

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-DR-38
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 8, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

Call Center Follow-Up

1. Following up on DR 23-15,
 - a. Please provide a narrative description of events in the call center (e.g., implementation of technology, unusual weather events, etc.) during the years 2009 and 2010. Identify any reasons during any time periods when the average speed to answer would increase, the CSR level of service would decrease, the percentage of calls abandoned would increase, or the number of calls taken per CSR staffing hour (as defined in DR 23-15) would decrease.
 - b. We have calculated that the number of calls per CSR staffing hour was much higher in the first half of 2009 than in the second half of 2009 and in most of 2010. Please explain why.
 - c. Please explain why the CSR Abandoned call rate was in the range of 2.4 to 4.3% from January to September, 2009, increased the 5% range for October-December 2009, increased further to the 6-11% range from January-July 2010, and then fell back below 3% in September-December, 2010.
 - d. Please explain why the number of IVR calls answered declined in the last four months of 2012 and increased in most months of 2010 relative to 2009.
 - e. Please provide a narrative explanation as to why the average speed to answer was over 80 seconds in November 2009 and January-April of 2010, and July 2010.
 - f. Please explain why the number of pay-by-phone calls answered declined precipitously in October, 2009 and has not increased back to the levels experienced before that month.

SoCalGas Response:

- a. The most significant event impacting Customer Service Representative (CSR) performance occurred in October 2009 with the implementation of a new phone system including a new automatic call distributor (ACD), a new CSR softphone, a new CSR desktop (or screen-pop), new call routing, a new speech enabled IVR, a new outbound dialing unit (OBD), and new performance reporting software. CSR productivity was negatively impacted with this implementation and did not show marked improvement until August 2010. Specifically, CSR average handle time (AHT) per call increased during the post October 2009 call center technology implementation period. Higher AHT led to longer customer CSR queues and therefore higher abandoned calls.
- b. See response to Question 1.a. above.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-DR-38
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 8, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

Response to Question 1 (Continued)

- c. See response to Question 1.a. above.
- d. SoCalGas assumes this question is asking about the last four months of 2009. As part of the new phone system, a new IVR was implemented in October 2009. SoCalGas cannot specifically state the reasons for the decline in IVR handled call volume in the closing months of 2009. As for the 2010 increase in IVR handled call volume over 2009, a primary driver was an increase in the number of IVR handled payment arrangements.
- e. See response to Question 1.a. above.
- f. SoCalGas cannot specifically state reasons for the decline in pay-by-phone volumes other than the possibility that customers opted to migrate to other payment channels.

**TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-DR-38
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 8, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 19, 2011**

2. Please provide information on the average handle time of phone calls by month from 2007-2010.

SoCalGas Response:

Please refer to the response to TURN-SCG-DR-23 question 10.e. for the average handle time by month for years 2007 through 2010.

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-DR-38
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 8, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

3. Please provide daily data similar to TURN DR 23-15 for 2007 and 2008.

SoCalGas Response:

The attached file contains 2007 through 2008 staffing hours, number of IVR calls, number of calls taken at the call center, corresponding levels of service, number of pay by phone answered calls, average speed to answer, and number of abandoned calls, similar to the data provided in response to TURN DR-23.question 15.



TURN DR-38 Q3
Attachment

TURN DATA REQUEST
TURN-SCG-DR-38
SOCALGAS 2012 GRC – A.10-12-006
SOCALGAS RESPONSE
DATE RECEIVED: SEPTEMBER 8, 2011
DATE RESPONDED: SEPTEMBER 19, 2011

4. Please provide a description of all quantitative goals or targets used by management as indicators of for call center operation (i.e., average seconds to answer of XX seconds; Y% of calls answered in Z seconds; abandoned call percentage of Q percent, etc.). Identify any changes in goals or targets since January 1, 2007.

SoCalGas Response:

The following table provides a list of the key indicators used to gauge performance in the Customer Contact Center (CCC). Included in the table is a description of each performance indicator, the current goal or target, and any changes to the goal or target since January 1, 2007.

CCC Performance Indicator	Goal	Description
Overall Level of Service (LOS)	2007-2008 LOS goal 78-82%; 2009-2010 LOS goal 76%	% of calls answered within 60 seconds
Abandonment Rate	4%	% of calls abandoned while waiting for CSR
Average Handle Time (in seconds)	Low 230s	Average time it takes for CSR to complete a customer call
IVR Self Service Rate	>20%	% of calls taken by the IVR with no CSR involvement
CSR Occupancy Rate	>85%	% of time CSR spends talking to a customer or performing after call work