

1. Do you agree that we should retain the vulnerability definition we set out in our 2016 Vulnerability Focus report?

No – I think this should be changed as it isn't very clear on who would be covered under this definition. I am Autistic, am I covered under this definition for example?

2. Do you agree with our approach to nomenclature, particularly our use of the term 'extra help'?

Yes, it's refreshing to see this new approach.

3. Do you agree with our proposed approach to applying the guidance to new appointees and the Welsh non-household sector?

Yes.

4. What impact do you think our draft guidance will have of the experiences of customers who need extra help?

I think it will be mostly positive and is welcome, but I think it needs to be made statutory.

5. Are there further lessons from other regulated sectors that could be incorporated into our draft guidance?

No comment.

6. Do you agree with our proposed approach to enforcing our customer focused licence condition by reference to our draft guidance?

I do agree, but I think there needs to be more teeth to it.

7. Do you agree that our draft objectives cover the broad areas of vulnerability support activities that companies should be considering?

Yes, I agree.

8. Do you agree with the proposed list of minimum expectations we have set out?

Yes, I agree – it is very thorough.

9. Do our draft minimum expectations offer a good balance between making clear the minimum standards we expect from companies, and challenging companies to innovate and find new ways to meet the needs of their customers?

Yes.

10. Do you agree with the proposed approach and timeline around companies' vulnerability strategies?

Yes, but I think this should be made statutory.

11. Do you agree with our proposed approach to how water companies should use our guidance?

Yes, but I think it should be made statutory.

12. Do you agree with our proposed approach and timelines for setting out our detailed expectations around the design of priority services registers in a separate standards document?

Yes, this is a very important area – please see my ‘other comments’ section for an example of where the PSR doesn’t currently capture problems that I feel should be considered.

Other comments:

I think companies should be forced to provide compensation for customers whose extra help needs have not been met.

I think that being on the PSR should also protect you more from poor customer service failings which have an impact on a disability. Recently in my case I was told that my account had been referred to a debt collection agency, but this turned out to be a mistake. The water company doesn’t seem to understand the distress this has had on me due to my disability which is recorded on the PSR. This is just an example of a case which falls out of the current remit and should be looked at.