

Notes of Meeting No.5 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group
3rd January 2018, South East Water, Head Office, Snodland.
Present:

Zoe McLeod (Chair)
 Karen Gibbs (KG) (CCW)
 Leslie Sopp (Independent – research and insight)
 Caroline Farquhar
 Oliver Martin (OM) (SEW)
 Alison Lee (AL) (SEW)
 Nicola Blake (NB) (SEW)
 Laura Harvey (LH) (SEW)
 Jo Osborn (JO) (SEW)

Apologies:

Mairi Budge (MB) (Independent – research and behaviour change)
 Jane Gould (JG) (Create 51)

| Agenda Item no. | Notes and Actions |
|---|--|
| 1. Introduction | The Sub-Group introduced themselves to the new members attending the meeting. Apologies were received from MB and JG. |
| 2. Minutes and actions from the last meeting | <p>The group agreed that the minutes from the previous meeting.</p> <p>A0019 and A0020 – action remains open, A0084 and A0085 comments need updating. A0136 – Action is closed A0137 – Action is open A0139 – Action is closed – there are two Action 139 – should be 140</p> |
| 3. PR19 overall approach graphic | <p>LS commented that he found it a little hard to figure out what the graphic was meant to be showing and suggested a number of changes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A key for the words in italics which referred to internal initiatives so it is clear what they mean. • The positioning of the communications plan should be looked at, perhaps up with the governance and assurance piece. • Horizon scanning position should also be looked at. • Directional flows of the arrows should also be looked at as they should flow in both directions. <p>LS assured the Company that as a first pass he felt this was a good visual and he liked the language around everyone counts, every customer counts etc.</p> <p>KG agreed with LS's comment and also expressed concern about the differing use of terms relating to societal issues/impact/deliverables. OM gave an example of what the graphic was trying to show in this respect and agreed a revised set of wording would be used for the next version to improve the clarity.</p> <p>CF and ZM thought that the governance and leadership section at the top of the graphic should also include the company vision and show as a two way flow – i.e. leading the activity below and getting feedback from it to learn and adapt.</p> |

| Agenda Item no. | Notes and Actions |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| | <p>ZM commented that she had struggled to see the flow of the graphic. SEW will look at how to better articulate the circularity of the process.</p> <p>After an explanation from OM all members agreed the graphic would be a useful visual once the suggested changes were made.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW to add a key for the words in italics • SEW to review the positioning of the communications plan • SEW to review the positioning of the Horizon scanning • SEW to review directional flows of the arrows • SEW to review wording for wider societal deliverables • SEW to review graphic to try and clarify the circularity of the process |
| <p>4. Engagement Strategy</p> | <p>OM presented paper 2 to the Sub-Group and asked for high level comments to be given as more in-depth comments will be able to be discussed at the main CCG meeting later in the month. KG pointed out that there were references to terminology, which was not clearly explained. SEW suggested adding short case studies to the document to explain the terminology and how SEW have/will use this in its business plan or day to day engagement. It was suggested that short examples would be enough.</p> <p>LS suggested the glossary of terms should be updated on a regular basis to include any new terms. SEW agreed to include the glossary with every paper pack going forward. LS also commented that work would need to be done to make customers understand co-creation and co-delivery. The understanding customer data table on page 6 was warmly received by the Sub-Group.</p> <p>ZM will send her in-depth comments however on page 2 she felt that the document did not show that the company really owns its engagement and read like it lacked authenticity. ZM would like the company to write what it truly believes the value of engagement is without the engagement jargon.</p> <p>KG expressed that the company can certainly point to how engagement has made a difference and the impact the satisfaction surveys have had to the performance of the business to help demonstrate this.</p> <p>Overall the Sub-Group found the document useful.</p> <p>LS commented that the company vision section doesn't look very inspiring and the wording is very corporate. ZM suggested the company should recognise its role as the provider of an essential service. The Company should look at reviewing the language used to be more inspiring.</p> <p>The group asked about the company's aspiration – did they want to be the best. SEW said there was no aspiration to be 'the best' but they did want to be the company that customers were supplied by and wanted to work for. ZM suggested they consider whether their aspiration level should move on from where they were four years ago. JO said she felt that this vision allowed for a high level of aspiration and staff really owned it.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW to update a key terms document and include the document with every meeting's paper packs • SEW to add key customer data on to the engagement dashboard • ZM to think about the crossover of data from both Sub-Groups |

| Agenda Item no. | Notes and Actions |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW to add short introduction section showing where SEW has come from, the journey so far, how it has shaped the engagement strategy, the benefit of the experience to date and why they have taken the customer centric approach we have • SEW to review text regarding 'purpose of this document' to include SEW role as a provider of essential service • SEW revise wording of sections 2.1 and 2.3 to make this more authentic and inspiring – outlining the true value of engagement and why this is important to SEW • Bullet point 2.1 suggested amendment of “our employees recommend us as a good place to work” to be “great place to work” • Customer participation section – explain what co-creation and co-delivery mean to us, in our language to reduce the use of the terms co-creation and co-delivery • In some sections give examples of what is meant – e.g. what we’ve done and what we think we might do • SEW to review the use of the word legitimacy to ensure consistent meaning and to review the paper generally to ensure plain English or any jargon explained • More visual summaries for quick reference • Sub-Group will be providing more detailed comments over the next couple of weeks • Move CCG circle to 'Our Regulators and Statutory consultees' ring in the rain drop diagram on page 11. |
| <p>5. Updates and Discussion</p> | <p>AL gave a verbal update on the below subjects for this agenda item.</p> <p><u>Willingness to Pay</u></p> <p>The cognitive interviews took place on 13th and 18th December where 18 customers participated. Amendments from these interviews along with comments from ZM, LM and KG have now been incorporated into the WTP survey which will be tested during the pilot phase, starting this week. The main fieldwork will commence in w/c 22nd January.</p> <p>ZM fed back to the Sub-Group that she was pleasantly surprised at how well the surveys worked and the level of understanding from the customers. Only one person found it difficult to understand the subject matter. She also raised that the different attitudes of the SEW segments were not coming through. Also, customers had very different views on comparative water company data. Some found it valuable, others said it made no difference to their decisions.</p> <p>KG asked if customers were genuinely able to pick and mix the options. ZM said her observation from the testing was seemingly not and there were times when people wanted to choose one option from one package and another from another. Accent said this had been carefully thought through to hone choices. SEW suggested that the Supercharge activity would enable greater differentiation though they would have to think how they weighted that.</p> <p>AL informed the group that comparative information and further information on the attributes will be available to people who take part in the live call interviews and extra time will be given for participants to read this information if they would like.</p> <p><u>Willingness to Pay attributes</u></p> <p>OM provided a paper detailing how the company designed the levels being tested in the Willingness to Pay surveys. Due to only providing the paper during the meeting comments were requested via email or telephone.</p> <p>ZM asked for the paper to be sent out to the group and to include Rupika for review and comment.</p> <p><u>Supercharge (Willingness to Pay triangulation)</u></p> |

| Agenda Item no. | Notes and Actions |
|-----------------|--|
| | <p>AL showed the Sub-group the prototype of the Supercharge game.</p> <p>OM informed the Sub-Group that due to the volume of work needed to populate the future costs of improvement the ability to switch to the future in the game may be disabled for the first release in February. ZM encouraged the company to try and include this if it was possible as she was hoping this would be able to help fill some the gap for future consumer considerations. OM assured the Sub-Group that the goal was to get this part of the game live and could be introduced as a second phase if needed.</p> <p>Testing will be undertaken by both customers and staff, SEW offered the Sub-Group the chance to be part of the testing of the game as well.</p> <p>Feedback from the group was that the game looked good and they liked the visuals – it was explained these were still a work in progress. ZM said United Utilities learning from this was to keep the graphics simple.</p> <p><u>Resilience</u></p> <p>Following the last Sub-Group meeting a workshop has been carried out with members of staff from the Regulation team, Assets team and Accent to come up with a topic guide for the workshops. These topic guides will be circulated to the Sub-Group within the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>Focus groups will take place on 29th January and 1st February between 6pm and 9.30pm in Basingstoke and Tonbridge. Sub-Group members were offered the chance to sit in one of the sessions.</p> <p><u>Non-Household</u></p> <p>Accent are currently working on a topic guide for the focus groups and updating the timeline. This will be issued within the next couple of weeks.</p> <p><u>Triangulation</u></p> <p>SEW is still developing its approach to triangulation, OM informed the Sub-Group that SB will be working on this, alongside horizon scanning, SB will be gathering research which is already in the public domain. ZM asked if the company would be getting a triangulation expert to help with the weighting of different evidence bases (given SB's lack of expertise in this area).</p> <p>ZM asked for an action on the Action log to be now marked as closed (A0136 – LS and MB to share with SEW any thoughts on they have triangulation experts) MB has provided some recommendations.</p> <p>OM informed the group that ICS is undertaking a review on the WRMP research, ICS Consulting Ltd has a proven track record in working across the whole of the business planning and regulatory functions in the water sector, with expertise in understanding and integrating customers' views into decision making, business planning, and delivery.</p> <p>We have asked ICS Consulting to carry out an assurance review of our Stage 1 triangulation approach and the areas its recommends we should consider for Stage 2 of the triangulation process. ICS has industry-recognised expertise in this area, having already assisted other water companies with triangulation of research findings. In addition we have asked ICS to undertake an assurance review of the engagement carried out so far on the company's Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP), which would then set out recommendations as to what additional engagement may need to be undertaken on the WRMP during the statutory consultation phase.</p> |

| Agenda Item no. | Notes and Actions |
|-----------------------|---|
| | <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEW to send out Willingness to Pay attributes paper to Sub-Group and Rupika. Sub-Group members to confirm if they would like to partake in the testing of the Supercharge game. Sub-Group members to confirm which resilience focus group they will be attending. SEW to update A0136 to close. |
| 6. AOB | <p>JO informed the group that she is speaking at the utility week conference on the 17th January and is able to get a ticket for a member of the CCG if they would like.</p> <p>KG asked if the dWRMP agenda item on the next CCG meeting will cover of the proposed engagement. SEW confirmed that this would.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sub-Group members to inform JO if they would like a ticket to the conference on the 17th January. |
| 7. Private session | The Group discussed the overarching strategy and SEW vision. |

Summary of actions

| Action | Owner |
|--|-----------|
| SEW to add a key for the words in italics. | OM |
| SEW to review the positioning of the communications plan. | OM |
| SEW to review the positioning of the Horizon scanning. | OM |
| SEW to review Directional flows of the arrows. | OM |
| SEW to review wording for wider societal deliverables. | OM |
| SEW to review graphic to try and clarify the circularity of the process. | OM |
| SEW to update a key terms document and include the document with every meeting's paper packs | NB |
| SEW to add key customer data on to the engagement dashboard. | LH |
| ZM to think about the crossover of data from both Sub-Groups. | ZM |
| SEW to add introduction section showing where SEW have come from, the journey so far, how it has shaped the engagement strategy, the benefit of the experience to date and why they have taken the customer centric approach we have | OM |
| SEW to review text regarding 'purpose of this document' to include SEW role as a provider of essential service. | OM |
| SEW revise wording of sections 2.1 and 2.3 to make this more authentic and inspiring – outlining the true value of engagement and why this is important to SEW. | OM |
| Bullet point 2.1 suggested amendment of "our employees recommend us as a good place to work" to be "great place to work" | OM |
| Customer participation section – explain what co-creation and co-delivery mean to us, in our language to reduce the use of the terms co-creation and co-delivery | OM |
| In some sections give examples of what is meant – e.g. what we've done and what we think we might do | OM |
| SEW to review the use of the word legitimacy to ensure consistent meaning and to review the paper generally to ensure plain English or any jargon explained | OM |
| More visual summaries for quick reference | OM |
| Sub-Group will be providing more detailed comments over the next couple of weeks | Sub-Group |
| Move CCG circle to 'Our Regulators and Statutory consultees ring in the rain drop diagram on page 11. | OM |
| SEW to send out Willingness to Pay attributes paper to Sub-Group and Rupika. | NB |
| Sub-Group members to confirm if they would like to partake in the testing of the Supercharge game. | Sub-Group |
| Sub-Group members to confirm which resilience focus group they will be attending. | Sub-Group |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| SEW to update A0136 to close. | NB |
| Sub-Group members to inform JO if they would like a ticket to the conference on the 17 th January. | Sub-Group |