

Notes of Meeting No.1 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group held on 15th June 2017, via conference call

Present:

Zoe McLeod (Chair)
 Karen Gibbs (KG) (CCW)
 Leslie Sopp (Independent – research and insight)
 Mairi Budge (Independent – research and behaviour change)
 Oliver Martin (OM) (SEW)
 Alison Lee (AL) (SEW)
 Nicola Blake (NB) (SEW)

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions	Action	Timescale
1. Terms of reference	<p>The Chair opened the meeting by discussing the draft terms of reference for The Sub-Group. The Company discussed each proposed paragraph in the draft terms of reference so The Sub-Group could understand the rationale for its inclusion. Members gave feedback on key items – including the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Name of the Sub-Group should be clear that it is only reviewing the research approach and methodology ▪ Functions of the Sub-Group should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To have sight of and input into proposals for stage of the research programme ○ To provide comments to the Company to help get best value for money of the research programme ▪ Remit of the Sub-Group should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the outputs of each stage of the research and any conclusions that are being drawn from it ○ how the findings of each stage of the research is used to inform the next stage of research or business planning ▪ Procurement process for appointment of any research agencies ▪ Sub-Group papers should be issued 5 days in advance of any meeting 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Company should explain why it cannot do something that is suggested by the Sub-Group <p>Action: 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.</p>		
<p>2. Research programme timetable overview</p>	<p>Company presented reminder of the programme No actions or challenges.</p>		
<p>3. Research programme – proposals for next phase</p>	<p><i>Customer priorities</i></p> <p>The Company presented the proposal that the Company had received from Accent in relation to 'customer priorities'. The Company outlined the approach proposed by discussing each slide and taking questions from the members of the Sub-Group.</p> <p>Actions raised from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LS to send comments on slide 8 of paper 3 through via email to the Sub-Group. ▪ The Company to confirm who owns the IP of the App that is being developed for the pre-task exercise. ▪ 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. <p>Challenges raised from both of these discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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. ▪ Accent to demonstrate their credentials on deliberative work and engaging customers with additional needs. ▪ 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? ▪ SEW to explore the potential to use research to create enduring engagement communities. 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SEW to demonstrate how planning to engage/have engaged with business customers. ▪ 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. ▪ Consider peer review on the WTP research. <p><i>WRMP</i></p> <p>It was agreed with the Sub-Group that the proposal for the WRMP research would be discussed in a follow up conference call. Notes from this separate call held on 22nd June 2017 are shown below:</p> <p>The Company discussed wider WRMP engagement and how the customer research fits into the process. This included a discussion about new requirements regarding resilience and reference levels.</p> <p>Actions raised from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ LD to circulate UKWIR guidance ▪ The Company to consider how the community can be involved in creating solutions as part of the engagement activity. ▪ The Company to confirm which stakeholders will be included in the inception meeting proposed in the research. ▪ LD to include in his update to the next CCG meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What the Company hopes to have at the end of this engagement? ○ How this information will be used? ▪ 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. <p>Challenges raised from both of these discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Accent to demonstrate their credentials on deliberative work and engaging customers with additional needs (also logged as a challenge in customer priorities item above) 		
4.	No discussion held on this item.		

Sharing of any other insights and learnings			
5. AOB	<p>Action: Members to send dates of any holiday in the next few months – NB to collate into spreadsheet.</p> <p>Action: Front sheets on all proposals to show which point on the engagement programme the proposal is relating to.</p>		
6. Private session	[text to be added]		

DRAFT