

373 ENW Respond ECP Discussion Guide

ECP Meeting #3 20th April, Aspect Studio Objective: optimise the effectiveness of Respond
Manchester communication materials before they are used with
potential trialists

| AREA OF DISCUSSION | TIME ALLOCATION |
|--|-----------------|
| (1) Introduction / Warm Up | 10 minutes |
| (2) ENW Q&A (shared prior to group) | 5 minutes |
| (3) Concept Summary (shared prior to group) | 5 minutes |
| (4) FCL service PowerPoint Presentation with voiceover | 45 minutes |
| (5) FCL service Q&A | 20 minutes |

Moderator briefing note

The materials have been written on the basis of providing comprehensive background information to customers who may be willing to participate in the **trial – not business as usual (BAU)**. If the trial is successful, the materials will form the basis of information packs that might be used in BAU, but the content would need to be amended for that purpose.

To avoid the ECP veering off into a debate about the provision of too little specific or technical information, we will need them to understand that when we first meet a prospective trial participant, Electricity North West will be represented by both a senior engineer and commercial manager; who will be able to discuss specifics and provide as much technical information as the company requires.

It is important that the ECP focuses on this being just the starting point of what will develop into a full technical design and contract negotiation process.

1 Moderator Introduction and warm up (10 minutes):

- Re-introduce yourself and re-cap on the journey so far:
 - ECP formed → communication materials tested → customer survey piloted → customer survey optimised in the second ECP meeting → customer survey completed → ECP re-convened
 - Note that we will be emailing a link for the ECP to access the survey results report in the next few days, (should they wish to do so at their leisure)
- Explain purpose of the discussion (*“optimise the effectiveness of Respond communication materials before they are used with potential trialists”*)
- Confidentiality is guaranteed, no right / wrong answers, interested in everybody’s opinions, in as much detail as possible. Explain moderator’s role and set out ‘rules’ (speak loudly / clearly / not all together)
- Explain audio and video recording, one-way mirror and presence of observers

Warm up question:

- What were the **key things you remember** regarding the Respond concept and FCL service agreement from the last session?
- Who is the **intended audience** for the Respond concept and FCL service agreement?
- How would the ECP describe the **opportunity** that the FCL service presents?

MODERATOR: When considering the various communication materials explaining the opportunity presented by the FCL service agreement we would like the ECP to keep in mind **who** the communication is intended for, **why** it is needed, **when** it should be shared (*remembering other organisations may not have had any prior awareness or engagement*) and **how** it should be shared [*It may help to use the who, why, when, how as prompts on a flipchart*].

2 ENW Q&A (four pages) MAX TIME ALLOCATION 5 MINUTES

ENWL Q&A -- *who we are, what we do and why*. This is essentially the same document that we presented to the ECP in phase 1, tailored to trialing the FCL service, rather than completing a survey.

MODERATOR: We need to convey to the ECP that whilst they all confirmed in the last meeting that they were familiar with ENWL, some customers may not be. We are seeking their opinion on the value of the document and the level at which it is pitched for the intended audience of technical and financial decision makers.

- Is the information sufficient (depth and appropriateness of the information)?
- Does it work as a standalone document to achieve the perceived purpose?
- Probe on page four "*Why are we asking you to be involved?*"
 - Is the intended audience for the Respond concept and FCL service agreement now clear?
 - Is the information contained and the way it is presented pitched correctly for the intended audience?
 - **Notice the Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn, YouTube logos; how could (and should?) these platforms be utilised to communicate about the FCL service?**

If Electricity North West approached your organisation to gauge your interest in taking up the commercial service agreement; when and to whom should this information be delivered?

- Think in terms of commercial (eg finance) vs. operational (eg engineering) staff and seniority
- Think in terms of when it should be shared (eg before f2f meeting?) and how

3 Concept summary (one page) MAX TIME ALLOCATION 5 MINUTES

Concept – Developed from the original concept board, which was well received by the ECP in phase 1 as a concise summary of the background, aims and objectives of Respond.

- Note the changes made since the last version;
 - Format (one page leaflet vs. PowerPoint slide format used previously)
 - Use of Images
- Does it work as a standalone document to achieve the perceived purpose?

4 FCL service PowerPoint Presentation with voiceover (40 minutes)

We are asking the ECP to evaluate this presentation on the basis that we are considering introducing the concept to prospective trial participants in this format. There may be some duplication with other communication materials, however, we ask that they evaluate it as a standalone piece and think about how it could be utilised.

MODERATOR READ OUT: Now imagine that your organisation has invited representatives (both commercial and engineering) of Electricity North West to a meeting to discuss the FCL service.

PLAY THE PRESENTATION / VOICEOVER

The presentation is too long to play in one movement and in reality; a normal 'sales' presentation would involve Q&A along the way so we suggest moving through the content in chunks; INDICATED BY PLAY/PAUSE.

Explaining fault current (slides 2-6) PROBE ON:

- Clarity of the information in differentiating between normal and fault current?
 - What helped; the water analogy and/or the fluctuating fault level diagram?
- Which elements of the presentation supported or detracted from the overall message?

A recap of how the network works at the moment vs. how it would change under FCL service (5-6)

- Was the recap helpful; did it help clarify anything or was it duplication/ redundant?

PLAY REMAINDER OF PRESENTATION

Financial rewards demonstrated through scenario A and scenario B (slides 7-16)

MODERATOR: We are only testing understanding/acceptability of the materials, not the price point itself which we have already tested in previous meetings and the customer survey.

- Usefulness of the provision of fault history specific information relevant to the organisations site
- Test understanding of scenario A and scenario B (Scenario B further away from the primary substation)?
- Test understanding of the basis of the reward calculation?
 - Test understanding that not all customer equipment contributes to Fault Current in the same way; hence rewards are likely to be different?
 - Test opinion of the different incentives available based on location of network and fault contribution (Scenario A vs. Scenario B)

OVERALL THOUGHTS ON THE PRESENTATION ...

...bearing in mind that this presentation is only a template that will actually be delivered in person to potential trialists.

- Overall reaction to....
 - the look and feel of the presentation
 - the length of the presentation
 - are we providing too much information for the initial consultation?

- the content of the presentation (depth vs. breadth of coverage)
- the tone and clarity of the language used
- the images, diagrams and visuals used
- How would your organisation and senior decision makers react to a presentation like this?
- Are there any unresolved questions? Risks?

5 FCL service Q&A (25 minutes)

FCL service Q&A – *More specific information about the FCL service.* This has again been developed from the original project Q&A document and now covers all the key points raised by customers (*during the ECP and customer survey*).

We need the ECP to recognise that this is a high level overview of the service and what it might mean to a trial participant. It is intended to be sent to prospective trial customers prior to our initial meeting, or left with them after that meeting to provide general information.

Far more detailed information will be provided and discussed with individual customers as the system is designed and the contract negotiated.

- What is the perceived purpose of this document?
 - Would they read the document themselves? Are others likely to?
 - Does it work as a standalone document to achieve the perceived purpose?
- Is the informationsufficient/ too long (if so how many pages should it be)?
- Is the informationrelevant/ too technical?
- Appropriate use of images?

If Electricity North West approached your organisation to gauge your interest in taking up the commercial service agreement; when and to whom should this information be delivered?

- Think in terms of commercial (eg finance) vs. operational (eg engineering) staff and seniority
- Test if, due to the complex nature of the concept, it would be appropriate to send the information prior to a f2f meeting and/or should it always be left with potential customers to peruse, along with a copy of the videos etc. after a f2f meeting?

Prompts: **Overview of the trial**

Page one:

- Clarity of what the problem, solution and benefits are and what the trial involves?
- Is any of the information confusing and/or lacking in detail?
- Anything that needs to be said much earlier on?

Prompts:

Page two:

- Clarity on eligibility criteria?
- Appropriate summary of the benefits?
- Reaction to annual availability payment? Understanding of the variables that influence the level of reward?
- Is any of the information confusing and/or lacking in detail?

Prompts:

Page three:

- Clarity on the technology being used and how it works?

- Reaction to “How frequently would my equipment be constrained?”
- Perceived usefulness of “*We will provide you with details of the fault history in your area*”
- How do customers feel at this stage of the document?

Prompts:

Page four:

- Reaction to “**How will my supply be affected if I agree to take part in the FCL service trial?**” Is this information helpful? Reassuring? What does it add to the leaflet?
- Understanding of when the FCL service **would** and **would not** be utilised by Electricity North West?
- Agree or disagree with the FCL service being “*more suitable for customers in the non-manufacturing sector, who are able to cope with the constraint of equipment without any impact*”
- Is any of the information confusing and/or lacking in detail?

Prompts: “Taking part in the trial”

Page five:

- Commercial and technical arrangements: what else would customers need to know or want to get out of a prospective meeting with Electricity North West?
- Any concerns regarding installation?
- Is it appealing to be able to appoint their own contractor?
- Is any of the information confusing and/or lacking in detail?

Prompts: “During and after the trial”

Page six:

- Would customers accept/object to giving feedback during the trial? How frequently would be appropriate? What type of feedback would they expect to give?

6 Summary

- Overall, **which piece(s) of communication** has been the most useful in explaining Respond, and WHY?
- How could Electricity North West be more creative in the way that it takes the FCL service to market and communicates the opportunity to potential trialists?
- In terms of the commercial agreement; test appetite for a ‘key facts’ illustration with all the pertinent aspects of the agreement in a couple of pages (akin to what is offered in financial services - **SHOWCARD**) with the bulk of the terms and conditions in an appendix.
- Thank respondents & depart