred Johansen, Lead PM  
Project #: 6013.331  
Project Manager: Janet Semonski  
Interview Type: 50% Project Complete

1. In terms of meeting your budget expectations, has Fictitious Firm (FF) met, not met, or exceeded your expectations? **Met**
2. Explanation.  
So far, FF is on budget for Phase 1. I have concerns, however, that the project will go over budget because of technical work done that did not seem to be needed.
3. In terms of work quality, has FF met, not met, or exceeded your expectations so far? **Met**
4. Explanation. **FF is technically competent.**
5. Regarding FF's client service (i.e., communication, response times, listening, and issue resolution), would you say FF has met, not met, or exceeded your expectations? **Not Met**
6. Explanation.  
There are actually two phases of the project and, at this point, it is not certain FF will be doing Phase 2 as originally expected. It has been challenging to reach the PM and her responses have been slow. The PM is a good person and has been an effective PM on past projects, but it appears that the project team is not focused on this project. Submittals have many typos and explanations are too confusing for the non-technical people on the board to understand. The board is the decision-making body for this project and they have concerns.
7. What rating would you give FF's project manager for his/her effectiveness in the role on the 1-10 scale with 1 being very ineffective to 10 being very effective? **6**
8. Explanation.  
The project manager was very effective on previous projects but seems to be spread too thin currently. Her project team does not appear to be focused or realize that Phase 2 is at stake.

9. What rating would you give for the effectiveness of FF's resolution to issues or concerns you have had using the 1-10 scale? **6**
10. Explanation.  
**It takes too long for an issue to be addressed. Once it is addressed, resolution is good.**
11. What rating would you give for FF's technical competency on the 1-10 scale? **9**
12. Explanation.  
**FF's technical work is always high quality, but the board chair has asked if there are other firms to work with that also do high quality work.**
13. Are there any aspects of working with FF that you view as strengths?
- Communication  Client service  Expertise  High quality  None offered
14. At this point in the project do you expect the project goals will be met? **Yes**
- 14a. If no or not sure, please explain.  
**We do not doubt that FF will complete the project as specified, but this has not been the positive experience we expected.**
15. If you were to make the decision again, would you use FF? **Not sure**
- 15a. If no or not sure about making the same decision, please explain.  
**It has become frustrating working with FF because their attentiveness and service have declined.**
16. Can you offer any suggestions for ways FF could be serving you better?
- In the project kick-off meeting, we emphasized that responses to our questions and concerns must be timely for updates to the board. At first FF was very responsive, but now response times have diminished greatly. FF must return to their previous high standard of client service. More face-to-face meetings would also be appreciated.**
17. Would you recommend FF to a colleague? **Not sure**
- 17a. If no or not sure about recommending, please explain.  
**FF is still doing high quality technical work but at this point in the project it has become too challenging to get answers to questions and concerns.**
- 17b. If yes, would the recommendation be strong, moderate, or with reservations? **NA**
- 17b1. If recommendation is moderate or with reservations, please explain. **NA**
18. Is there anything else you would like to comment on regarding FF?
- FF has great people and can do excellent work, but they must realize there are other firms with these same qualities. FF needs to revisit the client service side of this project if they want to be a contender for Phase 2.**