**Notes of JNCF**

*11 May 2023*

*Rugby Hub*

*Attendees:*

* Evri:
  + Conor Ormsby
  + Dan Allan
* GMB:
  + Eamon O’Hearn
  + Nathan Bell
  + Emma Wallace
  + Angela Ralph
  + Tracey Wint
  + Tracy Beeson
  + Jayson Forrow
  + Tony Slater
* Apologies:
  + Suzy Jenner

1. Review of previous actions

The action arising from the previous JNCF held across 16 and 21 February 2023 were reviewed. It was agreed that the following were the remaining outstanding actions:

* Evri to provide breakdown of CSR badges

*Evri agreed that they would do this as part of the info sent across re policies etc*

* Evri to raise hanging garment issue with NEXT when appropriate

*Agreed that this was an ongoing action with Evri reminding Next at appropriate opportunities*

* Evri to share Panel constitution/make up with GMB

*Agreed that this would be done as part of the info sent across re policies etc*

* Evri to review ULEZ clean air examples from Birmingham once received from GMB.

*Agreed that this had been incorrectly noted and that reference to Birmingham should have been a reference to Sheffield. Therefore this will be picked up as part of the Monday meetings*

1. Business update

* Discussion mainly centred around volume being ahead of budget and up slightly on last year
* It was agreed that a Peak input meeting would take place with the GMB, ideally prior to the JNNF, and Evri would respond with suitable dates
* GMB also shared their readout from the meeting between Gary Smith and Martijn. Evri confirmed that it matched their understanding and the points that were then to be focussed on

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Evri to provide dates for Peak input meeting to GMB | Evri |

1. GMB Items
   1. Pensions

* Evri reiterating that the mileage issue had impacted a small number of couriers and confirming that initial mileage fix had been put in at Easter week. This was to fix issue with data and Driver IDs.
* Following that fix, it had uncovered a further smaller issue where couriers pressed “start route” on route optimisation more than once. A fix was due to go in on 15 May and would be backdated to start of P3.
* Evri confirming that all issues should be resolved from start of P3.
  1. Invoices
* Discussion around issues and GMB conveying couriers frustration that invoices were still wrong despite Evri now having longer to put them together and pay couriers
* Evri clarifying that the invoice process change had been made to fix issues with the invoices themselves, which they had largely done. However what that wouldn’t fix was any inaccurate info feeding into the invoice process
* Further discussion re what was meant by “invoice issues” and following key themes identified:
  + Lack of clarity and/or breakdown of “additional payments” meaning couriers were unclear what these were for
  + Lack of clear process for approval and payment of ad-hoc payments. GMB gave examples of where couriers had not received what they had allegedly been promised and GMB reiterated their stance that a courier should not undertake any work in exchange for an ad-hoc unless that had been confirmed in writing
  + No understanding of why courier admin told couriers that the screenshots of their devices were not an accurate reflection of what they had been delivered, but instead were only a guide
  + An issue in relation to paying the Easter Bank Holidays

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Understand and revert to GMB with any changes that can be made to invoice to make clearer | Evri |
| Set out to GMB the authorisation process for ad-hocs and rules around them | Evri |
| Add Bank Holiday payments to the invoice checking process | Evri |

* 1. Misbands
* Discussion around the points set out in GMB’s agenda
* Evri acknowledging a significant issue for couriers. Confirming that there was always an ongoing process of trying to improve the situation but this now had top level focus as a result of the GS/MDL meeting
* Evri answered specific questions:
  + The weights displayed on parcel labels were from the client’s data, which sometimes would be accurate and on other occasions wouldn’t be (Evri gave the example of a client presetting all weights to 0.01kg)
  + That the time of 3pm being spoken about by couriers for all banding to show correctly was not scientific as far as Evri were aware
  + That aside from recent issues, the type displayed on the device should match the type displayed on COL. However Evri reiterated what had been communicated previously that the banding from Workforce Portal would not always be updated
* The following key actions were agreed:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Understand and revert to GMB with the C2C labelling/charging process following receipt of example from GMB | Evri |
| Understand and feedback on options for removing the weight data from labels | Evri |
| Confirm “cut off time” at which all parcels should show as having their allocated bandings on device and COL | Evri |
| Provide data on the various rejection reasons | Evri |
| Understand possibility of making rejection reasons clearer | Evri |
| Consider challenge process for couriers and what this could look like | Evri |
| Consider what data on weight/dims can be displayed when rejecting upgrade requests | Evri |
| Confirm if GMB are able to see volumetric scanner in action | Evri |

* 1. Star rating/HSP
* Discussion around agenda points re GMB concern on star rating
* Evri stating that star rating had consistently risen since introduction and agreement with GMB as part of previous JNNF
* Agreed way fwd was for Evri to send GMB data and GMB to come back with concise list of concerns
* GMB also raising concern re SoS and that a courier who had handshake should automatically pass DU>Courier leg

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Provide data on number of -ive and +ive badges | Evri |
| Provide proposed comms to be sent containing customer comments | Evri |
| Review and respond to GMB proposal re handshake/SoS | Evri |

* 1. Policies
* Agreed that discussion on holidays would wait until Evri item
* General discussion around process and procedures. Evri confirmed that there was no separate standalone absence policy but the Delivery Team would obviously take action to ensure that reliability of service was maintained

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Provide policies on performance to GMB | Evri |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Respond to GMB on points on slide | Evri |

1. Evri items
   1. Holiday

* Evri asked for feedback on the proposed survey sent to GMB on Friday 5 May. GMB commented that it was not really a survey and was instead more advanced holiday requests. Evri agreed and it was agreed that Evri would simplify and rework the comms and resend to GMB approval either later today or tomorrow
* Evri then ran through data in relation to numbers of holiday requested against number rejected
* GMB stated their view that holiday limits had not been agreed. Evri stated that they believed that they had

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Action** | **Owner** |
| Holiday “rejection” data to be provided to GMB | Evri |
| Search for and provide to GMB minutes if located of Summer 2019 meetings | Evri |
| Provide reworked holiday “survey” for GMB feedback | Evri |

* 1. Route optimization improvements
* GMB welcoming improvements as proposed around improved Optimisation, and the potential for it to “;learn the round”
* Evri and GMB agreeing that best way for GMB to be bought closer to the detail would be via the fortnightly meetings with IT.
  1. Changes to how Evri pay for cover
* Evri clarifying that:
  + On rounds where there was a big gap between the round rate and the PRG of Round Holder, Evri would look to increase these by 13p **on average**. There would not be a PRG increase. This is solely to make the rounds more attractive for cover.
  + Where the round rate was equal to the PRG currently then this would not see an increase, as there was not a gap between the 2
* GMB welcomed the development on the basis that more couriers would be able to offer their services to cover, on a higher rate