

**WATRS independent ADR Panel**  
**Meeting 48**  
**Minutes of a meeting on 28 March 2022 via MS Teams**

**Present:**

Susan Bradford  
 Louise Beardmore  
 Emma Clancy  
 Claire Forbes

Anton Gazzard  
 Daksha Piparia (Chair)  
 Claire Whyley

**Apologies**

**Attending**

Shona Flood (Secretary)  
 John Munton, Tom Earley,  
 Elliott Hatfield, Nina Kelly,  
 (Items 3a and 4)

		Action No.
<b>Item 1</b>	<b>Minutes from meeting on 6 December 2021</b>	
1.	The minutes of the meeting on 6 December 2021 were approved.	
<b>Item 2</b>	<b>Action log</b>	
2.	Accessibility (see Item 4)	
3.	Customer satisfaction questions: it was noted that customer satisfaction question had been amended.	
4.	Customer feedback re CMS: it was noted that an update on actions taken in response to customer feedback on usability of the CMS system had been provided. See also item 4.	
5.	Recruitment update: a. it was noted that interviews had been arranged for 2 candidates for the role of independent Panel member; b. it was also noted that nominations had been received for company representatives (WaSC and NHH) which Ms Piparia would discuss with the Chair of RWD.	[51] DP
6.	Scheme rules: it was noted that the updated Scheme Rules were available on the WATRS' and RWD websites.	
<b>Item 3</b>	<b>Standing Items</b>	
7.	2 <sup>nd</sup> Insights Report: The Panel considered that the report was very helpful but had concerns that it was very dense and that some observations and insights would be lost within the overall text. It was suggested that it would be helpful to have a compelling executive summary with all of the section summaries at the start of the report and greater definition in graphs and tables.	[52] EH/SF

<p>8.</p> <p>9.</p> <p>10.</p> <p>11.</p>	<p>It was noted that there was variance between customer, company and CCW categorisation of the root cause of a complaint and individual adjudicator perception. It was agreed that it would be useful to include greater feedback from adjudicators and, where appropriate to read across from the experience in other schemes operated by the service provider.</p> <p>It was further noted and agreed that the relatively small number of applications made to WATRS made it difficult to extrapolate meaningful trends from the data. It was agreed that the frequency of the reporting would be kept under review.</p> <p>Decisions: no significant changes were noted to outcomes; there continued to be a significant disparity between the amount claimed by way of compensation and the amount awarded.</p> <p>Customer satisfaction survey results: there was no significant change in the tone and tenor of the verbatim customer responses.</p>	<p>[53] NK/SF</p>
<p><b>Item 4</b></p>	<p><b>Accessibility</b></p>	
<p>12.</p> <p>13.</p> <p>14.</p> <p>15.</p>	<p>Representatives from CEDR talked through their engagement with the Shaw Trust and the work being undertaken by a Lion &amp; Mason regarding the content of the website.</p> <p>The process to date had been focused on the technical functionality of the CMS portal. It was accepted that there would need to be more focus on mobile and tablet compatibility and user experience. The Panel recommended that there should be user acceptance testing of the website and the CMS application process by a communications specialist as part of process.</p> <p>CEDR also acknowledged that whilst the website had a lot of useful information it was ‘text heavy’ and that should ideally be addressed in the report due from Lion &amp; Mason. It was anticipated that work in relation to any recommendations made by Lion &amp; Mason would be completed over the summer. Subject to recommendations made by Lion &amp; Mason, the Panel recommended that the service should update the examples in the case studies and consider using ‘talking heads’ videos to go through some of the examples.</p> <p>CEDR confirmed that all reading material has or should have a literacy reading age of 8. The overall aim was to make all materials as accessible as possible and to ensure that in the future the question of accessibility was treated as ‘business as usual’ rather than by way of periodic projects. The Panel noted that the guidance on distress and inconvenience had been updated: the Panel recommended that consideration be given to providing additional guidance regarding material costs not included in distress and inconvenience payments.</p>	<p>[54] JM/SF</p> <p>[55] JM/SF</p> <p>[56]TE/SF</p>
<p><b>Item 5</b></p>	<p><b>AOB</b></p>	

<p>16.</p> <p>17.</p> <p>18.</p>	<p>Future landscapes: Ms Clancy confirmed that following consultation and data gathering it was likely that a paper regarding CCW's proposals and engagement with stakeholders would be presented to the Board of RWD and the Panel in the early summer.</p> <p>E2E and annual review: It was noted that 10 potential decisions had been identified for review either as part of the E2E process or as case studies for the annual review. The E2E sub-group would meet towards the end of April/beginning of May to select which decisions to include in the E2E review and to agree the review criteria.</p> <p>It was noted that this was Ms Beardmore's last meeting with the Panel before stepping down. The Chair thanked her for her contributions to and support for the work of the Panel and WATRS.</p>	
	<p>Next meetings: 14/07/22:1:30pm 28/09/22: 10am 08/12/22: 1:30pm</p>	