

WATRS independent ADR Panel
Meeting 44
Minutes of a meeting on 26 March 2021 via MS Teams

Present:

| | |
|------------------|------------------------|
| Susan Bradford | Daksha Piparia (Chair) |
| Louise Beardmore | Katy Taqvi |
| Emma Clancy | Claire Whyley |
| Claire Forbes | |

Attending

Shona Flood (Secretary)

| | | Action No. |
|---------------|--|------------|
| Item 1 | Welcome and declaration of interests | |
| 1. | Ms Clancy was formally welcomed to the Panel. She confirmed that she has no interests in any supplier to or subscribing member of WATRS. | |
| Item 2 | Minutes from meeting on 6 October 2020 | |
| 2. | The minutes of the meeting on 11 January 2021 were approved. | |
| Item 3 | Action log | |
| 3. | It was noted that the action log had been updated. It was agreed that completed actions would be archived and that additional matters relating to possible future tender or contractual requirements would be noted within the action log | [20.] SF |
| Item 4 | Standing items | |
| 4. | The Panel discussed the current format of the monthly report. It was agreed that it would be more helpful if the service provider produced a quarterly report with more analysis relating to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • trends/emerging issues • best practices within the Scheme and across other comparable schemes provided by the service provider • changes in volume of applications being made to the Scheme | [21.] SF |
| 5. | In relation to the anonymised decisions, it was noted that there continued to be a disparity between the compensation requested and the amount awarded. | |
| 6. | Issues relating to understanding the profile of customers who came to the scheme were discussed. It was agreed that the service provider would be asked to confirm its accessibility strategy. It was further agreed that a review of available | [22] SF |

| | | |
|---------------|--|------------------|
| | <p>research relating to customers who make complaints would be undertaken.</p> <p>6. Ms Clancy confirmed that CCW intended to undertake further research in relation to complaints fatigue but that this work had been delayed due to the upcoming government elections in Wales.</p> <p>7. It was noted that customer satisfaction survey results were varied but the samples was too small to be statistically significant. It was also noted that the service provider had addressed the service issues relating to the operation of the CMS system that had been raised in the survey results.</p> | [23] SF |
| Item 5 | Preliminary decisions (PD) trial: recommendations to RWD | |
| | <p>8. It was noted that customer feedback taken over the phone tended to be more positive than the written feedback received through the email survey. It was further noted that companies tended to view the PD stage as being primarily a customer focused step: @50% of customers provided a response to the PD compared to 8% by companies.</p> <p>9. It was also noted that feedback from adjudicators was broadly in favour of retaining the PD stage subject to more guidance being provided as to the purpose and function of process.</p> <p>10. Whilst it was not necessarily possible to show quantifiable benefits in relation to the agreed success criteria it was agreed that retaining a 'right to reply' was desirable. It was further agreed that a recommendation would be made to RWD regarding the retention of the PD stage.</p> | [24] DP/SB/KT |
| Item 6 | 'Putting things right' | |
| | <p>11. The draft response to CCW to 'Putting things right' was agreed subject to minor amendments.</p> <p>12. Ms Piparia gave an update on the 'Future Landscapes'. The work was being led by CCW. It was noted that members of the Panel were participating in the new complaints process model, benchmarking and customer complaints journey workstreams. Ms Clancy confirmed that it was CCW's intention to publish its recommendations in due course.</p> | [13] SF |
| Item 7 | Terms of reference and development of the Panel | |
| | <p>13. The proposed changes to the Panel's Terms of Reference to be put to RWD for approval and ratification were agreed. It was agreed that RWD would be asked to consider the appointment of an additional independent Panel member.</p> | [25] DP/SF |
| Item 8 | GDPR Breach update | |
| | <p>14. It was agreed that the service provider would be asked to provide a post-incident report as to what has been learnt and what will be done differently in the future.</p> | [26] SF |
| Item 9 | AOB | |
| | <p>15. It was noted that the increased sector wide involvement of the Panel and/or the proposed recruitment of another independent</p> | [22] SF/DP |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>Panel member would result in additional expenditure and a request would be made for additional funding in the next financial year would be made to RWD.</p> <p>Next meeting: 25/06/21 @ 10am Provisional date for Oct mtg of 01/10/21: to be confirmed December mtg: 06/12/21</p> | |
|--|---|--|