

Notes of Meeting No.3 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group held on 06th October 2017, Telephone Conference.

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)
 Jane Gould (JG) (Create 51)

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
1. PR19 research findings report	<p>JG from Create 51 attended the meeting to discuss the research findings report which outlined the company's insight from activity to date. JG clarified that the report was designed to summarise the key findings from the research debrief slides and would continue to be populated as research continued. It did not include insight from the wider engagement work. OM informed the Sub-Group that following the Sub-group's challenge the company had decided to request an executive summary paper from Accent on all previous research projects undertaken to date and future work planned as recommended by MB.</p> <p>LS asked the Company to explain the intended audience and the intention of this document as this would affect comments going forward and how the paper should be written. JG responded that this document is intended for internal SEW and CCG review only and is a working document to meet a previous CCG challenge to capture and summarise the insights from research; LS asked for this to be made clear at the front of this document and any document going forward.</p> <p>LS thought that parts of the document were too detailed depending on the audience. E.g. inclusion of logos on page 7. JG told the Sub-Group that this was merely a reflection of the stimulus material tested and captured in the full debrief slides; not all of the document would be published in any eventuality, with it more likely that parts of the document would be extracted to form a supporting appendix to the business plan.</p> <p>All sub-group members felt the document was missing a section on how the results would be informing the Company's decisions. OM told the Sub-Group that this would be added, however this would be done at the end of the different phases of research (the pause for breath scenario), e.g. end of qualitative and quantitative research phases.</p> <p>Actions from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW to add audience and intention of document to future papers. • Research findings report to be shared with the whole CCG Group. • Sub-Group to provide further comments via email to JG. • JG to update report with comments from Sub-Group.

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>There were no Challenges on this agenda item.</p>
<p>2. PR19 engagement graphic</p>	<p>JG shared an information graphic outlining the overarching rationale for the research approach to engagement. This was designed to address concerns raised by CCG members at the away day about the rationale for each part of the research process and how it would be used. JG hoped the graphic resolved that issue in a more visual, logical way; if it did not then a further option would be to create a decision tree process to show/complement how SEW had determined its strategy/approach. All welcomed the information.</p> <p>KG asked for an additional line to be added to the bottom of the graphic to show what part of the business plan each piece of research will be influencing. The Company agreed to add this to the graphic.</p> <p>OM informed the Sub-Group that the graphic will be used at the Board away day next week.</p> <p>Actions from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG to update graphic to include KG suggestion. <p>The Sub-Group challenged SEW to provide an overview of their engagement strategy (as opposed to just the research bit.)</p>
<p>3. Engagement dashboard</p>	<p>JG presented the engagement dashboard which is a response to a CCG Challenge. This is designed to be used to capture day to day engagement learnings and insights including horizon scanning of learning from outside of the organisation. The dashboard will be used to provide an ongoing audit trail of insight and learnings from the many conversations, transactions and engagement with customers so that a) it becomes an embedded reporting tool in the business and b) can be used to evidence how that insight etc is influencing the business. The dashboard will be used to keep the CCG up to date with its engagement more generally to provide greater transparency on how the business is reaching operational and strategic decisions.</p> <p>MB thought the dashboard looked useful, however asked how it would be used in the business and who would have sight of it. The company suggested that a column should be added to include this detail for each line to provide that granularity of detail.</p> <p>ZM asked the Company to include some qualitative information on the dashboard such as top 5 complaints and contacts received. She also noted it was important to have a clear distinction between this and the performance reporting which was very different. The Company agreed to include this on the updated version.</p> <p>ZM also commented that the customer care outreach programme's work and statistics seemed to be missing from the dashboard, which could provide insight. Similarly ZM suggested horizon scanning and wider societal issues should also be considered for inclusion in the dashboard. The Company has agreed to look to incorporating these sections in a new version which it will recirculate when done.</p> <p>Actions from the discussions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JG to include qualitative statistics in an update to the dashboard. • JG to think of ways to incorporate horizon scanning and societal measures in a new part of the dashboard. <p>There were no challenges on this agenda item.</p>
<p>4. Non household</p>	<p>OM explained to the Sub-Group that the Company is currently in discussions with Accent in the design of an accelerated research plan for Non-Household (NHH) customers and are sending comments back to Accent regarding the preferred methodologies for certain types of NHH customers to be used e.g. focus group may work for SMEs however not for national/larger businesses.</p> <p>OM explained the process that had been undertaken when segmenting Non-Household customers before the retail opening of the Non-Household Market. MB asked the Company if it was possible to break down the SME segment any further as some elements were very generalised.</p> <p>Action: OM will clarify this with internally with those responsible for NHH and retailer relationships.</p> <p>ZM asked the Company if attitudinal segmentation will be overlaid on the Non-Household segments. OM responded the view is this would not work for some NHH customers such as national customers where the interactions with water supply is based around their procurement and purchasing criteria rather than an individual's attitude to water. That said, the attitudinal segmentation may work for SME businesses/sole traders that have similar water use patterns and behaviours to Household customers. ZM said she understood the Company's initial view but thinks there is merit in looking at whether attitudinal segmentation could work for the NHH research.</p> <p>Actions from the discussions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW speak to Richard Lavender about segments. • OM to send Sub-Group the SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) codes that sit below the SME segment. • OM to send a list of businesses included within the segments. • OM to discuss breaking down the SME segment further with KS. • OM and AL to discuss CCWater report with Accent. • WTP materials and non-household segments as soon as possible to whole CCG. • The earlier discussed engagement paper and graphic should also be sent out with the papers for the next CCG meeting. • ZM draft note to group to say they should expect the above. <p>Challenges from the discussions were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SEW to validate non-household segments. • Map non-household stakeholder groups - for engagement.
<p>5. Willingness to pay update</p>	<p>The Company gave the Sub-Group an update on the WTP research. The company is currently working with Accent and Frontier Economics to develop the list of attributes that should be tested. The Company have confirmed there will be focus groups next week to test the presentation and wording of the WTP packages - following challenge from LS at the away day.</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>Action: The topic guides and slide decks for those planned focus groups will be shared with the whole CCG.</p> <p>The complete main WTP survey documentation will be sent to the whole CCG in the next couple of weeks.</p> <p>MB asked the Company to explain what hard to reach customers meant when compared to vulnerable customers. The company responded that the hard to reach customers may not necessarily be vulnerable and/or have additional needs (temporarily or permanently) but tend to be difficult to recruit for focus groups and do not like to partake in telephone interviews. MB would like the company to make sure vulnerable customers are captured above and beyond this section of customers.</p> <p>Actions from the discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WTP materials action detailed in the previous section. • AL to talk to Accent regarding clearer definitions of terms around vulnerable customers/hard to reach <p>There were no challenges on this agenda item.</p>
6. WRMP update	<p>AL informed the Sub-Group that this research was still ongoing and we would expect a debriefing in time for the CCG meeting in November.</p> <p>ZM commented that the wider research planned for the WRMP was missing from the research findings report (currently only the first two stages of qualitative work are captured) and expressed concern that the CCG was not seeing the 'bigger engagement picture' on the WRMP, as the outputs of this plan formed such a critical component of the business plan. OM advised a paper was being prepared by Lee Dance to set this out but acknowledged it was overdue.</p> <p>Actions from this discussion were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OM to follow up with LD on WRMP engagement - group expressed real concerns about the lack of visibility on the engagement programme around this. • NB to chase LD on outstanding paper for the CCG. <p>There were no challenges on this agenda item.</p>
7. Sharing of any other insights and learnings	<p>Action: MB told the Sub-Group that she attended a Utility conference and would share the presentations that had been circulated.</p> <p>Ofwat are holding an event for developing segmentation. Action: Ollie to provide further information. Ofwat are also holding a customer engagement seminar at the start of November.</p> <p>CCWater published their annual complaints report last month in which they were pleased to comment on SEWs continued improvement.</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
8. AOB	<p>Action from triangulation meeting after: JG to issue triangulation paper to ESG and seek feedback/speak to MB about best practice learnings on the most appropriate methodology expertise to assimilate and assess different research sources.</p> <p>There was no other business at this meeting.</p>
9. Private session	