

Minutes of the Performance Advisory Group 09

12 October 2022 – 10:00 to 12:00

MEMBERS PRESENT

Chris Dawson	CD	MOSL (Chair)	Adam Boyns	AB	CCW
Michael Rathbone	MR	Severn Trent	Kate Russell	KR	Yorkshire Water
Jon Fuller	JF	Wessex Water	Richard Varley	RV	Southwest Water
Wendy Monk	WM	Wave	David Morris	DM	Waterplus
Emily Jerrome	EJ	Water2Business	Sarah Scott	SS	Veolia

OTHER ATTENDEES

Adam Richardson	AR	MOSL	Axelle Saada	AS	MOSL
Janet Judge	JJ	MOSL	Georgina Mills	GN	Ofwat
Steve Formoy	SF	MOSL	Lisa-Ann Lott	LAL	MOSL (Notes)

APOLOGIES

Andrew Smith	AS	Castle Water	Claire Yeates	CY	Waterscan
Trevor Nelson	TN	Business Stream	Neil Pendle	NP	Waterscan
James Higgins	JH	MOSL	Evan Joanette	EJo	MOSL
Elena Vaccarino	EV	PwC	Ben Gough	BG	PwC

ACTIONS FROM MEETING(S)

NO	Action required	Action by	Action Date
09/01	Members to advise of any possible customer focused metric relating to CV.23	All	26/10/22
09/02	Members to suggest any method to develop a metric regarding refunds in respect of UWE.6	All	26/10/22

1	Welcome
1.1	The Chair welcomed attendees to the meeting and confirmed apologies received.
2	Actions from previous meeting
2.1	07/01 - Send– COMPLETED 07/02 & 08/02 - COMPLETED 04/01 - OPEN The Chair reminded members minutes, recordings and slides are available on the website. The Chair highlighted to members the upcoming webinars on the consultation for which they had been sent invites.
3	Review progress to date
3.1	The Chair noted the consultation had begun and PAG moving forward on candidate metrics and tools. Chair noted the feedback from the Steering Group.
4	DISCUSSION: Process for candidate metrics
4.1	AS took members through the feedback received on candidate metrics and thanked members for their input, confirming items highlighted in green were taken as confirmation only and would work through items highlighted in yellow during the meeting:

- AB clarified for CV4 on the self-reported retailer complaints data recorded by Wholesaler and Postcode and therefore feasible to separate by Wholesaler but more complex to separate regionally.
- GM noted due to market share by Retailer in each Wholesaler area could be a volatile data set however if noting by Retailer then data more stable.
- AS noted need to ensure where pairing data this is taken into account.
- DM noted the potential for bias could be either way dependent on the relative pairings.
- AS highlighted where Retailer audit is raised this is including as part of the long list at this early stage for consideration.
- AS noted where switching is being suggested as a metric it is not a proposal to place an intervention against it
- AS noted for CV6 feedback on ensuring only items under Retailer direct control e.g., LLUM
- RV noted LLUM may need to be included as should be part of a partnership approach between Wholesalers and Retailers
- GM noted the wider nature of the view of primary responsibility when designing metrics/interventions moving forward and will be a continuing debate throughout the programme.
- AS highlighted for CV8 in respect of F4/F5 the potential use for Bilateral hub data however noting suitability is considered red.
- Chair noted where a process currently does not have an OPS in the Bilaterals hub does not dictate it remaining as such.
- AS drew out for CV23 the lack of customer focused metrics where assessing the accuracy of consumption in CMOS. Query to be drawn out in pre-read for PAG10.
- GM observed CV23 may need to be in high priority list as timely and accurate billing is determined by meter reads.
- AS noted due to lack of significant risk associated with CV23 driven its medium list status.
- AS noted for UWE4 no additional metrics highlighted in feedback
- Members noted the importance of SIC code in particular in regard to benchmarking for water efficiency etc.
- AS observed USRs had been retained within activities where they were appropriate however difficult to establish a metric and therefore intervention directly related to them.
- AS noted customer refunds as highlighted in UWE6 will be included within pre-read for PAG10 to try and establish a potential metric.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AR noted whilst audits may provide the information it will require a metric against which refunds can be audited e.g., following RF how long does it take to refund customers. • SF noted self-reporting will have a role in reporting refunds against any metric developed. • AS noted GS2 considered to be a binary activity however if information not easy to access or not clear and thus customers are contacting Wholesalers to establish answers to their queries may still require metric/incentive. • In respect of GS3, Chair noted all Bilateral processes are tracked and therefore reportable whether currently having an OPS measure or not. • GM observed complaints data important potential metric as could promote competition at Retailer level if known how well a Retailer deals with complaints and resolves those. • AB noted potential to utilise CCW data where complaints are escalated further. • AS highlighted for CV8, GS3 an overall time from receipt to resolve for F4 may not be a fair metric given the Bilateral aspect of dealing with a complaint. • AS noted 76 points of feedback provided overall and thanked members again. • Chair highlighted current behaviour within the Bilateral hub on F5 suggests use of auto-close may not be the most suitable metric as Retailers may be forgetting to close within the Hub. • WM enquired why against activities such as GS4 could outside sources are not utilised such as Trustpilot. AS noted will be covered within candidate tools. <p>Members agreed to ENDORSE the possible candidate metrics for exploration noting this is not closing down the opportunity to add other metrics should any be identified in future.</p>
5	<p>DISCUSSION: Process for candidate tools</p>
5.1	<p>JJ thanked members for their feedback and noted it had been grouped into themes. JJ then took members through the candidate tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JJ confirmed where suitability ratings had been queried and MOSL were in agreement this had been updated. • JJ highlighted the next steps established from the feedback noting at this stage of the programme all possible intervention tools remain available to be explored for use and does not mean incentives will be in place for every activity nor interventions established for all activities. • JJ highlighted the items for consideration when designing the tools as identified via the feedback.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JJ noted where feedback had indicated an activity or an intervention on an activity which were not considered appropriate/needed to be included within the MPF. • JJ noted all activities had been included at this stage within the consultation to enable long list to be compiled both of activities, interventions and tools. <p>Members agreed to ENDORSE the possible candidate tools for exploration noting this is not closing down the opportunity to add other tools should any be identified in future and may be adjusted once certainty achieved on the metrics.</p>
6	DISCUSSION: Process & Governance
6.1	<p>Chair noted AR to introduce the Governance framework and confirmed details will be forwarded to members following the meeting. AR took members through the governance for the programme as described to the Strategic Panel in September 2022</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • WM enquired if process should be applied immediately and until April 2023. • AR confirmed framework is an example for a future MPF noting may be opportunity to utilise for current MPF in the interim.
7	Any other business
7.1	<p>The Chair took members through the high-level agendas for the next meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EJ offered apologies for PAG 10 and will offer alternate if possible.
7.2	The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting.