

## Response to Citizen's Advice Consultation July 2016

Company: My Wave

Submission Deadline: 9 September 2016

#1 - Sec 2: 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?

Summarising the Metrics:

1. Complaints metrics listed for top 20 retailers
2. Customer Satisfaction - Retailer Contact: metrics for top 17 retailers
3. Customer Satisfaction - Ease of Understanding Retailer Bills: metrics for top 17 retailers
4. Switching Processing Time - metrics for top 17 retailers
5. Customer Commitments for Switch Guarantee Member or Billing Code Member - metrics top 17 retailers

Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.

In New Zealand we have found that consumers respond better to an overall rating. We would propose that the 5 metrics used are combined to provide a simple to read total – i.e. a ranking out of 100% with each metric contributing an appropriate pro-rata proportion of the 100%

#2 - Sec 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

(Weighting: 30%, 25%, 25%, 10%, 10% in order above)

No changes suggested.

#3 - Sec 2: 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?

We would prefer all retailers are included to provide a fair rating among all retailers. However we acknowledge that this may be unrealistic for the first release so request that timeframes of when the excluded retailers are to be added are supplied so we can advise our customers accordingly.

#4 - Sec 2: 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 to Sunday' is the appropriate timescale to capture this information?

Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.

Our preference is to provide customers with option where they are not compelled to use call centres. Online chat facilities can also help busy call centres improve effectiveness. It could be beneficial to acknowledge that as a communication mechanism.

Therefore, we agree that a communication performance metric is valuable but we recommend it not be limited to just call centres and other means of communication are included.

#5 - Sec 2: 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.

Yes - indicating switching accuracy as a performance metric helps consumers understand that the process isn't perfect and they are less surprised if things go wrong.

#6 - Sec 2: 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?

Nothing to suggest.

#7 - Sec 4: 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.

Agreed.

#8 - Sec 4: Do you agree that rounding supplier scores to the nearest quarter score will show sufficient granularity, while remaining clear enough for consumers to understand?

This makes sense if the data is collected quarterly.

#9 - Sec 4: Do you prefer the alternative scoring criteria over the initial scoring criteria set out in Section 4.1?

If so, why?

*The suggested methodology is as follows:*

- *Suppliers allocated a score between 1 and 17 for each metric, ranked by how well each supplier performs e.g. a score of 17 would be awarded to the lowest complaints ratio and a score of 1 to the highest complaints ratio.*
- *The metric weightings described in Section 2.1 are used.*
- *For identical performance, scores are divided equally between suppliers. The customer commitment metric is approached like this too, but where suppliers have not met the customer commitment a score of 1 is awarded.*
- *Suppliers receive a performance ranking based on their total score. For identical performance, suppliers are awarded the same final ranking.*

Instead of ranking from 17 to 1 where 17 is fewest complaints, it would probably be clearer to have position #1 represents least complaints, ie best performance.

#10 - Sec 4: Do you agree that the proposed tool will make improvements to the experience consumers currently have when accessing Citizens Advice performance information?

From pg 19:

*The energy supplier comparison tool proposes to introduce 4 new performance metrics (outlined in Section 2.1) alongside the existing complaints data contained with the league table (see Section 1.1) and present this information in a new format on the Citizens Advice website. The 5 individual metrics will be collated to provide an overall performance rating for suppliers. This proposal is initially for the 17 largest domestic suppliers only.*

By having performance metrics complement the current League Table of Complaints, this should start to frame the review in a more constructive light. It helps encourage a positive view of the industry where merit is shown. Further, this more directly helps a consumer find a high performing supplier.