



	<p>b. CCWater would have to amend information on its website regarding the complaints process (including the video)</p> <p>d. the annual statistical review had been sent to companies and all relevant stakeholders;</p> <p>e. customer feedback received was reviewed by the service provider and, where appropriate, changes to administrative practices and/or individual performance were made</p> <p>f. Ms Webber had met with Ms Fletcher (Ofwat to discuss WATRS in the context of customer care.</p>	
<b>ITEM 3</b>	<b>Standing items</b>	
	<p>4. It was noted that changes had been made to the service provider's monthly report. It was agreed that the service provider would be asked to reinstate data regarding outcome by application method. It was noted that the action for the Panel to recommend to the Board</p> <p>5. that the service provider's monthly report should be shared with member companies was still outstanding. The recommendation would be made to the Board at its meeting in September.</p>	SF SF
	<p>6. It was noted that a number of the recent decisions had high financial awards.</p>	
<b>ITEM 4</b>	<b>NHH options</b>	
	<p>8. The Panel considered the 2018/19 Non-household complaints report from CCWater. It was noted that complaints regarding NHH retailers had increased considerably. It was agreed that the current position with regard to NHH customers was unsatisfactory. It was further agreed that the Chair would write to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RWD and</li> <li>• Ms Balmer (chair of joint Retailer and Wholesaler complaints sub-group (RWG)</li> </ul> <p>to put forward a proposal for a review of a limited number of past decisions, with wholesalers participating voluntarily, to test the viability of tripartite adjudication. There would be potential cost implications for RWD. The past decisions would not be altered, this would be research for a future system.</p>	SW
<b>ITEM 5</b>	<b>Tender programme update</b>	
	<p>9. It was noted that the tender sub-group was making an initial presentation to the RWD Board on 25 September. It was considered that whilst the current timetable was tight it was workable, however the Panel wished to flag to the Board the risk that the contract might not be re-let before the current contract expired. The Panel recommended that the Board notify all eligible potential suppliers of the likely tender dates.</p>	SF
<b>ITEM 6</b>	<b>AOB</b>	

10.	<p>Ms Hunter was thanked for her service to the Panel. The RWD proposals with regard to recruitment of a new independent member for the Panel were considered. The Panel understood the need for more cost-effective advertising but would suggest to RWD that LinkedIn alone was not wide enough for the purpose. It was noted for instance that Ms Hunter had become aware of the work of the Panel through NOTUM.</p> <p>It was noted that the RWD website was still not effective and needed to be established as soon as possible to ensure the transparency of the scheme. RWD would be asked to ensure that the website was effective</p>	SW/SF
11.	<p>as soon as possible. It was further noted that individual Panel members had been approached by a member of the public asking for information regarding the way in which the Panel operated. It was agreed to offer a collective response to specific questions put in writing</p>	SF SW
12.	<p>It was noted that there was currently only one water company taking part in the on-going trial of a 'questions phase'. It was agreed that RWD should be asked to invite additional companies to take part as a matter of urgency.</p>	SF
	<p><b>Next meeting: November date tbc</b></p>	