

**Water Sector ADR Panel  
Meeting 37  
Notes of a Meeting on 27 November 2019 at Water UK, 36  
Broadway, London**

**Present:**

Joe Brownless	Sir Tony Redmond
Daksha Piparia	Sandra Webber (Chair)
<b>Apologies</b>	
Louise Beardmore	
Claire Forbes	

Secretary: Shona Flood

		Action
<b>ITEM 1</b>	<b>Minutes and actions arising from meeting on 19 June 2019</b>	
	1. The record of the meeting on 12 September was approved.	
	2. It was noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the proposed wording for the 8-week deadline had been shared with CCWater. CCWater had agreed to make corresponding changes to wording that appears on its website and in literature to customers. It was agreed that a joint letter should be sent from the Panel and RWD to the Customer PAG and individual NHH retail companies to ask for the wording to be in place by end March 2020, after which the Panel would wish to check company websites;</li> <li>b. amendments would have to be made to the WATRS' website to reflect the introduction of the '8-week deadline'</li> </ul>	SW/SF  SF
<b>ITEM 2</b>	<b>Standing items</b>	
	3. As regards the contents of the slides, it was noted that the service provider's report did not contain data regarding outcome by application method that had appeared in previous reports. The service provider would be asked to reinstate this information, and also to correct some errors relating to headings.	SF
	4. As regards interpreting the slides, the service provider should be asked what if it was possible to summarise the main reasons for objections to and rejection of cases; and the main reasons for No Actions Required.	SF

5.	It was further noted that it was not clear whether member companies had sight of the service provider's monthly report. It was agreed that the Board would be asked to ensure that the report was made available on the RWD website.	SW/SF
6.	It was noted that a number of recent decisions continued to have high financial awards.	
7.	It was noted that some of the verbatim comments from the service provider's customer satisfaction expressed the opinion that the adjudicator had either not understood the issues or had not taken all of the evidence into account when reaching the decision. It was agreed that the Panel would undertake an initial review of all decisions where the customer had raised these concerns and would then decide which, if any, should be subject to an 'end to end review'. The Panel also asked to see a report of the non-verbatim responses.	SF
<b>ITEM 3</b>	<b>Tender programme</b>	
8.	It was noted that the current contract had been extended by agreement with the service provider until 30 June 2020.	
9.	It was further noted that the RFP, specification and supporting documents had been sent to 12 ADR entities who had indicated an interest in replying to the tender. The closing date for replies was noted as 6 December. The Panel noted that a dynamic application	
10.	process could be more user-friendly and noted that the Specification says "The tenderer is invited to put forward proposals to improve on the ease of use and accessibility of the current application form." The tender sub-group would be asked to ensure that this was considered in the assessment of the tenders.	SF
11.	It was agreed that the Panel would receive a brief report and presentation from the top 3 prospective suppliers identified by the tender sub-group (TSG) following evaluation of all proposals received. The Panel would then, in accordance with its terms of reference, make a recommendation for the preferred supplier to the Board	
<b>ITEM 4</b>	<b>Panel recruitment</b>	
12.	It was noted that the independent member vacancy had been advertised and interviews would take place on 18 December.	SW/DP
<b>ITEM 5</b>	<b>Website</b>	
11.	It was noted with some concern that the new RWD website was still not available. It was agreed that Ms Webber would write to the Board to note the Panel's concern with the continuing delay. It was also agreed that additional information regarding the role and function of the Panel should be made available on the website.	SW SF
<b>ITEM 6</b>	<b>NHH trial</b>	
12.	The Panel was pleased to note that a process for the trial and the principles on which decisions would be based had been agreed with the service provider. A number of cases that could be used in the trial	SW/SF

	had been identified and the relevant companies would be approached and asked to participate.	
<b>ITEM 7</b>	<b>Publication policy</b>	
13.	The Information Commissioner's Office Model Publication Scheme was reviewed. It was agreed that the Panel's publication policy should follow the minimum requirements set out in the 2015 ADR Regulations.	SF
<b>ITEM 8</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<b>Next meeting: January 2020 to tbc</b>	