

AER Community Engagement Participant Feedback

Criteria	Low (1)	(2)	Medium (3)	(4)	High (5)	Score	Comment
The participants represented all the major groups affected	The participants were of a very similar cohort		There was a mixture of consumer types and		The group had wide diversity of participants, Size, activity, region, socioeconomic		
The selected participants had sufficient background knowledge to make informed suggestions and comments	Most participants had little knowledge of the topic				Skilled specialists were recruited from the community		
The Strategy framework surrounding the project was presented	The content of the discussion was not linked to the company strategy				The long term strategy was presented along with drivers, actions and expected outcomes		
The decision process and criteria were presented	The process for developing the proposal was not presented				The deciosn journey was outline in the context of the strategy and drivers		
The Business Case Was presented	The value of the proposal was not quantified		The Business Caae looked reasonable but lack sufficient detail to assess.		The cost of the proposal wss quantified and presented as an NPV or payback period		
Rejected Alternative Cases were presented	Only the preferred alternative was presented				A number of alternative proposals were presented with a summary of why they were rejected		
Training is supplied to increase competency on the topic under consideration	No technical or financial guidance was supplied to enhance the assessment		The business and engineering principles of the topic were presented.		There was access to unbiased technical profession to provide advice.		

AER Community Engagement Participant Feedback

The Facilitator Challenged the group to innovate	Minimal facilitation was supplied		The facilitator guided the group through a series of relevant questions		The facilitator challenged the group to explore possibilities beyond the current status quo resulting in a paradigm shift.		
The consumers had time to discuss amongst themselves and with competent specialists	There was little opportunity for consumers to compare notes		Several discussion were required but little opportunity		Adequate time was provided for the consumers to communicate and improve their understanding of the current topic.		
The consumers had adequate guidance and time to compose their recommendations/ comments	Recommendations back to the Company were piecemeal				Consumers had time to collectively draft and then optimise responses/ recommendations		
There was a process that allowed the consumers to ask questions for knowledge or clarification					Consumers had access to company or other industry experts to test ideas and broaden their understanding		
The Company provided detailed feedback on the acceptance or otherwise of the recommendations	No feedback on the response to consumer recommendations was communicated				A detailed explanation was given as to the response to consumer recommendations		
Adoption of Recommendations	No recommendations were adopted		Some Recommendations were adopted		Recommendations were essential adopted.		
At the end of the day the company response was	Unreasonable		Reasonable		Very Pleasing		

AER Community Engagement Participant Feedback

The consultation group was accessible	Access to the group was generally closed to interested parties.		Comprehensive minutes were published and accessible.		Consumers who wished to be involved in the process were able to join the group or engage with a representative within the group.		
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Application of the Feedback

1. Consumers to be requested to provide feedback on the engagement process within one month of the engagement and submitted with the Independent Consumer Report.
2. Completed feedback to be published.
3. Total ratings to be calculated and published in a public register maintained by AER that allows comparisons of all participating businesses.
4. AER to review feedback and request comments and corrective actions from the businesses on consistent deficiencies evident in the engagement process.