



**Name of Group: Customer Contact Details**

**Meeting Number: 2**

**6 November 2024, 13:00-14:00**

**Attendees:**

**Meeting Chair:** Gerard Lyden, Thames Water (GL)

**Members:** Lucy Brynes, CCWater (LB), Holly Woodhead, Ofwat (HW), Simon Bennett, MOSL (SB), Paul Baker, Business Stream (PB), Lauren Walsh, Wave (LW), Emily Jerrome, Water2Business (EJ), Sian Forward, Northumbrian Water (SF), Rosie Milsom-Dyer, Wessex Water (RMD), Mike Rathbone, Severn Trent (MR), Ray Porter, Castle Water (RP), Scott Simpson, United Utilities (SS)

**Secretariat:** Sam Mawby (SM)

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Meeting Minutes</b>
<b>1. Welcome and Apologies</b>	<p>GL welcomed everyone to the meeting.</p> <p>Apologies were noted from Ian Taylor (United Utilities) and Mary Porter-Chorley (South Staffs Water).</p> <p>Recap of last meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Agreed that the area was important in terms of customer impacts, customer outcomes and for the market.</li><li>• Considered why mechanisms used to date have not worked.</li><li>• Noted the issue of the fairness of placing an obligation on a Trading Party and the practicalities of being able to achieve it, particularly where customers decide who they will share their details with.</li><li>• Noted the need to try and achieve a balance between obligations and best endeavours.</li><li>• Acknowledged the different type and needs of customers, and that further consideration may need to be given to differentiation and prioritisation.</li><li>• Continued concern that there wasn't a centralised solution of any form to support data sharing between Trading Parties.</li><li>• Needed to consider customers who may need support for different reasons other than those already identified e.g. micro businesses, where English is not the first language etc.</li></ul>

## 2. Actions Update

### Action 01\_01:

The scope and key outputs had been updated in line with the discussion at the last meeting.

Following further discussion, the scope was refined to the following:

- To review previous work (including Code change proposals, RWG Good Practice Guides and consultation responses received as part of the recent Ofwat consultation on proposal to mandate retailer provision of emergency customer contact details within CPCOP)
- To make a recommendation to develop a ~~balanced~~ **pragmatic** solution that worked for Trading Parties and customers that would enable customer details to be captured **where practical** and shared appropriately

### Action 01\_02:

MR advised that there were not any crossovers identified between the work of the subgroup and the national power outage planning work.

A member asked whether a Trading Party would be tasked with communicating with customers in a situation where they may not have a phone/computer due to lack of power. MR responded that he understood this to be the case but would see how the project developed and keep the subgroup in the loop, as needed.

The subgroup noted that while there had been improvements in the data since market opening, it was still patchy.

### Action 01\_03:

Mary to circulate the feedback summary from the RWG Planned and Unplanned Events subgroup survey with members.

### Action 01\_04:

Luke Coyle was not able to attend the meeting and the following update was provided post-meeting in relation to whether the gaps in information were due to retailers not processing the data or not submitting it in relation to CPW 137 '[Interim Supply – Customer Data Provisions](#)'.

'From anecdotal evidence gathered, it was significantly more common that retailers do not have data in their systems to submit rather than just not submitting it. However, it was suggested that this thinking should be checked with retailers'.

	<p><b>Action 01_05</b> SB provided an overview of the data relating to sensitive customers, split across retailers and wholesalers.</p> <p>8% of the SPIDS were classed as sensitive in CMOS. 109,000 SPIDS was a high number, but the subgroup noted that this had reduced since market opening.</p> <p>The subgroup noted that sensitive customers were categorised based largely on the type of response that might be needed e.g. more proactive steps would need to be taken for a hospital or prison.</p> <p>The subgroup would need to consider the changes to SEMD in relation to its work.</p> <p><b>Action 01_06</b> SB highlighted that the number of site-specific arrangements (SSAs) flagged in CMOS currently stood at 3%.</p> <p>Several subgroup members queried the figure. SB took an action to check the data and clarify whether an SSA could be triggered in CMOS by two separate wholesalers.</p> <p><b>Action 01_07:</b> LB commented that there was no straightforward way of identifying which complaints were specifically about contact details.</p> <p>LB agreed to pull together a number of case studies so that the subgroup could better understand the impact on individual customers.</p>
<p><b>3. Identification of further gaps in knowledge/need for RFI or other information gathering</b></p>	<p>GL asked whether there were any further areas or data that needed to be flagged at this point to inform the potential options.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A potential RFI to obtain information regarding the percentage of customers that Trading Parties have no or partial information for.</li> <li>• Try to ascertain where retailers have attempted to acquire customer contact details unsuccessfully and the potential reasons for that.</li> <li>• Consider the different ways that retailers try and obtain information, and which mechanisms have most success.</li> <li>• Consider potential use of the Market Improvement Fund.</li> </ul>

<b>4. AOB</b>	n/a
<b>5. Date of Next Meeting</b>	The subgroup agreed to meet to start developing potential options.  Workshop confirmed for 13 January 2025 10.30-4.00 at the Ofwat Offices in Birmingham.

**Actions from Meeting:**

<b>Action</b>	<b>Owner</b>
<b>01_03</b> Share feedback summary of RWG Planned and Unplanned Events subgroup survey with members.	Mary Porter-Chorley
<b>01_04</b> Check whether gaps in information are due to retailers not possessing the data or not submitting it in relation to CPW137 Interim Supply – Customer Data Provisions.	Sam Mawby
<b>01_06</b> Identify how many SSAs are flagged in CMOS <b>Update</b> - SB to check the data and clarify whether an SSA could be triggered in CMOS by two separate wholesalers.	Simon Bennett
<b>01_07</b> Determine the number of complaints raised related to customer contact details <b>Update</b> - LB to pull together a number of case studies so that the subgroup could better understand the impact on individual customers.	Lucy Byrnes