

## Energy comparison consultation response for Citizens Advice

**Company: Energy Helpline**

**Sent on: 25 August 2016**

Responses to the question in the consultation below.

### Question 1

Do you agree that the combination of the 5 metrics proposed for the first release will provide consumers with an overall view of suppliers' customer service performance? Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.

Agree. Discussion point: complaints – we've discussed internally that this data is effectively out of date data during the 3 months following its release and is not necessarily indicative of a supplier's current performance. It is difficult to reflect this as a current state so agree that the weighting should be low.

Question 2 Do you agree that the indicative weightings are an accurate representation of the importance of each metric? If you suggest any changes, please provide an explanation and any supporting evidence

We don't necessarily agree with the weighting for billing as Ofgem rules mean that suppliers have to add a lot of information to the bill which is not actually related to the customer's usage, or the amount they need to pay. You could argue that they could make it easier to read; another argument could be that reducing the information on it would automatically make it easier to read. Awaiting outcome of Ofgem billing workshop where these ideas were discussed.

Question 3 Do you agree with the decision to limit the metrics and overall rating in the first release of the tool to the 17 largest suppliers from which we are able to collect representative data?

Agree to a certain degree; data on all suppliers would benefit customers, but also see that it would be easier and quicker to roll out for the largest suppliers initially in order to prevent delays.

Question 4 Do you agree that a future release of the tool would benefit from the inclusion of a performance metric about the average speed to answer telephone calls? Do you agree that the suggested scope of calls between '9am 5pm, Monday Sunday' is the appropriate timescale to capture this information?

Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.

This could be afforded a low weighting; it would benefit customers greatly if they could contact their supplier outside of normal working hours on weekdays so this metric could include weighting for suppliers that offer later opening.

Question 5 Do you agree that a future release of the tool would benefit from the inclusion of a performance metric about the accuracy of switching, based on the number of erroneous transfers? Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.

Does this relate to the number of customers a new supplier transfers back, or the number of customers that the current supplier prevents from leaving? This one is difficult as sometimes erroneous transfers take place due to customer error/misunderstanding, and may not be the new suppliers fault. More pressing is the issue of sales being rejected by the new supplier due to the current supplier not updating the National database effectively, or that customers with E7 meters are often allowed a single rate without removing the E7 meter and then have no way to switch on PCWs as this must be done like for like.

Question 6 Are there any additional qualitative indicators we should be considering for future development of the tool, in order to provide the best possible information for consumers?

As mentioned in 5 above, something which indicates how well suppliers update customer records to prevent problems switching in future – maybe a ‘go live’ by payment method indicator?

Question 7 Do you agree that the scoring definitions and scoring criteria proposed are appropriate to use for the comparison tool? Please provide any supporting evidence with your response.

Agree.

Question 8 Do you agree that rounding supplier scores to the nearest quarter score will show sufficient granularity, while remaining clear enough for consumers to understand?

Agree.

Question 9 Do you prefer the alternative scoring criteria over the initial scoring criteria set out in Section 4.1? If so, why?

We feel that this would be more difficult for people to understand if they looked at how it was calculated. After a quick read we didn’t immediately understand it.

Question 10 Do you agree that the proposed tool will make improvements to the experience consumers currently have when accessing Citizens Advice performance information?

Agree.