

Customer Advisory Panel – meeting minutes

Meeting	
Date	Monday August 25 2025
Time	11:00am -12:00pm
Location	MS Teams
Members	Philip Cullum (Chair), Hilary Newstead (Deputy Chair), Helen Bartley, Gavin Dufty, Dean Lombard
Attendees	CPPALUE: Renate Vogt (General Manager Regulation), Lauren Fetherston (Head of Policy and Compliance), Adam Nason (Head of Customer, Community and Customer Services), Angelica D'Amelio (Regulatory Engagement Lead), Winona Bonne (Customer and Corporate Graduate)
Apologies	Natalie Collard (member)
Pre-reading	CAP pre-read materials – August 2025

Item	Topic
1	Customer commitment drafts were presented to members, building on the criteria and priorities previously developed by the CAP. Overarching feedback - Discussion was had to confirm if the commitments aligned with the right strategic pillars. Broadly, the CAP agreed that CPU had chosen the right topics - Exceptions included: harmonics (being too narrow in focus), affordability commitment and minimum service levels for Powercor (as this initiative will be delivered regardless) - Feedback was given that the networks needed to give more context to help with understanding whether the measures were a good measure, aligned with compliance or an improvement – how does the commitment compare to what the business is achieving now? - It was suggested to present benchmark metrics to give this context - Where they relate to existing regulatory requirements, the commitments need to aim to deliver more – otherwise don't include them here - Recommendations were made to ensure commitments were meaningful to customers and not operationally framed - Specific examples included call centre commitment and the electrification commitment that should be phrased to show customers best interests - Relating to customer assistance package commitments, CPU should be clear on the outcomes customers are seeking. For example, phrasing could be changed to 'increase level of customers confidence in their energy literacy.' This will assist in making it more outcomes based. - It was suggested that the commitments be reviewed periodically – perhaps on an annual basis.

Wording optimisation

- Feedback was given to support understanding and implication of commitments. This included:
 - Avoid using jargon and try to explain complicated concepts simply
 - Not to assume that those whose electricity is being affected by the CPU network can understand/ know what specific terminologies are
 - Bringing clarity to who customers commitments are referring to

Harmonics

- Questions were raised as to why harmonics is a part of the customer commitments
- A suggestion was made to include context for issues to assist customer understanding. CPU could phrase it to show that they are responding to customer needs
- Noted that harmonics costs are immaterial compared to the other initiatives here. It was suggested that this could be better addressed elsewhere

Commercial and industrial (C&I) customers

- Questions were raised on why C&I customers are included as a category within the commitments
- There were views that this should not be a category but instead incorporated in the others
- A discussion was had on whether, alternatively, separate sets of customer commitments for C&I customers, SMB and residential customers would be better. However, this would only be beneficial if C&I customers benefit from being served separately

Resilience and reliability

- The theme of safety sits across reliability and resilience. One note was made about referring to a broader safety commitment outside of the specific measures
- Within resilience and reliability metrics, questions were raised about what happens to the 'tail' of customers who were worst-served or in instances where it takes longer to get supply back on after an outage for customer; in comparison to the 'average' measures
- With resilience, CPU could consider clearly stating that it's a real person answering the call, to sustain the value of speaking to real people
- Some suggestions to wording improvements included review of the fire safety commitment and use of 'major event' wording

Affordability

- The notion of value was suggested as a category. It was raised that affordability is too narrow. It was suggested that CPU could derive value using another metric
- Based on when the reset finishes, questions asked as whether bill impacts will stop being monitored, unlike the other commitments

Solar exports

- Questions were asked as to whether solar exports means that backstop gets used
- It should be stated what the customer experience is with solar exports and was suggested to change the language to reflect this
- Questions were raised to confirm if solar export measures should be different across networks