PR19 Customer Challenge Group – Research Methodology Sub-Group

Meeting number: **5**

Meeting Date: 3rd January 2018

Paper No: 1

Agenda No: 1

Title: Minutes from the last meeting, Challenge Log and Action Log

Author: Nicola Blake

Printing: This document does not contain any graphs or pictures and therefore does not require you to print in colour.

What is this paper about:	Minutes from the last Sub-Group meeting. Challenge Log and Actions from previous Sub-Group meeting.
Action needed from the CCG:	The Chair is seeking the Sub-Group's approval that the previous meeting minutes are a true and fair reflection of the meeting. The Chair is seeking the Sub-Group's views on the updated Challenge Log and Action Log.

Notes of Meeting No.4 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group

23rd November 2017, Telephone Conference.

Present:
Zoe McLeod (Chair)
Karen Gibbs (KG) (CCW)
Leslie Sopp (Independent – research and insight)
Mairi Budge (Independent – research and behaviour change)
Alison Lee (AL) (SEW)
Nicola Blake (NB) (SEW)
Jane Gould (JG) (Create 51)

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
1. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	The Sub-Group agreed the minutes from the last meeting. Outstanding Action from the previous meeting: • AL to speak to Accent regarding the clarification on the meaning of vulnerable customers and hard to reach customers in the research.
2. Research programme overview	AL presented Paper 2, a programme timing update, to the Sub-Group, and confirmed there are currently no dates scheduled for Willingness to Pay (WTP) cognitive interviews. LS and ZM informed the Sub-Group that they both attended different session of the focus groups which were testing how the WTP materials were presented and gave an overview of the kinds of comprehension challenges customers faced. AL and Rachel Risley from Accent made changes and a note will be sent to ZM to detail the changes that have taken place. The Company is currently working with the vulnerability Sub-Group to progress the vulnerability engagement strategy. This aims to ensure that the company engages with hard to access groups on all research questions, but also to identify what services are needed by customers with additional needs. ZM gave a brief update to the Sub-Group on the company's current thinking on co-creation that was discussed at the Vulnerability Sub-Group meeting earlier in the week. The Research Methodology Sub-Group were asked to share details of any co-creation experts. The Group had a brief discussion on how much input they wanted to have into the materials given the time constraints. They agreed that they would prefer to have an option to input on all stages of the materials and will respond where can depending on time availability. The Group will try to share out the workload to cover all issues. Actions from this discussion were: • SEW to circulate a *short* research specification for the vulnerability engagement work in particular the co-creation element for LS and MB to share with their expert research provider networks.

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	Challenges from this discussion were: • SEW to provide an overview of the engagement strategy - not just the research element e.g. what are the overarching aims of your engagement. NB: This is the subject of a further graphic being worked on by JG.
3. Triangulation	JG presented Paper 3 to the Sub-Group, which has been updated following the discussion at the last Research Sub-Group meeting and an internal workshop. The Company asked the Sub-Group to confirm if they agreed with the output of stage one of the work and asked for their views/input on the methodology and weighting that should be applied for stage two. MB suggested the Company first needed to articulate what research questions it wants the triangulation process to answer before this could be properly articulated. The Group stressed that in order to effectively do triangulation requires specialist expertise. LS further commented that the stage one 'sieving' graphic seems to be geared more towards the quantitative research, and some of the language used within the graphic seemed to articulate that bias and so a review of terms should be looked at. Actions from this discussion were: • LS and MB to share with SEW any thoughts they have on research specialists that could undertake the stage 2 triangulation. • SEW to include a glossary of terms in the triangulation document Challenges from this discussion were: • SEW to articulate/map the research questions it needs to answer for the stage 2 triangulation (this was an issue also raised at the away day on engagement)
4. Resilience research	AL presented Paper 4 and informed the Sub-Group that the concept of resilient/engaged customers would be discussed further at the main CCG meeting in January. ZM was concerned that the Company had not taken enough steps to make the language in the research as accessible and clear as possible. The Company responded that it could be possible to do in-house testing with staff to determine their understanding of issues before the focus groups, which are due to take place in 6 weeks' time. The CCG suggested that this alone was not enough, as those working in the water industry are more aware of key concepts and terms. LS stressed the importance of ensuring co-creation/deliberative work was appropriately designed and led. For example, LS raised some concerns that he felt that there was too much leading of those present at the previous futurologist research workshop. There is a need to be very careful about articulating the different roles of those present and the language used and materials. The Company said it would share materials and its approaches to co-creation before the work is undertaken. Actions from this discussion were: • SEW to confirm and detail Accent's credentials on deliberative work where they are doing this. Challenges from this discussion were:

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	• SEW to test the resilience materials and language used before wider rollout - the group welcomed the previous testing on the WTP materials and felt that was really useful.
5. Non household (NHH) research	The Sub-Group had a discussion on the proposed NHH segmentation approach and the degree to which, in the Sub-Group's view, greater segmentation of SMEs was needed. SEW fed back that they had spoken to Richard Lavendar of Chamber of Commerce and did not feel further segmentation was needed. The Group continued to query whether depending on the research question or purpose, SEW may need to differentiate the SME segments further and beyond water usage e.g. to identify the different messages likely to resonate with different kinds of SME business. The Sub Group reiterated its existing challenge to identify and map key business stakeholders and to validate the approach a bit more widely. The Sub-Group queried why the company had selected the same research approach for NHH customers as they have for HH customers. The Sub-Group felt that an alternative approach may be better given the relatively low levels of understanding among the NHH sector. Due to the time pressures LS suggested SEW may want to consider doing the quantitative research first and then following this up with a steering group of business representatives (which may only need to meet one or two times) - which could identify and consider the issues that matter most to businesses (raised in the quantitative work); this would reduce the cost of qualitative research and ensure the discussions were more targeted on the issues that matter most to businesses. MB also agreed that the approach taken for HH may not be the most appropriate for NHH given the aims of the research, and that it can be difficult to ensure that focus groups of SMEs are genuinely representative due to the self-selecting nature of who attends and the particular time constraints on many smaller businesses. She suggested phone call surveys/interviews may ensure better representation. Actions from this discussion were: • ZM to talk to Richard Lavender at the Chamber of Commerce on his views on segmentation of NHH customers beyond water consumption. Challenges from this discussion were: • SEW to review its approach to NHH engagement and consider if this should be adjusted and if not provide rationale for proposed methodology.
6. Triangulation of stated preference WTP	The Supercharge proposal was generally well received by the Sub-Group - the Group explored Supercharge's credentials including whether they are interactive web developers - and how they were selected; the Company informed the Sub-Group that Supercharge came recommended by Frontier Economics. The Group requested feedback on how the Company would ensure the website was accessible and usable. AL said they recognised it would not be able to reach all consumers

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	and so the company would be considering additional research for those groups that needed to explore the issues the Supercharge website was designed to address. The Sub-Group expressed a view that they would none the less expect it to be designed as inclusively as possible and wanted to know to know how Supercharge would ensure this. ZM highlighted that United Utilities had done something similar and said that in retrospect they reported that they would have made the visual model simpler. She expressed a view that SEW learn from other companies that have done similar things. It was also felt by the Group that it was important to ensure the format of any feedback from the interactive proposal links back as much as possible to customers' real life experience. e.g. show actual bill cost at the end and at the same frequency at which most people likely to be billed e.g. monthly/quarterly and looking like a bill. The Group explored the rationale for the web tool; and who it would be made available too. SEW highlighted that it was designed to be a more accessible way to help customers engage with service level trade-offs and willingness to pay attributes and would be used to support its main WTP research. ZM reported that feedback from UU had been very positive – they felt that it resulted in much better levels of comprehension around the short term and longer terms impact of decision making than WTP research which can be cognitively challenging. The Company has not yet articulated the precise audience for the Supercharge method but will be looking to test it on a smaller audience before making that decision. Actions from this discussion were: • SEW to explore with Supercharge how they can make the simulation experience as close to real life as possible e.g. if they can show the potential bill figure on a SEW bill illustration and mirror the payment frequency. Challenges from this discussion were: • SEW to find out how Supercharge ensure independent assessment of the usability and inclusivity testing of their web tools
7. Next steps and date of next meeting	Actions from this discussion were: • Sub-Group members to try and download/log on to Zoom.
8. AOB	There was no AOB
9. Private session	The Sub-Group discussed SEW progress on the engagement approach, timelines and operation of the Group.

Challenge Log

Item	Raised by	Date Raised	Subject Matter	Comment/ Feedback/ Challenge	Response	Status (Open/Closed)
29	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW should consider all customer segments, in their research approach including customers in vulnerable situations, else may be left with gaps in engagement at the end.	This will be considered as part of the vulnerability strategy.	Closed
30	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Accent to demonstrate their credentials on deliberative work and engaging customers with additional needs.	SEW will ask Accent for evidence of other work undertaken.	Open
31	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to demonstrate how it is meeting the needs of non-tech savvy customers e.g. are their paper options for customers who don't feel comfortable using Apps? How inclusive is the App? /Are you doing home visits to reach some groups?	Paper versions of any pre-task material were issued to customers who did not have access to the App. Depth interviews being undertaken at different stages of the research programme where appropriate.	Closed
32	Leslie Sopp	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to explore the potential to use research to create enduring engagement communities.	To be included in overall engagement straegy.	Closed
33	Zoe McLeod	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to demonstrate how planning to engage/have engaged with business customers.	SEW to develop separate programme for business customer research as appropriate. - SEW presented NHH strategy to engagement sub-group on November 23rd.	Closed
34	Leslie Sopp	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Explore piloting the approach at 3 hours rather than 2.5 or 5 and do at weekends. Risk that current approach is shoe horning research into SEW schedule rather than what will deliver the best outcome.	Approach to focus groups amended to pick up this challenge.	Closed
35	Sub-group	15-Jun-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Consider peer review on the WTP research.	Peer reviewed has been completed. Results to be shared with research sub-group	Closed
54	Sub-group	24-Aug-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Trial different ways of presenting packages.	Agreed. Qualitative research to be conducted on 2nd and 6th November.	Closed
65	Sub-group	06-Oct-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to explore how people see their societal role as monopoly provider of an essential service.	Link to challene 43.	Ongoing
66	Sub-group	06-Oct-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to validate non-household segments.	NHH segments discussed with research sub-group and Richard Lavendar. Confirmed that research programme will progress with proposed segments and be reviewed regularly to determine if segments needs to be altered (e.g. SME segment to be split into smaller segments).	Ongoing
67	Sub-group	06-Oct-17	Research Methodology sub-group	Map non-household stakeholder groups - for engagement.	This will be included in the Engagement strategy.	Open
72	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to provide an overview of the engagement strategy - not just the research element e.g. what are the overarching aims of your engagement.	This will be included in the Engagement strategy.	Open
73	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to articulate/map the research questions wanted in triangulation to address (this was an issue also raised at the away day on engagement)		Open
74	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to test the resilience materials and terms before wider rollout - the group welcomed the previous testing on the WTP materials and felt that was really useful.		Open

Challenge Log

Item	Raised by	Date Raised	Subject Matter	Comment/ Feedback/ Challenge	Response	Status (Open/Closed)
75	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to review its approach to NHH engagement and provide rationale for proposed methodology.		Open
76	Sub-group	23-Nov-17	Research Methodology sub-group	SEW to find out how Supercharge ensure independent usability and inclusivity testing of their web tools.		Open

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0016	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company agreed to update the draft terms of reference and circulate a 'tracked change' version to the Chair by the end of June 2017.	OM	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0017	Engagement Sub-Group	LS to send comments on slide 8 of paper 3 through via email to the Sub-Group.	LS	15/06/2017		Closed	Research graphic explains what research methods chosen and why
A0018	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to confirm who owns the IP of the App that is being developed for the pre-task exercise.	AL	15/06/2017		Yes	Not relevant as no significant IP involved
A0019	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to request information from Accent about their current client base and how they ensure any conflicts of interest are managed with other clients and SEW work.	AL	15/06/2017			
A0020	Engagement Sub-Group	LD to circulate UKWIR guidance	LD	15/06/2017			
A0021	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to consider how the community can be involved in creating solutions as part of the engagement activity.	AL/LD	15/06/2017		Yes	Part of co-creation discussions
A0022	Engagement Sub-Group	The Company to confirm which stakeholders will be included in the inception meeting proposed in the research.	AL/LD	15/06/2017		Yes	Part of co-creation discussions
A0023	Engagement Sub-Group	LD to include in his update to the next CCG meeting - What the Company hopes to have at the end of this engagement? - How this information will be used?	LD	15/06/2017	06/09/2017	Yes	Covered in WRMP update to CCG in November
A0024	Engagement Sub-Group	MB suggested that phase 2 community groups could include an outside view – potentially some of the expertise of the EFG. The Company confirmed they would review this suggestion.	LD	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0025	Engagement Sub-Group	Members to send dates of any holiday in the next few months – NB to collate into spreadsheet.	NB	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0026	Engagement Sub-Group	Front sheets on all proposals to show which point on the engagement programme the proposal is relating to.	AL	15/06/2017		Yes	
A0042	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to reword the objective shown in Section 2 of the report	JG	24/08/2017		Yes	
A0043	Engagement Sub-Group	Session with CCG members to go through the Experian data to use group knowledge to use the data to the best advantage, and help specify the requirements for the 'customer insight hub'.		24/08/2017		Yes	Data presentation made to Vulnerability Sub Group in November - check whether this should be issued to full CCG
A0044	Engagement Sub-Group	Add to graphic as to where the company thinks co-creation is and is meant by it.		24/08/2017		Yes	Part of co-creation CCG note and new approach to co-creation of vulnearbility strategy
A0045	Engagement Sub-Group	The Group should write what it means when it says co-creation and co-delivery to enable the Group and the Company to compare meanings.		24/08/2017		Yes	
A0046	Engagement Sub-Group	Share Willingness to pay research proposal to the Research Sub-Group for comment.		24/08/2017		Yes	
A0047	Engagement Sub-Group	AL to send out a survey to book the next meeting date.	AL	24/08/2017		Yes	
A0075	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to add audience and intention of document to future papers.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	Will be included in each cover note.
A0076	Engagement Sub-Group	Research findings report to be shared with the whole CCG Group.	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Email sent 20/11/17
A0077	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group to provide further comments via email to JG.	Sub-Group	06/10/2017		Yes	Discussed at main CCG Meeting
A0078	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to update report with comments from Sub-Group.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0079	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to update graphic to include KG suggestion	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0080	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to add a column to the dashboard to show how the information will be used in the business and who in the business will have sight of it.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0081	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to include qualitative statistics in an update to the dashboard.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0082	Engagement Sub-Group	JG to think of ways to incorporate horizon scanning and societal measures in a new part of the dashboard.	JG	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0083	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW speak to Richard Lavender about segments.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0084	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to send Sub-Group the SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) codes that sit below the SME segment.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	In folder ready for sending
A0085	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to send a list of businesses included within the segments.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	In folder ready for sending
A0086	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to discuss breaking down the SME segment further with KS.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	SME's can be split by consumption band. Approach discussed with R.Lavendar and agreed we would not split SME's at this point but keep this under review.
A0087	Engagement Sub-Group	OM and AL to discuss CCWater report with Accent.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	Accent completed the CCWater research into NHH segmentation. Accent have reviewed the segments from that research and have confirmed that they are in line with our proposed segments.
A0088	Engagement Sub-Group	WTP materials and non-household segments as soon as possible to whole CCG.	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Included in November CCG meeting
A0089	Engagement Sub-Group	The earlier discussed engagement paper and graphic should also be sent out with the papers for the next CCG meeting.	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	Included in November CCG meeting
A0090	Engagement Sub-Group	ZM draft note to group to say they should expect the above.	ZM	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0092	Engagement Sub-Group	AL to talk to Accent regarding clearer definitions of terms around vulnerable customers/hard to reach	AL	06/10/2017		Yes	
A0093	Engagement Sub-Group	OM to follow up with LD on WRMP engagement - group expressed real concerns about the lack of visibility on the engagement programme around this.	OM	06/10/2017		Yes	Included in November CCG meeting
A0094	Engagement Sub-Group	NB to chase LD on outstanding paper for the CCG.	NB	06/10/2017	01/11/2017	Yes	
A0135	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to circulate a short research specification for the vulnerability engagement work in particular the co-design work so that Leslie and Mairi can put it round their networks to identify people with appropriate skills.	OM	23/11/2017		Ongoing	On agenda for January 2018 sub-group meeting
A0136	Engagement Sub-Group	LS and MB to share with SEW any thoughts they have on triangulation experts.	CCG	23/11/2017			
A0137	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to include a glossary of terms in the triangulation document	JG	23/11/2017			
A0138	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to find out Accent's credentials on deliberative work	AL	23/11/2017			Draft received from Accent under review by SEW.
A0139	Engagement Sub-Group	ZM to talk to Richard Lavender at the Chamber of Commerce on his views on segmentation of NHH beyond water consumption.	ZM	23/11/2017			
A0139	Engagement Sub-Group	SEW to explore with Supercharge if they can include the potential bill figure on a SEW looking bill/frequency of a person's bills so as close to real life feeling as possible.	OM	23/11/2017			To be discussed at Research Sub-Group on 3rd January.

CUSTOMER CHALLENGE GROUP ACTION LOG

REF	FUNCTION	DESCRIPTION	OWNER	DATE RAISED	DEADLINE	COMPLETE	COMMENTS
A0140	Engagement Sub-Group	Sub-Group members to try and download/log on to Zoom.	CCG	23/11/2017			