

MEETING NOTES

Moat Customer Repairs Forum with Morgan Sindall Held on Tuesday, 12 September 2023 at 1pm

Attendees (in-person):

Customer(s):

Lorraine A (LA) – Chair
Zak D (ZD)
Tracy K (TK)
Tony H (TH)
Denise W (DW)
Mike H (MH)
Terence S (TS)
Abi B (AB)

Attendees (via Teams):

Customer(s):

Sharon C (SC)
Bob J (BJ)
Pat T (PT)

Other attendees:

Stephen Walker, Director of Customer Operations, Moat (SW)
Mark Warner, Director Property Services, Moat (MW)
Warren Harris - Partnership Manager, Morgan Sindall (WH)
Luke Culling, Social Value Officer, Morgan Sindall (LC)
Lanier Doyle, Partnering Manager, Moat (LD)
Sarah Reilly – Repairs Partnering Co-ordinator (SR)
Tanya Gray – Head of Customer Operations (TG)
Becks Sheldon – Customer Engagement Manager (BS)
Fran Aubrey – Minute Taker

1. Welcome, introductions and apologies

Apologies:

Andy Harris, Partnership Manager, Morgan Sindall (AH)
Amber Finnegan, Head of Customer Resolutions, Moat (AF)

2. Purpose of the meeting – LA

LA asked for mobile phones to be switched off. LA reminded today's Committee that the purpose of these meetings is to focus on the customer experience relating to repairs carried out by MSPS. Additionally, LA advised that the purpose of these meetings is to give customers the opportunity to hold Moat and MSPS to account; to scrutinise performance, provide feedback, propose changes and ensure that customers' voices are represented.

2.1 Review of last minutes

Minutes agreed.

3. Update on performance since the last meeting including KPI's – Warren Harris / Lanier Doyle

LD talked to the slide pack that was shared with the Committee ahead of today's meeting, which outlines a summary of the contractual performance measures for Morgan Sindall.

LD highlighted MSPS' continuing focus on the aged/ legacy repair jobs. It was confirmed to the Committee that the number of outstanding repairs, so those that are older than 90 days, were around 1,200 in March but today stand at c 460. LD further advised that the focus on the aged/ legacy repair jobs was having an impact on the customer satisfaction and the right first-time scores.

LA asked the question of whether the right first-time figures could exclude any repair jobs where it is known that they would not be completed at the first-time fix. LD responded that it may be possible to do some analysis and have that figure presented to the Committee but advised that contractually the KPIs would need to stay as they were.

At the last meeting it was discussed that MSPS can send customers text messages to let them know when the operative is on the way, however, this can only happen after the job before has been completed. It was confirmed that this is being picked up as a training issue and it was recognised that that the process as is would be impacting the figures regarding appointments kept.

ACTION: LD to discuss issue re PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) use with AH and provide an update at the next meeting.

ACTION: LD to catch-up after today's meeting with customer TH regarding a missed-appointment fee which he has been waiting c 6 weeks for.

PT questioned MSPS on how well their operatives know their blocks for communal repairs, so when thinking about attending a repair job would they, for example, know the right tools and materials to complete a repair at that first visit. MSPS responded that they normally keep the same operatives to the same repair areas, but this wasn't PT's experience.

ACTION: WH to investigate the ongoing communal issues at Johnson's Court, Sevenoaks.

As a solution MW proposed to MSPS that regardless of the existing light fitting, MSPS use the opportunity to replace the light with energy-efficient LED lighting. This would ensure that MSPS keep a constant supply of LED lighting and not rely on MSPS carrying a significant number of different bulbs.

ACTION: MSPS to start installing LED lighting as standard, where communal lighting needs replacing and they don't have a current supply of bulbs (or there is some other factor that is causing the problem that can be resolved by replacing with LED lighting).

4. Reporting on communal repairs via myMoat – Presentation – Lanier Doyle (Moat)

LD talked through the slide pack that was shared with the Committee ahead of today's meeting.

At the last meeting an issue was raised to MSPS regarding myMoat and how a repair logged via the portal disappears quickly from view before the reference can even be

noted. At the time it was confirmed that an overview of the myMoat portal is planned for later this year and that an update on this issue will be brought to future meetings. LD confirmed that the repair number doesn't now quickly disappear from view and does in fact stay on the screen for longer or until it is clicked away from.

LD went on to present an on-screen demonstration of raising a repair on the myMoat test system. Customers advised they would like to see the following in future versions of MyMoat:

- To allow customers to see the full detail history on communal repairs reported via myMoat.
- To enable customers the option to opt-out of receiving updates on communal repairs if they wish, noting that some customers don't want to be the main point of contact once a repair is raised.
- To better encourage customers to include any special considerations in the free text comment box

Customers at today's Committee agreed that updates should be well communicated to customers, no matter what channel they choose to use to report a repair. LD confirmed that MSPS are in talks with the Communications team to use, for customers that want them, stickers and appointment cards. Customers welcomed this arrangement.

BJ advised that any changes or upgrades to myMoat would be a bonus though he felt that this was already a really great tool, particularly for the reporting of repairs.

Customers wanted Moat to explore further ways for Moat to encourage and promote the use of myMoat, particularly to new customers. They suggested that it may be useful to create self-help video tutorials and to include help on how to use myMoat at future repair surgeries. ZD suggested that Moat's Customer Contact Centre promote, if they don't already, the use of myMoat when talking to customers about their repair issues.

LD confirmed we have a way to go as currently only c 200 repairs are reported via myMoat a month, but she would be keen to promote MyMoat once changes have been made the system and existing known limitations are fixed. Customers were clear that they particularly wanted Moat to support customers in Retirement Living.

LA asked Committee members to let her know if they, or any other customers, wish to be part of a review panel for the upgrades to the repairs element of the myMoat system.

ACTION: Customer attendees to confirm if they would like to be part of a future MyMoat review.

5. Repairs complaints – Amber Finnegan (Moat)

In AF's absence, LD presented the slide pack that was shared with the Committee ahead of today's meeting.

LA commented how disappointing it is that month on month over 50% of the Complaints under the area of Property Services are MSPS' responsive repairs complaints.

LD commented that the majority of the repairs complaints are about delays, more specifically in relation to communication or the lack of a clear completion date for works. It was agreed that communication around repairs needs to be better and customers agreed that even a call to say there is no update is better than not hearing anything. Customers were also in agreement that it would be really useful to have a single point of contact for repairs complaints.

ACTION: LD to work with MSPS and our Customer Resolutions team and advise at the next meeting what further steps will be taken to improve communication.

The topic of contents insurance was also discussed as sometimes customers were complaining for compensation in lieu of them not having contents insurance. Customers wanted Moat to do more to promote contents insurance and the importance of it to customers.

ACTION: BS to liaise with Moat's communications team about promoting contents insurance.

6. How Moat tailors services for disabled customers – Lanier Doyle & Tanya Gray (Moat)

TG expanded on her paper that was shared with the Committee ahead of today's meeting.

Customers were keen to understand more about training and how Advisors present questions. The example was given about a home with more than one toilet. In this instance whether the customer has access to another toilet and not just for it to be assumed that if the customer says they have another working toilet that it's accessible whilst they're in the property. LA asked the question of whether Moat make it clear to their customers that they need to advise on their specific needs or vulnerabilities. TG confirmed that they do, but committed to further guidance to Advisors in the context of today's conversations.

ACTION: TG to provide additional guidance to Customer Services Advisors regarding the questions they ask to ensure Moat is tailoring the service they need, ensuring the nuances of questions are understood.

Moat were commended at today's Committee for their access to/ use of Language Line and British Sign Language.

7. How Morgan Sindall is offering more than just a repairs service

LC highlighted to today's Committee the success of the first Customer Support Estate Day, which was held in Sittingbourne.

The Estate Day, which was held in partnership with MSPS, Ideverde and Cleanscapes, was a day of community fun, giving customers the opportunity to highlight any concerns, chase outstanding repairs, raise new ones and have jobs completed there and then, all whilst the children got involved in some hands-on activities.

LC said they will soon be looking at lessons learnt and the planning for future Estate Days.

Customers were pleased with the success of the day and were keen to hear about further events in the future.

LC provided an update on Apprenticeships and advised that 3 new apprentices have recently started; an electrician apprentice, a multi-trader apprentice and a planning apprentice.

8. Any other business

8.1 Sub-contractor usage

LD said that before today's Committee she had been contacted about the poor lack of communication regarding updates and delays to works, for repairs that are currently sat with sub-contractors.

LD said she wanted to better understand the process of how repairs are given to sub-contractors once they are reported by a customer. When asked the question, WH confirmed that it is the sub-contractor who books in the repair appointment with the customer. MSPS acknowledged the issues being experienced and did assure attendees at today's Committee that they have a member of their team monitoring the progression and completion of works being carried out by sub-contractors.

ACTION: MSPS to provide a specific update on sub-contractor performance and improvement at the next meeting.

8.2 Personal repair issues

ACTION: WH to catch-up after today's meeting with TH about ongoing repair issues at his property .

ACTION: SR / LD to give PT a call re outstanding communal repair jobs at Johnson's Court, Sevenoaks.

8.3 End of life repairs

Discussion held following point raised by ZD about where end of life repairs sit, question asked as to whether they fall into repairs or a different cycle, particularly when it comes to fencing and guttering jobs. The point was raised that if Moat only look at the one property then the issue isn't being fixed it's just being moved along. LD advised that there is a piece of work that has been picked up to address this further.

8.4 Repair responsibilities under shared ownership

ACTION: LD to discuss with Development the responsibilities around repairs, to ensure that these are fully understood by our customers when they buy into a shared ownership property.

8.5 Any other feedback from our customers

Attendees were thanked for their time. A summary of discussions will be shared with the customers at today's meeting for their sign-off.