

Developer Services Measure of Experience (D-MeX) for  
PR19: D-MeX Working Group 2b

24 October 2017

<b>Timing</b>	<b>Item</b>
14:00 – 14:10	Welcome and introductions Background
14:10 – 14:40	Topic 1 – Scope of D-MeX: customer segments and priorities
14:40 – 15:25	Topic 2 – Overall design and proposal from Thames Water
15:25 – 15:30	Break
15:30– 16:00	Topic 3 – Quantitative component: Water UK metrics & SLP proposal from Fair Water Connections
16:00 – 16:25	Topic 4 – Qualitative component and piloting D-MeX
16:25 – 16:30	Next steps and close

**Reminder: purpose of the D-MeX Working Group** is to aid the design and implementation of D-MeX. This includes by facilitating the development of the pilot & guidance that water companies will apply from 2020-2025; discussing the methodological details; helping to resolve practical issues. **Ofwat remains the decision maker.**

## **D-MeX working group set-up meeting 19 September – discussed:**

- purpose of D-MeX working groups;
- aspects of the design and implementation including those from consultation responses:
  - Ofgem's connections incentives and incorporating service levels into D-MeX;
  - The existence of connections customer segments with differing needs.
- views around surveying and challenges in identifying survey participants;
- timetable, group membership, future D-MeX working groups. Decided to hold a customer-only working group prior to today's one.

## **D-MeX developer customer sub-group 9 October – discussed:**

- customer priorities and requirements from their water companies;
- how different customer segments' specific characteristics could be captured by D-MeX;
- whether existing Water UK metrics could usefully be incorporated into D-MeX;
- how to approach capturing qualitative feedback from customers.

Previous D-MeX working group suggested customer segmentation due to differing customer needs (may affect survey questions) and different segments representing different values to the water company.

- **Views on whether the new connections customer base should be segmented as set out in the table? What definitions should be used?**
- **What are the priority aspects of service for each segment? Examples below**

Segment / priority	NAV (non contestable services)	SLP (for non contestable services)	Large developer	Small developer	Residential or one-time connection
<b>Segment definition*</b>	Definitions already exist		10+ units	2-9 units /	1 unit / standard 25mm pipe
<b>1</b>	?	Speed of response to point of connection request	Speed of new mains connection	Ease and speed of contact	Quality of digital self-serve offerings / online account management
<b>2</b>	?	Speed of design approval	Ease and speed of contact	Accuracy of quote	
<b>3</b>	?	?	?	?	?

\*Unit-based definitions based on practice adopted by Dept. Communities Local Government ( DCLG)

It is likely that the services included under the banner of “Developer services” vary amongst companies.

### Thames Water proposal for services to be included in D-MeX – for discussion:

Services in scope of D-MeX	Of primary concern to:	
	Large developers	Homeowners/ small builders
Requisitions	✓	
Service connections	✓	✓
Adoptions	✓	
Diversions	✓	
Consent to connect (waste network)	✓	✓

- **What are views on including the above services under D-MeX; any others?**
- **As part of a qualitative element, the survey sampling approach would reflect the scope of D-MeX - e.g. we could:**
  - a) Sample by customer group: surveying x number of customers in each agreed segment (regardless of the services they use)
  - b) Sample by service: surveying x number of customers for each service line

**If we adopted approach a), do we need agreement of the services in scope?**

### A measure with three key aspects - summary:

1. A **Qualitative** component to measure how customers have felt about their customer journey (regardless of whether they decide to go with an incumbent or with a third party) with a **25% weighting**.
  - Quality of information provided by companies
  - Ease of access to information
  - How well companies resolve complaints
2. A **Quantitative** component to measure the facilitation, planning and construction of connections work, **weighted at 75%**.
3. A **Competition** element to be introduced within both the qualitative and quantitative components to reflect openness to competition.
  - Within the **qualitative** element: clarity and transparency of quotations, effective signposting and support of choice for developers. These factors are of importance to both SLPs and NAVs.
  - Within the **quantitative** element:
    - For SLPs: review / select the most critical self-lay Water UK metrics (W19.1-30.1) – later
    - For NAVs: assess delivery-and timescale-related priorities and develop quantitative measures based on these for NAVs.

### ➤ Discussion: What are the group's views on this proposal?

# Topic 3.1: Metrics: Water UK's Water Metrics

W1.1	Performance	Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	21 days (Non-statutory)
W2.1	Performance	s45 applications – written acknowledgements within target	5 days (Non-statutory)
W2.1a	Information	s45 applications - refused/returned/questioned	None
W3.1	Performance	s45 quotations - within target	28 days (Non-statutory)
W4.1	Performance	s45 service pipe connections - within target	21 days (Statutory)
W4.1a	Information	s45 service pipe connections - within extended target	None
W5.1	Performance	Mains design - written acknowledgement within target	5 days (Non-statutory)
W5.1a	Information	Mains design - forms refused/returned/questioned	None
W6.1	Performance	Mains design <500 plots - quotations within target	28 days (Non-statutory)
W7.1	Performance	Mains design >500 plots - quotations within target	42 days (Non-statutory)
W7.1a	Information	Mains designs >500 plots - as % of total mainlaying jobs	None
W7.1b	Information	Mains designs >500 plots - % where extension agreed	None
W8.1	Performance	Mains construction within target	90 days (Statutory)
W8.1a	Information	Mains construction within extended target - as % of all mainlaying jobs	None
W16.1	Performance	Mains diversions - written acknowledgements within target	5 days
W16.1a	Information	Mains diversions- applications returned/refused/questioned	None

W17.1	Performance	Mains diversions (without constraints) - quotations within target	42 days	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W17.2	Performance	Mains diversions (with constraints) - quotations within target	By agreement	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W17.2a	Information	Mains diversion quotations - % where agreed extension	None	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W18.1	Performance	Mains diversions - construction/commissioning within target	90 days or by agreement (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W19.1	Performance	Self-lay point of connection applications - written acknowledgements within target	5 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W20.1	Performance	Self-lay Point of Connection report < 500 plots etc - reports issued within target	21 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W21.1	Performance	Self-lay Point of Connection reports >500 plots etc - reports issued within target	28 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W22.1	Performance	Self-lay design approval and terms request application - written acknowledgements within target	5 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W23.1	Performance	Self-lay design and terms request <500 plots etc - quotations within target	14 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W24.1	Performance	Self-lay design and terms request >500 plots etc - quotations within target	28 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W25.1	Performance	Self-lay signed agreement - acknowledgements within target	5 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W26.1	Performance	Self-lay water for pressure/bacteriological testing - provided within target	28 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W27.1	Performance	Self-lay permanent water supply - provided within target	14 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W28.1	Performance	Self-lay vesting certificates - issued within target	7 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W29.1	Performance	Self-lay Asset Payments - issued within target	35 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>
W30.1	Performance	Self-lay plot references and costing details - issued within target	14 days (Non-statutory)	<a href="#">View Definition</a>

# Topic 3.1: Metrics: Water UK's Sewerage metrics

Reference	Type <span>?</span>	Title	Target
S1.1	Performance	Pre-development enquiry – reports issued within target	21 days (Non-statutory)
S2.1	Performance	Sewer requisition - written acknowledgement of applications within target	5 days (Non-statutory)
S2.1a	Information	Sewer requisition - applications refused/returned/questioned	5 days (Non-statutory)
S3.1	Performance	Sewer requisition design – offers issued within target	Period agreed between undertaker and customer (Non-statutory)
S4.1	Performance	Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned within agreed extension	180 days (Statutory)
S4.1a	Information	Sewer requisition – constructed and commissioned - extensions agreed	None
S5.1	Performance	Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions– acknowledgements within target	14 days (Non-statutory)
S5.1a	Information	Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – applications refused/returned/questioned	14 days (Non-statutory)
S6.1	Performance	Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – approval or rejection letters within target	28 days (Non-statutory)

S6.1a	Information	Technical vetting of adoptions & diversions – extensions agreed	None
S7.1	Performance	Adoption legal agreement – draft agreements issued within target	14 days (Non-statutory)
S8.1	Performance	s106 sewer connection - approval letters issued within target	21 days (Statutory)
S9.1	Performance	s106 sewer connection - rejection letters issued within target	21 days (Statutory)

Source: <https://developerservices.water.org.uk/public/metrics>

**Standards (under the new connection charging arrangements) covering ‘non-contestable’ work, where the SLP is solely reliant on water company:**

	<b>Proposed Self-Lay Customer Service Measure</b>	<b>Standard</b>
<b>SL-1</b>	Point of Connection response (confirm PoC location – to enable design)	10 days [1]
<b>SL-2</b>	Design approval and terms request issue (after SLP application)	14 days [2]
<b>SL-3</b>	Provision of connecting spur and supply of water for pressure/ bacteriological testing of self-lay mains	28 days [3]
<b>SL-4</b>	Make asset payment on self-lay mains (after commissioning)	35 days
<b>SL-5</b>	Issue plot info for self-lay new connections (from SLP application)	14 days
<b>SL-6</b>	Provide meters & other fittings for service connections (from SLP request)	14 days

[1] For companies in Wales (new charging rules will not apply from April 2018) SL-1 standard needs to cover both a ‘Point of Supply’ and ‘Point of Connection’ response – suggest 21 days.

[2] For companies in Wales SL-2 response time could be set as part of the PoC response, so either 14 days where the PoS and PoC are coincident, otherwise set at 28 days.

[3] SL-3 standard could be set as ‘either 28 days or any longer period (of up to 56 days) notified in the PoC response when traffic restrictions prevent the 28 day standard being achieved’.

[4] Application acknowledgements represent good practice but does not need to be measured.

[5] Companies need to demonstrate that they check all applications for completeness on receipt.

[6] Companies set their own standards for any contestable activities they offer. Could include the ‘piece-up’/provision of a permanent connection of self-lay mains (which needs to be within 14 days).

➤ **Views on these metrics for SLPs? What metrics for other segments – how many?**

### 1. If we were to pilot the qualitative component, for example through a customer survey:

#### ➤ how could that be implemented amongst the five different customer segments (SLPs, NAVs, large developers, small developers, one-offs)? Examples:

- Gathering details twice per year of the last month's interactions from water companies (based on current SIM approach)
- Market research company doing a random digit dial survey once (or twice) per year

### 2. Requirements for pilot – advice on:

- Survey design and sampling approach amongst customer segments
  - Weighting/distribution of sample across different customer segments
  - Minimum Sample size – to be fair and representative
  - Person interviewed – e.g. the named applicant, or the person involved at the last interaction? (for large-scale developers this is frequently different)
  - Journey stage(s) captured in the sample – e.g. applied only at the end of a journey (i.e. job completion), or at key touchpoints/stages throughout the process?
  - Frequency of measurement versus job timelines - if measurement is every six months, will customers with jobs spanning, for example, 2 years be interviewed on repeat occasions to track their end-to-end experience, or is the sample randomised each time?
- **Any volunteers to contribute to a draft specification for the qualitative part of D-MeX?**

**Thank you for attending**