

Notes of Meeting No.2 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group held on 24th August 2017, Holiday Inn Wrotham.

Present:

Zoe McLeod (Chair)
 Karen Gibbs (KG) (CCW)
 Leslie Sopp (Independent – research and insight)
 Caroline Farquhar (CF) (Citizens Advice)
 Janet Hill (JH) (Swale Borough Council)
 Adrienne Margolis (AM) (Household Customer)
 Penny Shepherd (PS) (CCW)
 Rob Sheldon (RS) (Accent)
 Steve George (SG) (SEW)
 Oliver Martin (OM) (SEW)
 Simon Mullan (SM) (SEW)
 Alison Lee (AL) (SEW)
 Liz Everest (LE) (SEW)
 Nicola Blake (NB) (SEW)

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions	Action	Timescale
Section 1	<p>The Chair had hoped for a list of ODIs that showed which of these are Company’s statutory obligations and therefore what level of engagement the Company thought would have been needed around these and against the bespoke ODIs. OM drew up a list of the common Outcomes that Ofwat are proposing in the PR19 draft methodology and the areas where Ofwat are proposing to prescribe that the bespoke ODIs should cover.</p> <p>The Group suggested to the Company that it should be mindful of how much engagement it carries out around the statutory obligations and duties.</p> <p>The Company told that group that due to customers not being informed what the statutory obligations and duties are before research many of the priorities that are identified by customers naturally cover a lot of the statutory obligations.</p> <p>There were no Actions or challenges in this section.</p>		
Section 2	<p>The Group asked the Company what its appetite for innovation in the delivery of the business plan? The company responding by saying there was a lot of appetite for innovation and gave a number of examples where this see could be reflected in the business plan.</p>		

	<p>The Group expressed concern that the Company's objective shown in Section 2 of the report is too open to interpretation and not prescriptive enough. The Company confirmed it would consider this issue and reflect on the objectives articulated. The Group also thought that an overall objective should not be written before the engagement programme had been completed as this could appear as though the company had decided what it was going to do before engaging with customers.</p> <p>A gap in the programme was discussed in regards to community and society engagement. The Company confirmed they would review this point.</p> <p>The Company explained that the wording 'service recovery' will not be used in the business plan but will be something along the line of 'when things go wrong'.</p> <p>PS asked the Company if it would do anything to discover emerging issues that could come about in the next five years? This should also include relative societal issues. The Company said that they had seen these kind of issues emerge in the futurologist research.</p> <p>Actions from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG to reword the objective shown in Section 2 of the report <p>Challenges from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW should show evidence of horizon scanning having been undertaken. 		
<p>Section 3</p>	<p>It was felt that there was not a lot of learning from vulnerable customers and financially vulnerable customers. LS also suggested that the Company should look at future vulnerability.</p> <p>LS asked the Company if it had the function of analytical support to use the Experian data in the most effective way? OM explained that this area was under review to ascertain what resource would be required to develop the concept of the 'customer insight hub' as described in the report.</p> <p>AM asked the Company if a cost benefit analysis piece of work will be done on the research and the data outputs? OM explained each individual piece of research was reviewed to ensure it was cost beneficial.</p>		

	<p>Actions from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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’ 		
Section 4	Not reviewed		
Section 5	<p>The Chair informed the company that it was still unclear why the company had chosen to use the methods it had and how it was going to use the data from each piece of work. The Company stated that it was struggling to articulate what the Group wanted.</p> <p>The Chair went on to explain what questions needed answering to try and clear this up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The strengths and weaknesses/limitations of the research methods. • Any gaps in the current research programme • How are the company going to fill the gaps? • Risks of differences in opinions • Who are we targeting and why <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add to graphic as to where the company thinks co-creation is and is meant by it. • 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. 		
Section 6	Not reviewed		
Willingness to Pay teaching	<p>Rob Sheldon from Accent attended the meeting with Paul from PJM joining on the phone.</p> <p>The Group asked the Company if the industry had discussed ways of engaging with customers on the common outcomes. The Company responded by saying this would be tested as part of the WTP research.</p> <p>The Company confirmed the segmentation golden questions will be included in the research so Accent will be able to present the results in the different attitudinal segments as well as the traditional demographic segments.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share Willingness to pay research proposal to the Research Sub-Group for comment. <p>Challenges from this discussion were:</p>		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trial different ways of presenting packages 		
AOB	Action: Alison to send out a survey to book the next meeting date.		
6. Private session	[text to be added]		

DRAFT