

**Notes of Meeting No.4 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group**
**23<sup>rd</sup> 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)

<b>Agenda Item no.</b>	<b>Notes and Actions</b>
1. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	<p>The Sub-Group agreed the minutes from the last meeting.</p> <p>Outstanding Action from the previous meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>AL to speak to Accent regarding the clarification on the meaning of vulnerable customers and hard to reach customers in the research.</li> </ul>
2. Research programme overview	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEW to circulate a <i>short</i> 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.</li> </ul>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>Challenges from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p>3. Triangulation</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LS and MB to share with SEW any thoughts they have on research specialists that could undertake the stage 2 triangulation.</li> <li>SEW to include a glossary of terms in the triangulation document</li> </ul> <p>Challenges from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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)</li> </ul>
<p>4. Resilience research</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEW to confirm and detail Accent's credentials on deliberative work where they are doing this.</li> </ul> <p>Challenges from this discussion were:</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> </ul>
<p>5. Non household (NHH) research</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The Sub Group reiterated its existing challenge to identify and map key business stakeholders and to validate the approach a bit more widely.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ZM to talk to Richard Lavendar at the Chamber of Commerce on his views on segmentation of NHH customers beyond water consumption.</li> </ul> <p>Challenges from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SEW to review its approach to NHH engagement and consider if this should be adjusted and if not provide rationale for proposed methodology.</li> </ul>
<p>6. Triangulation of stated preference WTP</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Challenges from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SEW to find out how Supercharge ensure independent assessment of the usability and inclusivity testing of their web tools</li> </ul>
7. Next steps and date of next meeting	<p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sub-Group members to try and download/log on to Zoom.</li> </ul>
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.