1. **Do you agree that the combination of the 5 metrics proposed for the first release will provide consumers with an overall view of suppliers' customer service performance? Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer**

Economy Energy agree with the proposed new metrics to improve consumer understanding of supplier performances and believe that it will greatly improve consumer's ability to gain a more rounded overview of supplier's performance.
We do however have the opinion that speed to answer calls is an important area for consumer's and this should be included in the first wave.
We also do not agree with the inclusion of commitments to codes as a comparison tool and feel there should be more focus on the experience a customer receives rather than if a supplier is signed up to a certain code.

2. **Do you agree that the indicative weightings are an accurate representation of the importance of each metric? If you suggest any changes, please provide an explanation and any supporting evidence**

Economy Energy to not believe that there should be such high weightings on Billing. This is due to the fact that our customer base it largely prepayment, 98% and therefore there is a concern that we would not score well on this area as it's not a relevant issue for the majority of our customers. We would find it more appropriate to take this into consideration when scoring a supplier and that the score is generated in relation to a supplier portfolio.

3. **Do you agree with the decision to limit the metrics and overall rating in the first release of the tool to the 17 largest suppliers from which we are able to collect representative data?**

No, Economy Energy believe that all suppliers should be included in the first wave of the new tool. This is due to an increase in switching, particularly to new market entrants and therefore they should not be excluded due to the size of their customer base. We take the approach that the threshold should be lowered.
This will enable a whole market overview from the start of the new tool rollout.

4. **Do you agree that a future release of the tool would benefit from the inclusion of a performance metric about the average speed to answer telephone calls? Do you agree that the suggested scope of calls between '9am 5pm, Monday Sunday' is the appropriate timescale to capture this information? Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.**

Yes, in part. Economy Energy believe that call answering speed is extremely important to consumers and should even be included in the first wave or reporting. If this was not to happen we would fully support its inclusion in a future release however we do believe that the scope of calls should be Monday to Saturday, and see this as a fairer measure.
We support matrixes that focus on the actions of the supplier rather than codes that have been signed up to as the absence of a commitment does not necessarily mean a supplier is not fulling what the codes dictates.

5. **Do you agree that a future release of the tool would benefit from the inclusion of a performance metric about the accuracy of switching, based on the number of erroneous transfers? Please provide any supporting evidence for your answer.**

Yes, Economy Energy does believe that ETs should be included however we believe that to make this fair it should be accepted ETs and not the total number of ETs.

6. **Are there any additional qualitative indicators we should be considering for future development of the tool, in order to provide the best possible information for consumers?**

At present Economy Energy do not have any additional indicators it wishes to be considered.

7. **Do you agree that the scoring definitions and scoring criteria proposed are appropriate to use for the comparison tool? Please provide any supporting evidence with your response.**

We do not agree with the scoring for switching within 21 days – we feel that 95% and above should be seen as an excellent performance as 100% would be a very rare occurrence due to potential issues outside of our control. We would propose a slightly amended version of the scoring for switching. We also believe that this scoring could drive certain behaviours in order for suppliers to gain higher scores such as not working objections and rejections.

8. **Do you agree that rounding supplier scores to the nearest quarter score will show sufficient granularity, while remaining clear enough for consumers to understand?**

At this point Economy Energy are unsure and would need to see the scoring in action.

9. **Do you prefer the alternative scoring criteria over the initial scoring criteria set out in Section 4.1? If so, why?**

Economy Energy prefer the alternative scoring as we believe that this is creates a clearer comparison. We do however believe that the ranking should be reversed, for example 1 is least complaints received and 17 being the most compared to 17 being the least complaints and 1 being the most as proposed in the document.
We do feel that with either ranking system there should be a clear display of each area and a supplier scoring and not just a focus on the overall score, this is due to the fact that some customers will prioritise certain areas such as call answering speed or complaints over areas such as switching or billing.
We also think that the ranking bests suits a supplier's position if the commitments to codes is included in the tool as receiving a ranking would be better than a score of 0 out of 5 in the initial scoring suggestion.

10. **Do you agree that the proposed tool will make improvements to the experience consumers currently have when accessing Citizens Advice performance information?**

Economy Energy believe that more information and transparency can only be a good thing for the consumer.