

Responder: Decision Tech

Question	Your response
<p data-bbox="204 331 754 472">Question 1: Do you agree with our proposed changes to the scheme criteria? Please provide evidence to support your views.</p>	<p data-bbox="809 331 1385 403">We agreed with the proposed changes to the scheme criteria, subject to the following points:</p> <p data-bbox="809 443 1038 472"><u>Provider Coverage</u></p> <p data-bbox="809 479 1390 651">3.65 relates to listing of the providers including in the calculator. We currently do this. However it also states that if a 'complete' coverage of the market is not given this should be made clear in a statement, before displaying results.</p> <p data-bbox="809 692 1382 1115">We do not consider this to be practical or helpful to the consumer. They only providers we do not cover are small, regional providers. Most consumers will not have heard of them. Because they are the only providers missing we cover a very high % of the market. Interrupting the comparison flow to make a statement regarding small regional suppliers that will not be known to consumers will undermine confidence in the whole process, and create a very disjointed experience. We do not believe doing so adds any value to users.</p> <p data-bbox="809 1155 1219 1184"><u>Explanation regarding algorithms</u></p> <p data-bbox="809 1191 1385 1294">3.35 states that sites need to make it clear as to how results are generated if criteria other than price alone are used.</p> <p data-bbox="809 1335 1377 1617">We support this point however the requirement is not clear in terms of whether that explanation should be a worded narrative explaining the criteria that are considered, or a mathematical explanation outlining how offers fair against those criteria. If the latter we do not believe that this is practical and will only serve to confuse users.</p>