

Notes of Meeting No.8 of the South East Water CCG Customer Research Sub-Group
27th March 2018, South East Water, Head Office, Snodland.
Present:

Zoe McLeod (Chair)
 Leslie Sopp (Independent – research and insight)
 Karen Gibbs (KG) (CCW)
 Alison Lee (AL) (SEW - Economic Regulation Manager)
 Nicola Blake (NB) (SEW - Regulatory Programme Controller)
 Oliver Martin (OM) (SEW - Head of Economic Regulation and Strategy)
 Laura Rafferty (LR) (SEW - Insight Lead)
 Jo Osborn (JO) (SEW - Head of Communications)
 Jane Gould (JG) (Create 51)
 Jo East (JE) (ICS)
 Andy Clowes (AC) (SEW - Business Consultant)
 Steve Brown (SB)

Apologies:

Mairi Budge (MB) (Independent – research and behaviour change)

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
1. Introduction	Apologies were received from MB. JE introduced himself to the group.
2. Declaration of Interest	The Sub-Group had no interests to declare at this meeting.
3. Minutes and actions from the last meeting	<p>The Sub-Group agreed the minutes from the previous meeting. NB to update actions with owners.</p> <p>Action: NB to update action list on minutes from the 5th March meeting with owners.</p>
4. ICS proposal on WRMP	<p>The Company provided the Sub-Group with ICS' proposal for additional WRMP research with 8 x focus groups (with pre-task), 12 x in depth phone interviews with vulnerable customers and 600 quantitative telephone interviews. Some of the qualitative research will be held in those areas that experienced the recent freeze-thaw event.</p> <p>Focus groups will commence w/c 9th April, the topic guides for these focus groups will be circulated to the Sub-Group after the Easter bank holiday.</p> <p>LS commented that it was useful to see the research mapped out however thought that there should be no use of acronyms in the proposal to make it easier to read.</p> <p>LS raised concerns about the framing of some text in the proposal regarding the aim 'not undermining previous results' but this additional research was an opportunity to re-test again.</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>The Sub-Group were also concerned there would be a lot of material to cover in one focus group; the Company explained that each focus group would be topic focussed and so not all subject matter would be covered in a single group.</p> <p>LS thought that this approach could mean linkages between topics are missed, i.e. leakage and water reduction. SEW suggested there are some natural overlaps that occur to minimise this occurring eg leakage arises in the WRMP options focus group as well as being a standalone topic for another focus group. LS also asked if the Company could increase the length of the focus groups to 2 hours to allow more time for deliberative work. JE responded that ICS will address this. ZM also raised concern that the time allowed for the focus groups does not give customers enough time to give an informed view.</p> <p>The Sub-Group discussed the opportunities of more deliberative work in the pre task materials, ICS to look at how the materials it develops could be used to maximise deliberations.</p> <p>Action: ICS to review pre task materials and how these could be expanded to ensure deliberative aims achieved.</p> <p>LS asked the Company if it would be possible to carry out a light touch cognitive interview stage before the focus group to ensure that participants were able to participate fully. JE responded that this could be built into the recruitment stage. .</p> <p>The Sub-Group raised some concern around the 45-60 minute proposed telephone call with vulnerable customers being achievable. JE assured the Sub-Group that ICS had extensive experience of undertaking this approach before and it had worked well.</p> <p>Action: The Company is to share with the Sub-Group the types of vulnerable customers that would be contacted for a telephone survey.</p> <p>The Sub-Group asked the Company and ICS to change the criteria for selection from bill payer to those who use and have influence on water use in the home. The Sub-Group also asked the Company how it would address inclusivity of the research in the timings and locations of the focus groups. The Company stated that it would look into this and that future customers will also be included in the research, with the focus groups including both current and future customers.</p> <p>KG commented that the risks stated around drought and more extreme restrictions (particularly standpipes and rota cuts) need to be clearly explained and context on the subject given. The Company would consider including this in the pre-task material.</p> <p>KG stressed that how talk about the risks associated with drought would be critical to the views given. Customers need to properly understand the implications of options such as standpipes and rotacuts.</p> <p>ZM suggested that Natural England and the EA should be engaged with for the framing of topic guides that would be used to ensure that there was balanced and impartial information on the advantages and disadvantages of different approaches.</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>ZM highlighted the importance of the framing around leakage given that the WTP research had an upper level of 15% - this research should be more open.</p> <p>The Sub-Group discussed the large amount of pre task work and the importance of having a mix of text and visuals for customers to work through. The Sub-Group also discussed how the recruitment of customers would work; JE discussed over recruiting and if customers were unable to carry out the pre task test they would not be included in the eventual focus group.</p> <p>JO informed the Sub-Group that to date the Company had received 45 representations on its dWRMP; the Company received 66 in total on the last dWRMP. The Company is reviewing all responses that are received.</p>
5. Responsible business workshop	<p>JO updated the Sub-Group on the stakeholder work shop taking place the day after the meeting; 23 stakeholders had confirmed attendance, including fire, police, WWF, the military and council planners. Paul Butler and Andrew Farmer will also be attending the workshop on behalf of the board and a member of the environment team will also be attending. ZM informed the Sub-Group that she and Adrienne would be in attendance.</p> <p>JO reminded the Sub-Group how they intended to start with a very broad discussion to ensure that they didn't restrict the options that emerged. This has been developed by Creative Sensemaking and shared between meetings.</p> <p>LS asked the Company what level of roles would be attending from the stakeholders. JO responded that they were largely strategic level roles. Due to this LS suggested that Paul Butler should observe after opening the meeting and setting the scene as members of the meeting may look to him to provide answers. JO would speak to Paul about this.</p>
6. Stake holder mapping update	<p><u>Stakeholder mapping update</u></p> <p>JO informed the Sub-Group that following the recent freeze thaw incident it became apparent that the Company has different interactions with stakeholders during such events. The stakeholder database will be updated by Springboard Marketing following the local elections. JO has also been in discussion with the Ofwat communications team about their 'engage' system, as the Company would like to eventually have a CRM for stakeholders.</p> <p>Action: ZM asked JO to flag where in the perceptions paper she specifically would welcome comments from CCG (note to go with papers)</p> <p><u>Perception audits</u></p> <p>JO updated the Sub-Group on the results of the stakeholder perceptions audit that was carried out with 40 stakeholders completing the audit. 25 surveys were completed online and 15 over the phone.</p> <p>The summary of the findings were that there were a large number of neutral responses, the Sub-Group commented that this is not necessarily a bad thing if it was genuine. However, it would be important to unpick 'the neutrals'.</p>

Agenda Item no.	Notes and Actions
	<p>LS suggested the company uses base numbers on graphs for results from a small sample size and not percentages.</p>
<p>7. Research forward plan</p>	<p><u>Outcomes Research</u> The Company is currently working with LS on the one page summary sheet for this research. Systra has been selected to carry out the research and the Company has a project inception meeting with them and Frontier. All agreed the proposed questions need simplification and clarification.</p> <p>KG queried the timings as to how the research would feed into the outcomes discussion.</p> <p>Action: SEW to circulate the Outcomes research one pager and questionnaire to the Sub-Group.</p> <p><u>Bill profile research</u> The Company informed the group this research would be carried out in similar style to the Annual Tacker Survey, via a postal survey with the option to complete it online and would be sent out to 25,000 customers.</p> <p>LS raised a question around prize draws ie they can be awarded even if the survey was not completed. SEW responded that its legal team had agreed the current wording but would check again.</p> <p>The Sub-Group suggested the Company get the survey tested for comprehension before sending out to customers and also think about the visualisation and the presentation of the questions.</p>
<p>8. AOB</p>	<p><u>Horizon scanning questions</u> AC and SB joined the meeting to discuss the questions to be asked during the vulnerability horizon scanning questionnaire. The survey would be online and will be tested by SEW staff before going live. The Company asked the Sub-Group to send comments back within two weeks due to the short timescale on this piece of work.</p> <p><u>Non-Household research</u> AL informed the Sub-Group that the non-household (NHH) willingness to pay (WTP) would be discussed at the following CCG meeting and the slides will be circulated before the meeting.</p> <p>AL also informed the Sub-Group that any comments received from NHH customers following the freeze-thaw incident will be incorporated into the engagement and review.</p> <p>The Group raised a challenge around the representation of commuters and younger people in the qualitative research observed to date. Also the lack of visibility over non-household customer research.</p>
<p>9. Private session</p>	<p>Discussion on the timings and research selection.</p>

Summary of actions

Action	Owner
NB to update action list on minutes from the 5 th March meeting with owners.	NB
ICS to review pre task materials and how these could be expanded to cover more information for deliberative work.	ICS
The Company is to share with the Sub-Group the types of vulnerable customers that would be contacted for a telephone survey.	AL
ZM asked JO to flag where in the perceptions paper she specifically would welcome comments from CCG (note to go with papers)	JO
SEW to circulate the Outcomes research one pager and questionnaire to the Sub-Group.	AL