

UBER_JCCP_MDL_001104996

Metadata

#Author	bmora@uber.com	SEMANTIC
#Date Modified	06/14/2017	SEMANTIC
#DateCreated	06/02/2017	SEMANTIC
#Title	RH Meeting - 06/07/2017	SEMANTIC
Account	dportugal@uber.com	SEMANTIC
All Custodians	Sheridan, Danielle	SEMANTIC
All Paths	Sheridan, Danielle: \JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018_dportugal\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018_dportugal@uber.com_0.zip; Sheridan, Danielle: \JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018_dportugal\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018_dportugal@uber.com_0.zip	SEMANTIC
Application	Microsoft 2007 PowerPoint Presentation	SEMANTIC
Attachment Names	ppt	SEMANTIC
Begin Family	UBER_JCCP_MDL_001104996	SEMANTIC
Collaborators	aash@uber.com; mw@uber.com; sam.eastwood@uber.com; nweaser@uber.com; lisha@uber.com; allison.frelinger@uber.com; shelly@uber.com; dportugal@uber.com	SEMANTIC
Confidentiality	Confidential	SEMANTIC
Date Created	06/02/2017 7:50 pm	SEMANTIC
Date Modified	06/14/2017 6:19 am	SEMANTIC
DocID	1uX0rkUyqhcYHvBHzN9oK38NIOqnbprhuBIVN0vpujk4	SEMANTIC
Document Type	Electronic File	SEMANTIC
End Family	UBER_JCCP_MDL_001104996	SEMANTIC
File Path	\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018_dportugal\JCCP-EDISCO-23800_BEFORE2018_dportugal@uber.com_0.zip	SEMANTIC
File Size	1290331	SEMANTIC
Filename	RH Meeting - 06-07-201_1uX0rkUyqhcYHvBHzN9oK38NIOqnbprhuBIVN0vpujk4.pptx	SEMANTIC
GoogleDocumentType	PRESENTATION	SEMANTIC
Hash Value	9686de6c7d72d13faaab10162057053d	SEMANTIC
Hidden Content	Yes;	SEMANTIC
ILS All Bates	UBER_JCCP_MDL_001104996	SEMANTIC
ILS Document Date	06/14/2017	SEMANTIC
ILS Prod Date	10/21/2024	SEMANTIC
ILS Prod Vol	JCCP_MDL023	SEMANTIC
LINKSOURCEBATES	UBER_JCCP_MDL_005003342	SEMANTIC
Other Custodians	Sheridan, Danielle	SEMANTIC
Primary Date	06/02/2017 7:50 pm	DOC_TYP E_ALIAS
Production Volume	JCCP_MDL023;	SEMANTIC
Redacted	No	SEMANTIC
Sort Date	06/14/2017 6:19 am	SEMANTIC
SourceHash	b207853e3ceb7e7b4809e10e30df01b2	SEMANTIC






US & CAN Business Standards

Q2 2017


Standards Progress

At the end of this week, we'll have reviewed **82** standards (of 105), representing **48%** of all ticket inbound, **72%** of waitlists, and **91%** of deactivations

Standards Reviewed



Standards Optimized as % of Key KPIs



Current Schedule:

- **Full Standards Revamp Completed:** July 5 (final meeting pushed from 6/30 due to scheduling difficulties)
- **Full Comms Revamp Completed:** June 30
- **Strike Team Roll-Off:** June 30

High-Priority Standards






Accidents & Collisions Overview

Occurs when a vehicle collides with another vehicle, pedestrian, animal, road debris, or other stationary obstruction, e.g. a tree or utility pole.

OLD STANDARD	NEW STANDARD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> L1 and L2 accidents involve full IRT investigation, and require pictures of the vehicle before it can be driven on the app again. Drivers' vehicles are waitlisted until photos are received, their accounts are not waitlisted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to the L1 and L2 accident process are being implemented at this time
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No SLAs or defined process for closing out accident investigations / JIRAs and reactivating partners waitlisted for L3 reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined investigation & reactivation process for IRT agents to follow to resolve L3 reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Quick reactivation</i> process for partners with no prior safety incidents and where no injury in L3 reported (24 hour SLA) <i>Standard investigation</i> process for investigation and reactivation of driver account for all other partners (72hr SLA) Subregion and Legal POCs notified of escalated incidents [definitions here]
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No deactivation thresholds for accidents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strike policy in place that plugs into current Dangerous Driving strike policy (<i>details on next slide</i>) for all accidents (not just L3s)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reported off app accidents don't require photos for vehicle reactivation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IRT agent rates vehicle a 1 and requires photos for vehicle reactivation for off app accident reports
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rider opening a door into an object is considered an L1 accident 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rider causing damage to driver's car that doesn't involve a 3rd party falls under Damage policy; may still be routed to insurance per Rider Caused Damage

*Defined as sum of appeasements, miscellaneous payments, and net one-sided fare adjustments

ANNUAL STATS (Current)

	PARTNERS IMPACTED: % OF ACTIVE PARTNERS	112.0K 3.3%
	% TICKET VOLUME:	0.6%
	% DEACTIVATIONS/ % WAITLISTS:	4.3%/ 41.8%
	CSAT: % ABOVE / BELOW MEDIAN	77.1% 26.9%
	COST*:	\$2.2 M

ADD'L COST TO BUSINESS

INC. TOTAL COST*:	N/A
% ABOVE / BELOW ORIGINAL	N/A

SUCCESS METRICS

- 14d Driver Online Hours
- DSAT
- Saved Reply Usage Rate

Slide 4

1

represented by an attorney & hospitalization

Danielle Sheridan; 6/9/2017 11:36:34 PM

Accidents & Collisions: Deactivation Process

Adjudications & Review Process Details

- “Accident & Collision” reports will integrate into our Dangerous Driving deactivation framework. Given this, if 3 accident reports or Dangerous Driving reports within 375 trips OR 10 reports within 2,000 trips are reviewed & validated, the driver is deactivated
- Drivers who cross the accident/dangerous driving threshold are referred to the Central Adjudication Team for review. The review verifies the validity of all reports using bliss tickets and JIRAs for L3 reports.
- All edge cases are flagged to the business policy team for review

Accidents Policy: Strike vs. Non-strike Reports	
Counts as a strike for deactivation	Doesn't count as strike for deactivation
<p>Indication that a driver's actions contributed to accident</p> <p>Below list is not fully inclusive, but examples of possible strikes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stopped in middle of driving lane • Pulled into bike lane • Turned into pedestrian, bicycle, motorcycle, other car • Illegal driving maneuver of any kind (i.e. U-turn, speeding, illegal turn, running red light) • Driver broke hard before accident occurred • Driver was not paying attention and bumped a pedestrian • Partner was distracted in any way 	<p>No indication that a driver's action contributed to the accident</p> <p>If the rider/driver report is vague or indeterminate if driver's actions contributed to the accident - below list is not fully inclusive but examples of non-strikes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Car is stopped at stop sign or red light and driver gets rear-ended • Rider caused injury (i.e. rider opens door into bicycle, rider falls entering/exiting vehicle) • 3rd party runs into car (i.e. bicycle hits cars, motorcycle or car drives into side of drivers car, other 3rd party causes impact with vehicle) • Rider states it was not the driver's fault
<p>Please note: When an accident report comes in, we take the rider's report at face value & give the driver a strike (based on the rider's claim), irrespective of driver pushback.</p>	

*Review Threshold: 3 accident reports or Dangerous Driving reports within 375 trips OR 10 reports within 2,000 trips are reviewed for deactivation. Deactivation only if reports are validated during review.

Destination Discrimination - Regulated*






Occurs when a driver calls a rider to determine the trip destination, and subsequently cancels the trip due to the destination being undesirable *in a regulated market*

OLD STANDARD	NEW STANDARD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No investigation and process flow for drivers who are identified as committing "Destination Discrimination" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Defined investigation and process flow to identify and validate reports of "Destination Discrimination" (details on in two slides)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No warning and strike policy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Driver sent outbound and receives a strike on each reasonable allegation of destination discrimination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stricter approach of waitlisting and outreaching in DC due to stricter regs Airport trips are included in this process Driver subject to strike policy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposing 3 in 300 trip rolling threshold for warnings deactivation in cities that have regs (all relevant cities except DC, which requires stricter monitoring) Airport trips are included in this process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No education is provided to riders or drivers on how to amicably resolve requests for unreasonably long trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide resources for drivers and riders on how to amicably resolve requests for unreasonably long trips

* Includes the vast majority of markets in the US, all of top 20 markets, except Toronto (TBC) & Phoenix

**Defined as sum of appeasements, miscellaneous payments, and net one-sided fare adjustments

ANNUAL STATS (Current)

 PARTNERS IMPACTED: % OF ACTIVE PARTNERS	24.0K 0.003%
 % TICKET VOLUME:	0.2%
 % DEACTIVATIONS/ % WAITLISTS:	0%/0%
 CSAT: % ABOVE / BELOW MEDIAN	24.5% -37%
 COST**:	\$106k

ADD'L COST TO BUSINESS

INC. TOTAL COST*: % ABOVE / BELOW ORIGINAL	N/A N/A
--	-------------------

SUCCESS METRICS

- 14d Driver Online Hours
- DSAT
- Saved Reply Usage Rate

Destination Discrimination - Non-Regulated*

Occurs when a driver calls a rider to determine the trip destination, and subsequently cancels the trip due to the destination being undesirable in *a non-regulated market*






OLD STANDARD	NEW STANDARD
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No definition for, investigation and process flow for drivers who are identified as committing "Destination Discrimination" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop policy-approved and legal-approved process for identifying and escalating true destination discrimination incidents (<i>details on following slide</i>) Destination Discrimination is valid if driver refuses trip to an "underserved area" (defining these areas by market is WIP)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No warnings, strikes, or educational outbounds on Uber Community Guidelines 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Escalation / driver outbound process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 in 300 trip rolling threshold for deactivation Analogous warning and deactivation process for cities with regs, with an additional step of matching trip end points to underserved areas Airport trips are included in this escalation process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No education is provided to riders or drivers on how to amicably resolve requests for unreasonably long trips 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide resources for drivers and riders on how to amicably resolve requests for unreasonably long trips

* Largest markets include: Toronto (TBC) & Phoenix

**Defined as sum of appeasements, miscellaneous payments, and net one-sided fare adjustments

P-00054.00009

ANNUAL STATS (Current)

 PARTNERS IMPACTED: % OF ACTIVE PARTNERS	24.0K 0.003%
 % TICKET VOLUME:	0.2%
 % DEACTIVATIONS/ % WAITLISTS:	0%/0%
 CSAT: % ABOVE / BELOW MEDIAN	24.5% -37%
 COST**:	\$106k

ADD'L COST TO BUSINESS

INC. TOTAL COST*: % ABOVE / BELOW ORIGINAL	N/A N/A
--	-------------------

SUCCESS METRICS

- 14d Driver Online Hours
- DSAT
- Saved Reply Usage Rate

Destination Discrimination: Investigation Overview

Determining the validity of a Destination Discrimination claim is contingent on determining if the report contains the criteria below. If any of the criteria below are true, the report is **not** considered Destination Discrimination:

1. The trip started and lasted longer than two minutes
2. The driver claimed he/she didn't have enough time to complete the trip
3. The rider is writing about a trip that is different from the contact
4. The driver wrote a contact on the same trip that provided a reason for the cancellation that is not a refusal of the destination
5. The trip never began and the driver never contacted the rider
6. The driver claimed the trip was too long
7. The trip's estimated duration was 60 minutes or longer
8. The trip would have crossed service areas
9. ~~The driver claimed that he/she refused trip because it would take him/her to destination where he/she could not accept trips for legal reasons (for example, lack of business license)~~
10. [Non-Regulated Market Only] Trip was not to an underserved area.

Slide 8

1

+dportugal@uber.com regarding item number 9, we were advised by Aaron Brand and Bram Hanono to use this in the screening methodology. Brad gave the NYC example, however, there is another example in California where dropping off or picking up is illegal without a business license for that particular town or city. We added #9 from a direct recommendation from Employment and Regulatory Counsel

Assigned to dportugal@uber.com

Deleted user; 6/7/2017 7:36:31 PM

Rider-Caused Vehicle Damage Overview






Occurs when a partner reports that a rider or rider's guest accidentally or intentionally damaged the interior or exterior of their vehicle

OLD STANDARD	NEW STANDARD
Damage <\$250 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Payment from Uber up to \$250 • Rider is not charged for Damage 	<i>More detail on next slide</i> Damage <\$250 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uber facilitates rider payment up to \$250 • Rider charged for damage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rider informed of investigation; oppty to respond ○ If no response or admission, rider charged ○ Refund on dispute (100% for denial; 50% if disputing severity)
Damage >\$250 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No payment for first \$250 of damage • Referred to claims team. If driver has comp/coll., payments made beyond \$250 • Rider asked to consent before being charged (less than 2% pay) 	<i>More detail on next slide</i> Damage >\$250 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All partners eligible first \$250 of damage • [No Change] Referred to claims team • Rider informed of investigation and then auto-charged for validated damage up to \$250 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Refund or reduce charge if disputed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Photo evidence and repair estimate of damage is required for reimbursement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [No change] - Photo evidence and repair estimate of damage is required for reimbursement
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Riders are banned after 3rd report of damage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [No change] - Riders are banned after 3rd report of damage

*Defined as sum of appeasements, miscellaneous payments, and net one-sided fare adjustments

P-00054.00012

ANNUAL STATS (Current)

	PARTNERS IMPACTED: % OF ACTIVE PARTNERS	9.6 K/24.4K 0.3%/0.7%
	% TICKET VOLUME:	0.0%/0.1%
	% DEACTIVATIONS/ % WAITLISTS:	0.0%/0.1%
	CSAT: % ABOVE / BELOW MEDIAN	35.2%/62.4% -42.0%/2.7%
	COST*:	\$881.4 K

ADD'L COST TO BUSINESS

INC. TOTAL COST*:	+\$24.7K
% ABOVE / BELOW ORIGINAL	+2.8%

SUCCESS METRICS

- DSAT
- 14d Driver Online Hours Post-Ticket
- Rider Charge Success Rate

Rider-Caused Vehicle Damage Detail

Riders are informed of a damage incident and then charged up to \$250 for the damage. The driver receives up to \$250 payment from rider for all claim amounts. Insurance process remains unchanged.

	Current State		Future State	
	Driver	Rider	Driver	Rider
< \$250 Valid Damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligible for reimbursement by Uber up to \$250 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not responsible for payment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligible for rounded "inconvenience fee" up to \$250 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for payment and charged up to \$250 Charge refunded upon dispute
> \$250 Valid Damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not eligible for reimbursement by Uber Encouraged to file insurance claim* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rider asked to pay for damage - consent required to charge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eligible for rounded "inconvenience fee" up to \$250 Encouraged to file insurance claim* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Responsible for payment and charged up to \$250 Charge refunded upon dispute
Invalid Damage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not eligible for reimbursement by Uber 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not eligible for rounded "inconvenience fee" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

*Partners encouraged to file insurance claims on damage > \$250 due to existing 3rd party deductible reimbursement process from \$250 to \$1000

Sexual Misconduct

Rider or driver reports inappropriate remarks, explicit behavior, or indecent exposure

CURRENT STANDARD	PAIN POINTS
<p>There are 4 categories within sexual misconduct and strikes are siloed within each category</p>	<p>No coordination between categories - can get a strike in each w/o deactivation [example]</p> <p>373 active US & CAN drivers have 3 or more strikes for sexual misconduct</p>
<p>Sexually Inappropriate Remarks/Conversation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Definition</u>: Staring / leering; Inappropriate remarks [e.g. personal questions like "Are you married?" or "How's your night been?"] <u>Action</u>: <i>Confirmed or unconfirmed cases: 3 strikes</i> 	<p>No specific feedback until deactivation, partners don't know what they did wrong so can't change [example]</p> <p>Non-sexual misconduct issues such as sexually explicit music are included here [example]</p>
<p>Explicit Behavior</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Definition</u>: Offer / solicit sex; Consensual acts involving or not involving the driver <u>Action</u>: <i>Confirmed cases: Zero tolerance, Unconfirmed: 2 strikes</i> 	<p>Unclear definitions and boundaries which leads to serious issues not treated appropriately [example] - 1 message to rider, not banned]</p>
<p>Indecent Exposure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Definition</u>: Masturbation / nudity <u>Action</u>: <i>Confirmed cases: Zero tolerance, Unconfirmed: On discretion</i> 	<p>Non-sexual indecent exposure issues such as public urination categorized here [example]</p>
<p>Sexual Assault</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Definition</u>: Non-consensual intercourse; Threat of sexual assault; Non-consensual touching <u>Action</u>: <i>Confirmed cases: Zero tolerance, Unconfirmed: On discretion</i> 	<p>Comms include procedural info (e.g. blocked user pairing), which is unsatisfactory when the reporter wants to know the offender has been deactivated</p>

ANNUAL STATS (Current)

No Contact vs Contact

PARTNERS IMPACTED: % OF ACTIVE Partners	10.9 K / 3.7 K <i>0.3% / 0.1%</i>
% TICKET VOLUME:	0.2% / 0.0%
% DEACTIVATIONS:	4.7% / <.01%
CSAT: % ABOVE / BELOW MEDIAN	83.9% / 85.5% <i>+37.9% / +41.0%</i>
COST*:	\$518 K / \$53 K

ADD'L COST TO BUSINESS

	INC. TOTAL COST*:	N/A
	% ABOVE / BELOW ORIGINAL	<i>N/A</i>

SUCCESS METRICS

- **DSAT**
- **SR usage**

Based on our collaborative [workplan](#) with T&S, we recommend implementing an interim policy that would complement the extensive long-term research T&S is completing

- **Immediate Actions** (June)

Owner: Business Policies Key Stakeholder: Trust & Safety

- Deactivate 373 drivers with complaints across related Sexual Misconduct support types
- Update Saved Replies
 - i. More empathetic & balanced
 - ii. More specific, actionable feedback
 - iii. Remove inappropriate references to internal procedures (blocked pairing)
- Update Support Logic with Clear Definitions and Comprehensive [Deactivation Criteria](#)
 - i. Deescalate less severe issues (professionalism / urinate outside vehicle)
 - ii. Address severe issues (rider sexual harassment)

- **Mid-term Actions** (August)

Owner: Trust & Safety Key Stakeholder: Business Policies

- Complete comprehensive research and analysis on Uber's sexual misconduct data
- Develop and implement custom communications - both proactive and reactive
- Implement comprehensive support & deactivation logic, leveraging broad range of support types
- Develop metrics and detection for reporter fraud

Meeting Schedule Recap

Meeting Schedule Recap

Here is a recap of the meeting schedule we are using to get final sign-off on for our remaining policies:

Proposed Meeting Schedule

We have three additional meetings on the calendar to wrap-up our policy work:

- **Wednesday, June 14 (1 Hour)**
 - Did Not Take Trip
 - Fare Adjustments
 - Lost Item
- **Friday, June 16 (1 Hour) [New!]**
 - Cancellation Standard
 - Appearments & Refunds + Appearment Abuse
 - Surge
- **Wednesday, July 5 (1 Hour)**
 - Appeals
 - Suspected Impaired Driving
 - Firearms & Weapons

Low Priority Standards

Will consider "approved" after this meeting

Business Standards

Standards we've re-written that are not safety related

Standard	Old Standard	New Standard	Partners Impacted	Ticket Volume	Deactivations	CSAT	Current Cost*	Inc. Cost
Customer Support Payment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A customer support response for demands of reimbursement or lost wages due to serious incident, not otherwise covered by an Insurance product. City Ops makes call on payment without guidance or comparables Payments characterized as a "reimbursement" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receipts are not required for payment Payments are a round or lump sum 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A customer support response for demands of reimbursement or lost wages due to serious incident, not otherwise covered by an Insurance product. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If insurance is available, including Driver Injury Protection, these guidelines will not apply Set criteria for reimbursement and formalize process; release, waivers, etc. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> IRT executes payments <\$500 City team approves \$500 according to guidance Payments characterized for "inconvenience" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Receipts are not required but agents should ask for details (ex. make/model) and cross-check the price online 	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Car Seats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No standard in place Vague Saved Replies in response to partners' questions around car seats 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Riders may bring car seats for their children; rider must install Drivers are expected to follow local laws and may cancel trip if uncomfortable transporting child 	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
City Switch	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CSR confirms partner wants a permanent change and determines if a new BGC is required. CSR submits a JIRA using the US BGC JIRA Process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process Improvement: CSRs are provided a tool that allows them to check if a BGC re-run is required so response time is greatly accelerated 	259k	1.1%	0%	79.5%	\$2.7k	\$0

Appendix

Based on our collaborative [workplan](#) with T&S, we recommend implementing an interim policy that would complement the extensive long-term research T&S is completing

Due by	June 16	June 30	July 15	July 31	Notes
Support Logic					
Group issue types together based on what action is required	Business Policy Team				Open item: Business Policy proposed this framework; discussion with safety team ongoing
Re-route mis-classified tickets to correct flow (e.g. professionalism)	Business Policy Team				
Messaging					
Update SRs to remove problematic language (e.g., blocked pairing) + improve empathy + offer more specific feedback	Business Policy Team				
Draft education / prevention comms			Safety Team		
Threshold Analysis / Strike Proposal					
Update support logic to count strikes in different categories together, resulting in ~370 deactivations	Business Policy Team				Interim solution: Can be done in conjunction with long-term solution. Matrix approach proposed here .
Update support logic based on data science input to change thresholds (possibly introducing rolling thresholds)	Safety Team				Long-term solution: Implementing this after our interim solution will not be a pain for IRT to implement
Develop safety score looking at multiple factors (e.g., cancellation rates by rider gender, ratings)	Safety Team				Support logic required as well, which would take 2+ weeks to implement
Develop metrics to check for reporter fraud			Safety Team		