

## **REVIEW OF WATER PERFORMANCE REPORT INDICATORS**

### **LOWER MURRAY WATER**

#### **2 PROPOSED NEW CATEGORIES AND INDICATORS**

##### **2.1 Customer Responsiveness and Service**

###### *CRS 1 – Website mystery shopper*

LMW are of the view that this would be a beneficial exercise and also presume that each parameter would be measured by a scoring range.

###### *CRS 2 – First Call Resolution*

LMW feel this has some merit as a measurement of First Call Resolution, seems far more 'Friendly' indicator than just the listing of number of complaints

The issues with being able to measure this are acknowledged in the report and we can only add to the difficulty in measuring this within the context of the Revenue sections of LMW

During our peak times which is the issue of urban accounts we are inundated with customer contact both over the phone and at the counter there are always a number of calls which we simply can not take as we are already assisting other customers

There is always a message taken and we will ring the customer back as soon as we are able to.

In relation to the proposed "Telephone Survey" who would be undertaking this LMW or an independent??

###### *CRS 3 – Net promoter score (NPS) or Customer Effort score (CES)*

LMW would be happy to include one or either in our customer survey, however we question the proximity to CRS2 – First Call Resolution which is also measuring the customer experience?.

###### *CRS 4 – Customer Satisfaction Survey*

LMW would be happy to include a common set of questions which could be used to measure customer satisfaction across the sector.

## **2.2 Usage, Price Trends and Payments Management**

### *UPP 7 – Physical visits*

This proposes the reporting of actual physical visits by a business representative in regards to non payment, hardship and legal actions

Under the GSL we have to be able to provide adequate records to prevent us from being found in breach of the GSL and therefore liable for the payment

Given the above I do not see an issue in having to report the number of physical visits we make.

Find this hard to understand when there is a set procedure to follow and checklist which you would use to show evidence of the process followed.

## **2.3 Financial Information**

LMW is not in favour as already mentioned Water Corps have financial indicators in their annual reports.

Presuming this is an annual measure only, the ESC has the base information to calculate the KPI's already from annual regulatory account lodgements.

Stakeholders who are interested just need to seek this info for themselves which is readily available on the web.

The issue is not to calculate but the time needed to provide the explanations.

## **2.4 Resource Security**

### *SEC 1 Supply volume available to meet demand volume (ML)*

LMW is of the view that this information is meaningless and has no relevance to us as we do not own/ operate headworks (eg dams etc) . Metros have dams which are their supply point. How does the Murray River get quantified?? LMW may not have a lot even in storage tanks due to demand eg lower demand in winter so it will just give rise the unnecessary questions.

### *SEC 2 Demand versus sustainable yield.*

As per SEC 1

### *SEC 3 – Independent Supply Systems*

LMW are happy to accommodate this indicator.

## **2.5 Productivity**

*PRO 1 – Operation, maintenance and administration (OMA) costs per customer.*

Costs can be out of the Water Corps control eg black water events as has been experienced for the last 2 years which is a significant cost.

In times of drought LMW will buy water on the mark to secure supplies. Is there an ability to exclude extra-ordinary costs/ events that translate into costs to say having to continually explain the variance?

Of what benefit is this to anyone when the ESC has approved the costs – must be what is needed to run the business?. As noted every Corp has their own set of operating costs which vary from each eg gravity vs pumped.

*PRO 2 – Cost to serve (\$ per customer)*

LMW response to “What should be included as a measured activity” is that its impossible to uniformly apportion non direct costs eg IT systems, utilities, finance, HR the same way across all water corps. The only way this would work is if a % was determined and utilised by all corps.

If this goes ahead it needs to be on direct cost only basis.

## **2.6 Trade Waste**

*TDW1 – Number of sampling activities.*

With regards to the trade waste reporting requirements, it won't be an issue to provide the information/data, however, there should be a clear requirement “guidelines” on the trade waste sampling frequency. I believe most water businesses have had and still having arguments with the main trade waste dischargers regarding the sampling frequency and whether they were representative!

Question asked is “Who will be interested in this?”.

*BED 19 – Volume of trade waste received (ML)*

Data on trade waste volumes is collected and used to calculate the charges. This applies to major trade waste discharges only as minor trade waste dischargers contribute very little to the trade waste flows. Flows from minor trade waste dischargers is not collected as it isn't used for calculating the charges, water consumption through their water meters may be available.

Question asked is “Who will be interested in this?”.

### **3 PROPOSED INDICATORS FOR REMOVAL**

#### **3.1 Baseline explanatory data**

*BED 13 – Water treatment plants: Disinfection, unfiltered; Further treatment*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

*REW 4 – Bursts and Leaks rectified*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

*REW 6 – Water supply interruptions restored within 3, 5 & 12 hours.*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

#### **3.3 Sewerage Network Reliability and Efficiency**

*RES 5 – Customers receiving 1,2,3 & 4+ sewer blockages in a year.*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

#### **3.4 Customer Responsiveness and Service**

*CRS 12 – Property Development Agreements*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

*CRS 13 – Information Statements turned around in 5 days*

LMW – Agree

Our continuing business process in regards to the issue of information statements is designed with customer service in mind and it has assisted the vendor and purchaser on many occasions however as this performance measure is purely based on the turn around time we always had poor results which has to do with when the meter reading is done as LMW supplies all the information together.

#### **3.5 Water Conservation, Reuse and Recycling**

*CRR 8 – Trade Waste priority parameter*

LMW - Agree

Not sure why they require the BOD? We test the COD as it encompasses the BOD as well, and some LMW's charges are identified based on the **COD** load rather than the BOD?

### **3.6 Drinking Water Quality**

*DWQ 1 – Standards for drinking water quality*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

## **3 PROPOSED INDICATOR MODIFICATION**

### **4.1 Water Network Reliability and Efficiency**

*REW 7 Water Supply customer interruptions (No)*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

*REW 10 – Customers affected by planned water supply interruptions greater than 5 hours*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

### **4.2 Usage, Price Trends and Payment Management**

*UPP1 – Instalment plans*

LMW – Agree

This will not be an issue and can be achieved with just tweaking our current report

LMW believe this suggestion has merit as we have to report the break down of concession and non concession customers who have been restricted therefore we should be doing the same breakdown on instalment plans.

### **4.3 Customer Responsiveness and Service**

*CRS 7 – Affordability Complaints*

*CRS 8 – Billing Complaints*

LMW – Agree (no comment)

### **4.4 Water Conservation, Reuse and Recycling**

*CRR 3 – Volume of sewage spilt from emergency relief structures (ERS) and pumping stations (ML)*

LMW – Agree (no comment)