

Minutes: Meeting of The Dee Valley Customer Challenge Panel

24th February 2016 – The Ramada Plaza, Wrexham

Attendees:

Dee Valley Water:

Ian Plenderleith (IP) – CEO, Wendy Jones (WJ) – Head Of Customer Services, Oliver Twydell (OT) – Head Of Quality & Environment, Tracey Jones (TJ) – Customer Relations and Department Assistant

Customer Challenge Panel:

Clare Evans (CE) – Chair, Angela Davies Jones (ADJ) – LCA CC Water, Lia Moutselou (LM) – Policy Manage CC Water, David Oxley (DO) – Sustainable Blacon, Paul Roberts (PR) – CAB, Councillor Martyn Delaney (MD) – Cheshire West and Chester Council, Councillor Bob Dutton (BD) – Wrexham County Borough Council

Apologies:

Dee Valley Water:

None

Customer Challenge Panel: Graham Jones – Federation Of Small Business, Andrew Ellis – Kellogg Company Of Great Britain, Stephen Mayall – Natural Resources Wales

Agenda:

1. Welcome and introduction of our new Chair
2. Previous minutes and actions
3. Sign off of the Terms Of Reference
4. Performance and Business updates
 - a. ODI Progress update & new inclusion discussion
 - b. Legacy programme update
5. Customer Engagement and Service Initiatives
 - a. SoC's / Social Tariff
 - b. Questions
 - c. Business for next meeting and date of next meeting

Meeting opened at 10.30

1. Welcome and introduction of our new Chair

CE/ The Chair opened the meeting and welcomed everyone. She introduced herself as the new Chair for Dee Valley Water CCG and offered an invitation for each CCG member to chat after the meeting. CE advised that she was looking forward to the next stages and delivering outputs from the panel meetings.

CE / The Chair invited all attendees to introduce themselves and an action was taken for all members to provide their own Biography and a photograph to be uploaded onto the Dee Valley Water website.

2. Previous minutes and actions

CE / The Chair began the review of the previous meetings minutes.

ADJ requested amendment on pg2. Sentence *'in the past could be regarded as 'stakeholder' independent verification'* to be stated as *'in the past **should be classed** as 'stakeholder' independent verification.'* This was accepted by the group.

PR asked if the minutes could be sent earlier than a couple of days prior to the meeting

WJ advised the minutes were originally sent two weeks after the previous meeting

CE/ The Chair confirmed everyone was happy with the minutes being sent two weeks after the meeting. Everyone agreed and was to be confirmed in the TOR agenda item

ADJ referred to the TOR document and a comment on page 3 and advised the comment should read "meetings should not be allowed to lapse and should be every three months or more frequent if required"

ADJ asked for TOR timelines/terms of office to be added into the document.

WJ advised this was acknowledged within the actions from the previous meeting and would be added in to the TOR

ADJ referred to AB (Andrew Bickerton) comment on page 5, 6th comment from the bottom, and asked for the comment "not clear to me" to be removed. It was acknowledged by **WJ** that this was an error and confirmed that the comment would be removed from the minutes.

CE / The Chair continued with a review of the actions

1. Complete
2. **WJ** referred to the sheet titled "Customer Challenge Panel – New Name?" and asked for the panels thoughts and suggestions.
PR suggested "Price Challenge Group" and "Local Challenge Group"
CE / The Chair said "local" kept it in line with who the CCG was there to represent
ADJ asked why we would change it – if it's not broken don't fix it – and suggested we keep the same name.
PR agreed with **ADJ**
LM said she would like to keep "Customer" and to either stay the same or align with other Companies (Customer Challenge Groups), she would not support the name "Customer Engagement Panel" as it would imply a different remit for the group.
CE / The Chair said that "Challenge" was what the group did
PR advised he liked "Group" and other panel members agreed and that this would align us to other Companies
WJ Confirmed that a decision had been made to change the name to "Customer Challenge Group"
3. Complete
4. Agenda item covered in the TOR
5. Covered in the Agenda
6. Covered in the Agenda
7. Covered in the Agenda
8. Covered in the Agenda
9. **WJ** advised that she and **TJ** are in the process of contacting other organisations and took an action to contact those who haven't attended for the past few meetings to confirm if they still wish to be a part of the CCG meetings.
10. Document was circulated
11. Complete. Timescales will be covered in the TOR

BD asked if the minutes will be on the website

CE / The Chair confirmed these will be published

12. **IP** advised of the importance of attendance at the CCG meetings. Having looked at other groups some offer nominal payments to panel members if they attend. **IP** went on to ask the group for their views.
BD said that **IP** should proceed carefully as some attendees can claim expenses from elsewhere, for example **BD** can claim expenses from the local authority
PR didn't think a financial payment would encourage members to attend
DO felt that as probably the only member not able to claim expenses from anywhere he would welcome some financial payment
LM advised that any work done for the CCG is done so on behalf of CCWater and no expenses would be claimed from the company for this
CE / The Chair asked if this should be left for now while we understand why panel members aren't attending and then make a recommendation
DO advised that had been paid previously and was able to claim travelling expenses
ADJ said that Independence is key for these meetings and the work of the group and that they were there to represent the consumer and that there was potential for conflict if payment was made.
CE / The Chair replied that if expenses were to be paid, they would have to be made public and transparent
DO commented that his understanding was that members of the panel were there to represent a cross section of people
CE / The Chair agreed with **DO**
BD advised that mileage allowance rates can be found on the HMRC website
IP advised that if the Group subsequently decided to implement payment for the reimbursement of expenses incurred that he would circulate wording and suggest some rules to the Group.
CE / The Chair asked if there was an opportunity to pay through other channels such as Trust Funds
ADJ felt this was a slippery slope to start on
CE / The Chair felt that it was clear from the Group comments that "payment" for the role was not being suggested, that it may be worth **SVW** looking into payment for appropriate expenses
MD advised he could claim via the Council
DO advised he is unable to claim from anyone

It was agreed that panel members should not receive any fee for attending, however verifiable expenses incurred for the meeting attendance should be reimbursed, but in accordance with a policy pre-approved by the CCG

IP recommended that **DVW** would circulate guidelines on expenses with the emphasis on maintaining the "Independence" of the Group members at all times.

13. Complete
14. Update in the ODI
15. Covered in the Agenda
16. Covered in the Agenda
17. Complete
18. Recommended 5 years for Term Of Office which is documented in the TOR
19. Covered in the Agenda
20. Complete
21. Available on the Ipad to view over lunch, also covered in the Agenda time permitting
22. **WJ** to obtain comment
23. **WJ** to update
24. **WJ** to obtain comment / update
25. Discussion as part of Social Tariff update
26. Discussion as part of Social Tariff update

IP queried action 25 and advised that nothing specific in the budget had been set aside with regard to the Social Tariff but that in the retail budget allowance from Ofwat for HH/NH there was an unidentified amount which could be identified for this.

CE / The Chair advised that premise of the Social Tariff was that it should pay for itself with just admin costs being borne by the Company

3. Sign off of the TOR

CE / The Chair / WJ circulated and talked through the TOR. She advised these probably wouldn't be signed off today as she had introduced new amendments that CCG members may not have time to consider. She had looked through Ofwat recent documents, reviews of the PR14 process along with an assessment of previous responsibilities and that new ones would need to be established

CE / The Chair highlighted some changes made by her since the ToR were circulated

“What is our main purpose”: Changed to “Purpose” – Comments were invited on this section.

“Role of the Group”: The wording now reads “Customer” rather than “Stakeholder”

“Role of the Group”: Point 2 now reads “Scrutinise” and not “Advise”

Point 7 to 9: All as before. ADJ advised it would be good / it is good to add legal outcomes.

CE / The Chair asked for feedback on this

CE / The Chair asked what panel members felt the maximum number of the group should be

DO said it would be good to have cross selection of members

PR felt it would be good to bring in additional people

CE / The Chair agreed with PR and that this would bring expertise within the core group

CE / The Chair added that there was a point raised at the last meeting regarding “experts” being invited as required and CCG members agreed (eg: LM)

PR asked if there should be something added about responsibility and liability

CE / The Chair confirmed that that should be covered in amendments made to the TOR and the cross section of people

BD asked for clarification of “Technical” people and why these would be required

CE / The Chair advised that this would be people with specific expertise and knowledge that would be invited as a guest to the meeting

LM felt that “Ofwat” should be at the bottom of the list under “Technical Experts” as it might be more likely that regulators and a reporter or auditor are invited to attend. It would also be useful to specifically name CCWater as an expert in addition to Drinking Water Inspectorate and Natural Resources Wales

CE / The Chair advised these weren't in any particular order but that she understood LM's concerns and the order would be changed.

ADJ Felt that Technical Experts offering advice should provide reports for pre-read. There is no reference to this in the TOR

CE / The Chair advised that she had made provisions on the agenda for “Next Meeting” to understand what is coming up, what needs to be addressed and what, if any, Technical advice would be required

IP Agreed and said that we would pick up from this agenda item what’s coming up and ensure that we have the right people invited to the next meeting. **IP** also took an action to circulate a DVW calendar of upcoming events. This calendar would also help to decide which technical experts would be required

CE / The Chair asked if people agreed that the panel should be members for 5 years

ADJ commented that it can be difficult to get members so could this be extended

MD advised it might be difficult to get Council representation due to Elections

CE / The Chair advised it would be ok to extend past 5 years if necessary and that this would be reflected in the revised TOR

CE / The Chair asked for feedback on the section “Style and conduct of meetings”. Asked if it was helpful and that the group was there to challenge and register concerns and issues

CCWater (ADJ / LM) challenged this section and didn’t feel it was appropriate to always aim for consensus positions. This may not be possible in some cases. The group will not always agree with each other so consensus may not always be possible but minutes and reports should note these differences. They both ask that this section is removed and this was agreed

PR said there was always opportunity to challenge

CE / The Chair advised she was happy to take it out and this was agreed by the Group

CE / The Chair moved on to “Governance and Meetings” section and confirmed four meetings per year with more if required, however if meetings weren’t required they could also be removed

CE / The Chair also confirmed that minutes, agenda and paperwork etc. should be sent no less than 5 working days before the next meeting and the agenda should be available on the Company website. The first draft of minutes should then be circulated two weeks after the meeting. Once minutes have been approved at the meeting they should then be uploaded to the website.

CE / The Chair advised that in the “Conflict of interest” section she added that “if an agenda item might represent a conflict of interest for him or her, this should be raised with the Chair in advance of the meeting.

WJ advised that she had set up a Challenge Log and asked **CE / The Chair** how she would like to proceed with it

LM advised there was a challenge log but it was not set up from the outset and it did not always respond to the question or the challenge with the action the Company took

CE / The Chair confirmed it was ok to ask if the comment was a “challenge” or “query” and add to the minutes

WJ took an action to share the Challenge log with **CE / The Chair** and then the CCG

BD felt that the challenges should be formally declared and recorded in a formal template

BD asked if there should be a register of interest

CE / The Chair advised members that it's their responsibility to make people aware of any challenges that they specifically wish to have recorded and for any conflicts members wish to be declared.

ADJ said if something doesn't add value it should not be included in the TOR. We do not necessarily need a detailed document that explains every aspect of our operation and the background to the CCG

CE / The Chair said she was happy to remove this information but that it was an introduction to who we are

ADJ asked if it could be simplified

IP agreed it was needed for the wider community but could be simplified so that when it's on the website people understand it. Didn't feel the history was needed

LM asked if members could send comments through

CE / The Chair advised that all comments would be welcomed prior to the next meeting when an amended document would be presented and adopted at the appropriate agenda item

4. Performance and Business Update

a. ODI Progress update & new inclusion discussion

WJ introduced the ODI spreadsheet and explained that it would be used at each meeting to update on performance.

WJ invited feedback on the template and asked if the graphs were useful.

ADJ said she liked the template

CE / The Chair liked the traffic light system but to be careful as "decrease" in a target can sometimes denote an improved performance, depending on the metric being used. It was agreed by the Group that the arrow symbols used in future updates should ensure an upward facing arrow would indicate an improved performance and a downward facing arrow would indicate a reduced performance

WJ took an action to add a key to the template to explain the colours and symbols for future reports

PR said he understood red and green but asked what the definition of amber was, for example would it be amber if the target was missed by 10% etc.

WJ advised she wasn't a fan of amber herself and asked if it should just be red and green for either being "on" or being "off" target

PR said that if **WJ** planned to use amber it should have a measure

IP provided an example of amber being that the Company may be achieving the Ofwat target but missing the business target

LM said the Company may be on target but it is important to highlight whether the Company is in decline compared to performance earlier in the year – identify trends

CE / The Chair summarized that the Groups view was that just red and green should be used in future update reports

IP recommended that if we were in green now, we should highlight if it was felt that we weren't on track to remain in green. This was welcomed by the Group.

LM asked if column titles could be added to the tables. This was agreed

WJ went on to advise why the results were in red on page 2 of the report. This is due to the NHH SIM being taken from Rant and Rave results. As responses are low any negative scores heavily impacts the results. A new mechanism is being looked at with alternative method of representing the scores

LM asked if the method for reporting was going to be different moving forward, how would we compare the results with this quarter

WJ advised we were using the same mechanism as SIM

LM asked if it would be comparable next time

WJ took an action to show the difference in the two measures on the next report for clarity and comparison

WJ explained Interruptions

IP advised that overall DVW is doing well but that there are some pockets of people in specific areas who have been affected by poor performance, for example Sun Bank and Churton

CE / The Chair queried the relevance to the customer of the "number of hours lost" service measure and agreed with **IP** that of more relevance to the customer would be the number of time the customers water supply had been cut off.

WJ said it was important that DVW start to demonstrate who's affected by service failures and how the asset management plans reflect it. **WJ** gave the example of Holt and the new pipe replacement work that has taken place. **WJ** advised that where it matters it is addressed

LM said the CCWater quarter reports are shared publicly and could be shared with the CCG or key issues highlighted by that report could be reported to the CCG. She queried why data cell "B1" is the same as CCWater but it was clarified that data in this table is for the quarter only. It is important to have a key that explains exactly what information and for what period it contains.

LM asked if the number was accurate. Average YTD v Rolling 12 months. DVW's figure is based on a rolling 12 months

IP / WJ explained DVW measure is rolling 12 months and how this is different from quarter and YTD

CE / The Chair felt it was easier to compare to other companies by using YTD but liked the rolling 12 month measure

IP advised he would never report on YTD, he'll always report on a rolling 12 month figure. The rationale for using the rolling twelve months figure was explained by **IP** and the Group agreed the usefulness of this metric

MD felt that the discussion from the ODI report should be about performance

PR said it would be helpful for non-technical people to have a definition of "what is being discussed", a glossary on the ODI template of the measures, what they mean and how they are calculated

BD felt DVW should be checking short term for improvements

WJ asked if the Group felt any additional service measures were missing and what is meaningful to individuals and businesses

PR said affordability was missing. This is the biggest impact for Councillors. PR gave the example of people not being able to afford their council tax and water would be way down this list. He felt it would be useful to see the impact of this

CE / The Chair suggested adding this to the customer profile

PR suggested that the Group may like to look at the trends relating to numbers of customers owing more than £xx amount

ADJ asked the Company what the figure of bad debt was for the Company and how it impacted on customer bills. She requested the addition of compensation for failures in customer service (eg: distinguishing GSS and Ex Gratia payments)

CE / The Chair Asked if there was a target from Ofwat for DVW relating to bad debt

IP advised it was difficult to measure due to the different accounting policies and management estimates used by each company.

PR asked if DVW could provide the number of customers who were xx months in arrears

CE / The Chair asked if the number of weekly payment plans were increasing

IP agreed and asked what people would like to see for a future discussion of customer vulnerability and affordability

LM asked again about the purpose of the report. It would be important for it to be comparable to other companies so that CCG can have an understanding of Dee Valley Waters performance against the industry

CE / The Chair asked what the CCG would like to see the Company report on in addition to the agreed ODI measure so that the Group could challenge and discuss. The Group were tasked with suggesting additional measures that are meaningful to the customer on which the Company could report to the CCG

LM said affordability is a key issue for this group to consider and it would be important to measure affordability offerings progress. CCWater is collecting this information in it's quarterly reports and these could be included to any submissions to the CCG by the Company

PR would like to see information relating to the take up of Social tariff and any trends that appear

CE / The Chair suggested asking the Company to provide the CCG with information relating to the social tariff take up rate

IP advised that DVW wants to be proactive in encouraging payment plans and should be looking at the trend of customers who miss one payment, as this is the start of someone having difficulty with future payments. It was suggested that information in relation to customer trends on different payment plans may be useful for the CCG to have sight of at a future meeting

PR felt that a simple measure was affordability

CE / The Chair summarized the discussion and it was agreed that the next meeting would have a focus on customer affordability and information from the Company in relation to debt, payment plans, defaults, assistance schemes/social tariff take up would be provided. Any further suggestions from members would be welcomed.

CE / The Chair confirmed that the CCG were now all happy with the way the ODI report would be presented at a future meeting

4. Performance and Business Update

b. Legacy programme update

OT updated the CCG on Legacy which covered the following areas:

- Discolouration causes
- How we were doing
- Managing the risk at Legacy
- Legacy alternative
- Progress effect of alternative on water resource management plan
- 2015 performance
- Next steps

DO asked how far DVW had gone with ice pigging the mains and what the work ongoing?

OT advised there was no more planned for this year but would resume again next year

DO asked if this was in line with the new plant and will it cause the problem entirely. **DO** also asked if there was any problems in Chester

OT advised there was a problem with Iron but not manganese and advised that 40% of water mains were constructed in unlined cast iron.

LM asked for confirmation of what was meant by “this year”, is it 2016/17

OT advised it was a calendar year and so pigging would start again in 2017

BD asked what was causing the increase in manganese

OT advised numerous things such as weather patterns and changes in land usage are causes for increased levels of manganese

IP advised that DWI agreed that DVW now had a better scheme than the original

PR commented that having one resource rather than two is a risk

IP advised that Legacy only provides three hours of supply for a small number of people, which is actually a false level of security

OT confirmed the new plan was more resilient

LM asked for explanation about the £3m saving

IP confirmed this is an estimated saving

DO asked if there would be more than one pumping station

OT confirmed there would be one to prevent common cause failures and others will be duty standby pumps at the new pumping stations. There will be several pumping stations installed on the network to increase the volume of water that we can transfer. This would be an integrated network

CE / The Chair asked if Penycae and Ty Mawr would no longer be used

OT explained that DVW will continue to use these reservoirs with Llwyn Onn

PR asked if this would reflect in future bills

CE / The Chair asked if directional drilling had allowed a shorter process

OT confirmed it had but in areas of high risk this was mitigated

PR asked how the cost compared for this process

OT advised it was more expensive but that other costs, including time was mitigated

BD asked if any mining rights were being challenged

OT said he wasn't aware of any

CE / The Chair asked if DVW currently own all the land for the new reservoirs

OT confirmed DVW did

CE / The Chair asked what the surplus was in Wrexham as a percentage

OT advised 60 mega litres per day and is on top of head room

CE asked if this was spending the potential saving identified in the new process

OT confirmed this was part of the £14m

WJ tried to show the video of Trunk Cleaning in the presentation, however couldn't get it to work.

LM said it would be useful to have the video link.

WJ took an action to share the video link with the CCG

OT continued to explain Ice Pigging in detail

DO commented that he had had positive experience of the SMS/Voice message system around disruption notification

CE/The Chair asked OT to clarify the total network cleaned historically

PR asked do we need to repeat the cleaning once undertaken

OT replied we need to monitor

PR commented that we had gone from 50 km to over 200km

OT concurred that the old targets were unrealistic in terms of improving performance so had to improve

OT continued to state that once this programme had completed the cleaning would turn to iron issues which were predominantly in Chester

DO commented on that he knew this was an issue in Chester

OT continued to state that we manage DMA risk areas by baseline levels of iron and manganese and have planned 200km out of 500 so far in Chester for 2016

LM asked was this ice pigging

OT confirmed no it was heavy flushing

CE / The Chair asked if this caused disruption or dirty water

OT confirmed this was proactively managed via our SMS services

PR referred to the ODI and asked if they should be based on what DVW is going to achieve

OT advised this was based on upper quartile of industry standards, Ofwat have done it across the whole industry

IP advised DVW were ahead of the target

LM commented that it would be worth noting in the ODI that DVW have achieved the ODI target but not that set by DVW as a higher internal target

IP confirmed that as manganese was now under control, DVW needs to start to manage Iron more closely and then understand what the next focus is

CE / The Chair ended the discussion at this point to break for lunch (12.20pm).

Note: BD and OT left the meeting at this point due to other commitments.

TJ demonstrated a Beta version of the website to each of the CCG members during the lunch break

CE / The Chair resumed the meeting at 12.50.

5. Customer Engagement and Service Initiatives

a. SoC's / Social Tariff

IP Updated on the SoC's and Social Tariffs including the 4.9% increase in bill costs and asked the CCG for their thoughts and feedback

CE / The Chair asked for clarification that if DVW lost a couple of businesses, could the average household bill increase

IP confirmed that this could happen

PR asked if non household customers could go elsewhere for their water

WJ confirmed they could if their usage was over 50 mega litres

LM asked if DVW were penalised for the increase in bill costs

IP advised that, yes DVW could be penalised if it continued to under recover revenues by more than 2%,

CE / The Chair asked if customers would be more likely to see instability of bills if customers and businesses were lost

LM asked if other companies had been in a position like this, where they had lost business and been required to increase customer bills

IP advised that he didn't know

LM said it would be interesting to see what other companies would have or have done. She agreed to ask CCWater colleagues and to feedback to the CCG

IP said that he would welcome that information

LM advised that it's not the first time DVW has made errors in its revenue predictions and that is of concern.

IP advised the forecast in previous AMPs revenues were reviewed over the five year period of the AMP rather than year on year

CE / The Chair asked, why would Ofwat change from a reconciliation over the AMP to yearly

IP commented Ofwat probably wanted companies to motivate to improve their annual forecasts in the expectation that this would improve bill stability, which was stated by customers in all customer research

CE / The Chair said that she assumed that the Household customer base would be stable but the biggest risk would be business customers

IP advised that if something happens in the year that hasn't been planned then it unfortunately it has an impact and the customer bears that impact

IP said he would have done something differently to mitigate or minimize the impact if he could, however with potential for penalties for inaccurate forecasts the company could not make adjustments to smooth the impact over the lifetime of the contracts.

LM asked what "increased investment" means

IP confirmed that this belonged on the K factor line.

PR commented that with DVW being a small company they have more risk of being penalized as bigger companies can absorbed the additional costs (fluctuations)

WJ advised that all call takers at DVW have been briefed on the situation and any complaints will be recorded

WJ continued with the Social Tariff update. She advised that as a starting point DVW have said that 1700 customers (1% of base) could receive upto 30% off their bill, if they fulfil the qualifying criteria

LM asked if DVW was subsidizing the administration costs of running the Social Tariff

WJ confirmed that the cost of the assistance itself was covered with a 50p contribution from the customer and that DVW would cover all administration costs.

PR advised that Welsh Water's customers had given a mandate to use a figure up to £15 per customer towards their social tariff. Compared to that, DVW couldn't do much with 50p

WJ said DVW ensured that customers were surveyed equally in case of different outcomes

IP advised that DVW had used the same research company and the similar questions to remove the variability. IP said that the world had changed in the past couple of years, for example austerity cuts may have contributed to making people less prepared to give, this could be the reason for the difference in £15 and 50p

CE / The Chair said the CCG could perhaps make a suggestion to the company to look at reducing customers' bills if they stayed on their set payment plan. Similar schemes were in operation in other water companies and examples could be provided at the next CCG meeting

PR agreed that people need to be kept engaged and paying their bills

CE / The Chair also agreed and said that it could be that if the customer continues to pay then they see some benefit from the company

PR said that there is a need to build customer sustainability

CE / The Chair asked for suggestions on how to help vulnerable customers

MD said he would like to look at ways to get the message out across Cheshire West and Chester

PR asked if 1700 people were receiving 30% off their bill, what the average bill was

WJ confirmed that the average customer bill was currently £145

PR queried that the cost to operate the social tariff would then be higher than the fund value

WJ reminded PR that the social tariff could offer up to 30% off and that if DVW had less uptake than the forecast 1700 customers DVW were then in a position to help with more customers costs

CE / The Chair said that we should track these customer trends

PR asked whether the social tariff would be reviewed

WJ advised that research will be carried out annually including affordability

WJ next gave an update on Rant and Rave

CE / The Chair asked if DVW had seen an increase in it's SIM ranking for billing which reflected in Rant and Rave results and customer feedback

WJ advised that the score started at 4.6 but is now regularly 4.8 – 4.9 and that billing is ranking first in SIM

IP commented that Rant and Rave was a very good predictor for SIM as they are currently scoring the same

PR asked if staff could see the overall score so that they could compare their individual score

WJ advised they could but they can't compare themselves to other agents. The scores are so high and similar that someone scoring 4.6 might be last in the league table but only 0.3 points behind the person at the top. This would be demotivating.

PR said he was originally concerned with the word "rant"

ADJ agreed with PR

WJ said she initially agreed however it doesn't seem to be having a negative impact

PR asked if there was an opportunity to provide feedback on the website via Rant and Rave

WJ confirmed there will be. WJ advised she doesn't like exit surveys, but there will be a floating button on the website for customers to leave feedback if they wish to. WJ also advised that she will use Google analytics for page information

5. Customer Engagement and Service Initiatives

b. Questions

No questions were raised at this point

5. Customer Engagement and Service Initiatives

c. Business for next meeting and date of next meeting

CE / The Chair confirmed that the following should be included in the next meeting:

- TOR sign off
- ODI figures
- Financial Information
- Affordability – presentation from DVW Inc. trends and debt with group discussion
- Presentation from Research Company – Impact Utilities.

PR asked if the CCG need to sign a confidentiality agreement as some of the content maybe sensitive or confidential

CE / The Chair said this would be up to DVW to advise the CCG

IP didn't feel the need for this to happen

ADJ asked if the next meeting was in Packsaddle and if so, was that right, as there needs to be independence within the group

IP said he was happy for the venue to change to the Ramada or somewhere similar. TJ took an action to change this

WJ advised that if anyone wanted a visit to Packsaddle, this could be arranged

CE / The Chair reminded the CCG to send a biog of themselves and an overview of the organization / business they are representing on the CCG along with their photograph so that it can be uploaded on to the website

CE / The Chair advised the date of the next meeting is 18th May 2016

The meeting closed at 2.10pm

Action	Page No		Owner	Due Date
1	1	All members to provide their own Biography and a photograph in order to be uploaded onto the Dee Valley Water website.	ALL	4 th May
2		Ensure everyone had name tags / signs at future meetings.	TJ	18 th May
3	2	Minutes from 23 rd November to be amended on pg. 2 to read 'in the past should be classed as 'stakeholder' independent verification.' Re ADJ comments.	TJ	21 st March
4	2	ADJ referred to the TOR document and a comment on page 3 and advised the comment should read "meetings should not be allowed to lapse and should be every 3 months or more frequent if required"	TJ	21 st March
5	2	Consider timelines/terms of office within the TOR	TJ	21 st March
6	2	Minutes - AB (Andrew Bickerton) comment on page 5, 6 th comment from the bottom, and asked for the comment "not clear to me" to be removed. It was acknowledged by WJ that this was an error and confirmed it would be removed from the minutes.	TJ	21 st March
7	2	Contact those members of the CCG who haven't attended for the past few meetings to confirm if they still wish to be a part of the CCG. CE to then call any that don't respond to the first letter	TJ / CE	30 th April
8	3	DVW would circulate guidelines on expenses with emphasis on "Independence"	WJ/TB	30 th April
9		Provide update within minutes regarding the receiving of assurance statement, requests of support from AB	AB	30 th April
10		Confirm who NRW representative liaised with re company assurance plans	AB	30 th April
11	3	All share feedback on new TOR. Comments by the end of April	ALL	30 th April
12	4	Circulate a DVW calendar of upcoming events. This calendar would also help to decide which technical experts would be required	IP/WJ	18 th May
13	5	Share the Challenge log with CE / The Chair and then the CCG	WJ	4 th May
14	5	IP agreed introduction in the TOR was needed for the wider community but could be simplified so that when it's on the website people understand it. Didn't feel the history was needed, just a simplified version	IP	18 th May
15	6	Add a key to the template to explain the colours and symbols on the ODI template	WJ	18 th May
16	6	Add column titles to the ODI template	WJ	18 th May
17	6	Add a definition of "what is being discussed", and a glossary on the ODI template	WJ	18 th May

18	8	Add to next agenda items on vulnerability and finance profiles	TJ	4 th May
19	10	Share the Ice Pigging video link with the CCG members	WJ	4 th May
20	11	Understand how other water companies have dealt with miscalculation of revenue and how they may have addressed the risk of bill increases differently	LM	18 th May
21	12	Remove K factor increased comments remark from Soc's description.	WJ	4 th May
22		Ongoing meetings to be at the Ramada or other non-company location in Wrexham as appropriate	TJ	18 th May

Decision	Page No		Owner	Due Date
1.	2	A decision was made that the panel name would change to Customer Challenge Group		
2.	2	A decision was made to send the first draft of minutes 2 weeks after the CCG meeting		
3.	5	A decision was made to send minutes, agenda, and any paperwork for pre read no later than 5 working days before the next meeting		