

AtkinsRéalis



**AMP 7 Technical
Assurance Provider**

8th July 2025

ASSURANCE OF AFFINITY WATER 2024/25 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT

Notice

This document and its contents have been prepared and are intended solely as information for and use in relation to assurance of Affinity Water’s 2024/25 Annual Performance Assurance Report.

AtkinsRéalis assumes no responsibility to any other party in respect of or arising out of or in connection with this document and/or its contents.

Document history

Revision	Purpose description	Originated	Checked	Reviewed	Authorised	Date
1.0	Initial draft	Various	RD	JAJ	JAJ	05/06/25
2.0	For issue to ARAC	Various	RD	JAJ	JAJ	10/06/25
3.0	Updated on completion of final assurance activities	GL	RD	JAJ	JAJ	08/07/25



Contents

- Assurance Statement for Affinity Water’s 2024/25 Annual Performance Report.....4
- 1. Scope of work.....6
- 2. Key Findings6
 - Categorisation of Issues7
 - AMP7 Performance Commitments 2024/257
 - Additional APR Regulatory Information Reporting.....10
 - PR19 Reconciliation Models11
- Appendix A - Summary of Changes in Company Submission.....14
- Appendix B - Detailed Scope of Work.....17



Assurance Statement for Affinity Water's 2024/25 Annual Performance Report

AtkinsRéalis is engaged by Affinity Water to provide independent assurance on technical and some expenditure items in the Annual Performance Report for 2024/25. This assurance statement encapsulates observations we made during the course of our technical audit programme. We presented our findings to Affinity Water's Regulation Team on 6th June 2025 and the Affinity Water Audit Risk and Assurance Committee (ARAC) on 24th June 2025. This statement is part of a continuous improvement process that has involved detailed consideration of the methodologies and their applications by which Affinity Water reports on its performance each year.

Our approach to technical assurance is to draw upon our experiences at previous rounds of audit and to plan in detail who should be present, what information will be covered, where and when. We issue a notification, carry out the audit, provide immediate verbal feedback and a formal feedback summary including requests for further information or clarification with a table of issues raised. The issues from all the audits and subsequent interactions are compiled into an Issues Log, which is used to manage the resolution of reporting issues before the finalisation of the technical assurance process. This statement reflects the technical assurance position after the iterative process of resolving outstanding issues has concluded.

Affinity Water has 28 Performance Commitments (PCs), 15 of which have associated financial incentives. As part of our independent assurance of Affinity Water's annual reporting, we have been engaged to audit the tables and submissions to be published in Affinity Water's 2024/25 Annual Performance Report and regulatory reporting to other bodies. The areas in scope for this assurance are:

- Data and commentary (where applicable) reported as part of the Annual Performance Report (APR) to Ofwat:
 - Table 3A & 3E - Outcome performance tables (common and bespoke measures)
 - Table 3C – C-MeX
 - Table 3D – D-MeX
 - Table 2N; 3F; 3I; 4A; 4D; 4F; 4J; 4L; 4Q; 4R; 4Z; 5A; 6A; 6B; 6C; 6D; 6F; 10F; 10H – Asset and financial data
 - 11A – Operational greenhouse gas emissions reporting
 - PR19 Reconciliation Tables
- Reported financial Performance Commitments:
 - Common Performance Commitments – 3A.1 to 3A.6
 - Bespoke Performance Commitments – 3A.7 to 3A.15
- Reporting updated Past Delivery data for the PR19 Blind Year Reconciliation
- Ofwat additional data request – Average time properties experience low pressure
- Condition G Licence Statement
- Environment Agency – Annual average out-turns
- Report to CCW
- Reporting to Water UK

In a series of approximately 40 virtual meetings between April and June 2025, we carried out combined methodology and data audits designed to confirm whether:

- Affinity Water has appropriate systems, procedures and reporting mechanisms in place to control and meet its reporting obligations.
- Affinity Water understands the accuracy of the data that it is providing and is able to identify where specific reported data may not be appropriate to meet regulatory expectations. Many of the items that we audit inherently contain an element of uncertainty, so it is not possible to assure their absolute accuracy.



- The key assumptions and processes that are used to report against Affinity Water's Performance Commitments are consistent with the way that the target was set for the PR19 Final Determination.
- The methodologies that have been used for reporting of the common metrics are consistent with the technical guidance that has been published by Ofwat and other bodies (DWI, WaterUK, CCW), and where there are shortfalls these have been identified appropriately using the Red, Amber, Green classifications provided by Ofwat in the RAG Compliance Checklists.

We traced reported data back to data sources and information systems. We raised 173 issues with the Company and there were 15 changes to reported data where we identified some errors in reporting and/or areas of misunderstanding in relation to the reporting guidelines or methodology.

There are only two areas of note which we identified with the reporting of the Company's AMP7 Performance Commitments are:

- 3C.5 to 7: Total Household Complaints. This is the 3rd year that we have classified Complaints reporting as Amber. While there are other drivers also cited by the Company for the number of complaints doubling, one of the key reasons is an improvement in the accuracy of the reporting as a result of the Management Plan that was put in place to address our previous findings. However, the Company's internal quality assurance checks still show that the error rate for 2024/25 was high even if the trend is improving. The Company has been transparent about this in its commentary to Ofwat.
- 3E.1 Risk of Severe Restrictions in a Drought. Affinity Water uses actual Distribution Input, which may not always represent a dry year as required under the guidance, and has set out to Ofwat each year that this approach has been adopted.

We consider that the published metrics provide a fair and reasonable account of Affinity Water's performance in 2024/25 relative to its AMP7 targets. While we observed a number of issues for which we provide comment within our main report, we believe they have been exposed by the Company and do not impact materially upon the potential to sign-off the Company submission.

We confirm that Affinity Water has continued to provide us with full and transparent access to its systems and processes, including unrestricted access to all systems, files and documents that we requested from the Company. During the assurance activities, we had free access to the Regulation team and the full cooperation of the people responsible for preparing and reporting the 2024/25 APR and regulatory submissions and the supporting information.



Julian Jacobs

Regulation Director

1. Scope of work

AtkinsRéalis Limited has been appointed to provide external assurance on the regulatory submissions presented by Affinity to Ofwat under the conditions set out in its Licence with the Secretary of State. There is also associated regulatory reporting to the EA, Water UK and CC Water which falls within the scope of our assurance.

The areas in scope for assurance are:

- Data and commentary (where applicable) reported as part of the Annual Performance Report (APR) to Ofwat:
 - Table 3A & 3E - Outcome performance tables (common and bespoke measures) including assurance of RAG Compliance Checklists where applicable
 - Table 3C – C-MeX
 - Table 3D – D-MeX
 - Table 2N; 3F; 3I; 4A; 4D; 4F; 4J; 4L; 4Q; 4R; 4Z; 5A; 6A; 6B; 6C; 6D; 6F 10F; 10H – Asset and financial data
 - Table 11A - Operational greenhouse gas emissions reporting
- Reported financial Performance Commitments:
 - Common Performance Commitments – 3A.1 to 3A.6
 - Bespoke Performance Commitments – 3A.7 to 3A.15
- Ofwat additional data request – Average time properties experience low pressure
- Condition G Licence Statement
- Environment Agency – Annual average outturns
- Report to CCWater
- Reporting to WaterUK

The scope of our assurance for the updated past delivery data for the PR19 blind year reconciliation focused on the following requirements detailed in IN 25/02:

- PR19 blind year reconciliation
- The past delivery data table for the blind year reconciliation
- Strategic regional water resources reconciliation model
- Updated versions of the following models:
 - ODI performance
 - In-period adjustments
 - Strategic regional water resources
 - RPI-CPIH wedge

In relation to Table 4Z Section C it should be noted that the scope of this audit is only to confirm payments made (customer numbers and values). We have not been asked to assure the underlying processes for identifying GSS events and thus the findings from this audit cannot be used to confirm that all payments are being made in line with statutory obligations, which would involve a much more comprehensive review to provide assurance of the end-to-end GSS processes.

2. Key Findings

We confirm that Affinity Water has provided us with full and transparent access to its systems and processes, including unrestricted access to all systems, files and documents that we requested from the Company. During the assurance activities, we had free access to the Regulation team and the full cooperation of the people responsible for preparing and reporting the 2024/25 APR and regulatory submissions and the supporting information.



2.1 Categorisation of Issues

As with previous years we classify our findings into 'Red', 'Amber' and 'Green' categories. The definition for each category as follows:

Categories	Definition
Red	These are material reporting risks to the Company relating to either the application of the methodology, the accuracy of the reported data and/or the meeting of a performance commitment
Amber	These are significant issues where we identified reporting risks to the business. They may relate to the methodology and/or data, however they do not alter the performance reported relative to targets and threshold values, or the impact on performance has been exposed by the Company in its commentary to Ofwat.
Green	These signify either no issues or relatively minor issues that are designed to provide continuous improvement to the reporting process and are highlighted within the individual audit summaries that we provide for the Company.

We identified 173 issues during our assurance activities (compared to 158 in 2024/25, 189 in 2022/23, 175 in 2021/22 and 197 in 2020/21). We categorise the issues raised both initially and then the categorisation if and when they are closed. From the initial categorisation, there were 16 Red issues, 82 Amber issues and 75 Green issues identified.

Categorisation	Initial	Final	Open
Red	16 (9%)	1 (<1%)	0 (0%)
Amber	82 (48%)	15 (9%)	2 (100%)
Green	75 (43%)	155 (91%)	0 (0%)
Total	173	171	2

The Company has addressed all the issues within its control and can be considered as resolved for APR-25 (35 non-material issues have been marked as revisit next year). There are 2 issues open which relate to the fact that the Company is reporting provisional scores issued by the Drinking Water Inspectorate (DWI) for the Compliance Risk Index (CRI) and the Events Risk Index (ERI). There is still therefore a risk that the final scores may change, although it should be noted there is no further action that Affinity Water can do to close these issues as the Company is awaiting notification from the DWI.

While there is one issue closed as "Red" in the issues log, overall the reporting for this area has been categorised as "Amber" because the Company is exposing the issue with the accuracy of the reporting in its commentary to Ofwat, which we believe is a reasonable approach.

2.2 AMP7 Performance Commitments 2024/25

We have reviewed all the financial and non-financial PCs on a PC-by-PC basis as part of our assurance work and capture our findings below on the outcome of the assurance on the PCs below. Any weaknesses have been identified but overall we are satisfied that the PC requirements have been met.

Table 2-1 Summary of financial PCs reviewed

PC Ref.	Performance Commitment	Findings	Methodology	Data
3A.1	Water Quality Compliance (CRI)	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with the data that is reported to the DWI. The reported score is provided by DWI. The score is described as a provisional figure, but no change is expected in the final score.	Green	Green
3A.2	Water supply interruptions	For Water supply interruptions, we confirmed through our assurance activities that Affinity Water	Green	Green

		is fully compliant with the common methodology. The methodology is robust, in line with Ofwat guidance, and the reported performance can be considered reliable, accurate, and complete. The RAG Compliance Checklist that has been submitted is in our opinion a fair reflection of Affinity Water's methodology.		
3A.3	Leakage	For Leakage, we confirmed through our assurance activities that Affinity Water is fully compliant with the common methodology. The RAG Compliance Checklist that has been submitted is in our opinion a fair reflection of its methodology. The reported leakage performance commitment is robustly reported with all RAG reporting lines categorised as Green this year. The 20% reduction against the baseline has not been achieved, as reported as a risk at mid-year, the availability of resource to manage the spring / summer outbreak being a significant contributing factor to not achieving the performance commitment.	Green	Green
3A.4	Per capita consumption	For PCC, we confirmed through our assurance activities that Affinity Water is fully compliant with the common methodology. The RAG Compliance Checklist that has been submitted is in our opinion a fair reflection of its methodology. The reported PCC performance commitment is robustly reported with all RAG reporting lines categorised as Green this year. The impact of the pandemic on PCC performance continues to be felt. The in-year performance level of 153.9l/h/d has reduced marginally from APR-24 which was at the baseline prior to the COVID19 pandemic.	Green	Green
3A.5	Mains repairs	For Mains repairs, we confirmed through our assurance activities that Affinity Water is fully compliant with the common methodology. The RAG Compliance Checklist that has been submitted is in our opinion a fair reflection of its methodology. The approach used by the Company to track and calculate main repairs is robust and the jobs can be tracked from being raised through the corporate systems. The checks that the Company has in place for its data give confidence in the process and by extension the reporting. Mains repairs is a measure that is greatly impacted by the weather conditions within a year, reflected in this year's reporting.	Green	Green
3A.6	Unplanned outage	For Unplanned outage, we confirmed through our assurance activities that Affinity Water is fully compliant with the common methodology. The RAG Compliance Checklist that has been submitted is in our opinion a fair reflection of its methodology. The outage reporting process is robust with strong checks and controls built into the business-as-usual process and improvements are continuing to be made to the reporting systems.	Green	Green
3A.7	Environmental innovation - delivery of community projects	The Company has continued to deliver projects which have an innovation theme and is claiming two (2) project units this year, with 12 overall for the AMP. The Independent Challenge Group is responsible for signing this off.	Green	Green

3A.8	Reducing the total number of void properties by identifying false voids	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with the reporting.	Green	Green
3A.9	River restoration	The Company has delivered 42 River Restoration project units by 31/03/2025 which is an overperformance against the target of 36 units for the AMP period. The reporting methodology and documentation is robust and no issues were identified with the reporting.	Green	Green
3A.10	Abstraction reduction	The Company has met the year 5 Performance Commitment for Abstraction Reductions. The methodology is unchanged and data is robustly reported and evidenced.	Green	Green
3A.11	Sources operating under the Abstraction Incentive Mechanism	Methodology and processes are robust. The Company has exceeded AIM performance.	Green	Green
3A.12	Properties at risk of receiving low pressure	The properties at risk of receiving low pressure are reported robustly.	Green	Green
3A.13	Number of occupied properties not billed (Gap sites)	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with its reporting.	Green	Green
3A.14	Unplanned interruptions to supply over 12 hours	The methodology is robust, in line with Ofwat guidance, and the reported performance can be considered reliable, accurate, and complete.	Green	Green
3A.15	Customer contacts per 1,000 population for Water Quality	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with the reporting.	Green	Green
3C.1-3	Annual C-MeX survey score	We were able to confirm that near complete datasets are sent to the market research company for the purposes of conducting the customer service survey. There are human errors which lead to contacts not being logged but we do not believe this would have any impact on the survey score.	Green	Green
3C.5-7	Total household complaints	This is the 3 rd year that we have classified Complaints reporting as Amber. While there are other drivers also cited by the Company for the number of complaints doubling, one of the key reasons is an improvement in the accuracy of the reporting as a result of the Management Plan that was put in place to address our previous findings. However, the Company's internal quality assurance checks still show that the error rate for 2024/25 was high even if the trend is improving. The Company has been transparent about this in its commentary to Ofwat.	Green	Amber
3D.1-3	D-MeX	The Company's processes are considered fit for purpose. We are satisfied that the data reported is robust and that the survey sample provided to the market research company is accurate and complete.	Green	Green

Table 2-2 Summary of non-financial PCs reviewed

PC Ref.	Performance Commitment	Findings	Methodology	Data
3E.1	Risk of severe restrictions in a drought	Affinity Water uses actual Distribution Input, which may not always represent a dry year as required under the guidance, and has set out to Ofwat why this approach has been adopted over AMP7. The Ofwat guidance contains specific requirements for the 'end of period' reporting but it is unclear if this is still relevant due to subsequent changes made for AMP8 and Affinity Water is awaiting clarification from Ofwat.	Amber	Green
3E.2-4	Priority services for customers in vulnerable circumstances – PSR reach; Attempted contacts; Actual contacts	The Company's methodology and data appear to be to a high standard. In previous years we have challenged the Company on the methods utilised to conduct surveys, with the view that it was not fully meeting the requirements to conduct surveys using multiple channels of communication; only conducting surveys by email and SMS. This year the Company confirmed it does send a small number of letters, now reaching those customers whose only form of contact with the Company is via landline or letter.	Green	Green
3E.6	Average time properties experience low pressure	The average time properties experience low pressure is reported robustly.	Green	Green
3E.7, 11	Customers in vulnerable circumstances satisfied with our service	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with the reporting.	Green	Green
3E.8,12	Customers in vulnerable circumstances who found us easy to deal with	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with the reporting.	Green	Green
3E.9	BSI accreditation	The BSI accreditation has been replaced by a new ISO standard which is the equivalent, and that the Company provided certification for the reporting year.	Green	Green
3E.10	IT resilience	The Company's methodology for reporting is robust, checks and controls are built into the processes and no issues were identified with the reporting.	Green	Green
3E.13	Value for Money survey	We did not identify any issues with the method or data and consider the reporting to be accurate and complete.	Green	Green
3E.14	Delivery of Water Industry National Environment Programme (WINEP) requirements	The Company have delivered all 166 WINEP schemes with a current agreed completion date of 31/3/2025 or earlier and have 'Met' the WINEP delivery requirements. We did not identify any issues with the method or data and consider the reporting to be accurate and complete.	Green	Green

2.3 Additional APR Regulatory Information Reporting

We have reviewed other data reported and highlight on an exception basis any areas of note. This includes regulatory reporting of asset and financial data to Ofwat, the EA (45 data lines) and CC Water (107 data lines). We have identified six other areas to note. The full scope of assurance is set out in Appendix A.

Table 2-2 Areas of note encountered during audit of additional regulatory information tables

Table Ref.	Reporting area	Findings	Methodology	Data
5A.23 6A.6 6A.34 6B.24	Average Pumping Head	The overall process has been improved this year and knowledge of the systems and processes has increased, together with a good system of change control and internal review. Abstraction volumes rather than Distribution Input data is used in the calculation. This has been used for many years. The Company confirms that this will be given further consideration for future reporting.	Amber	Amber
6C.18-20	Communications Pipes	The ongoing issue around infilling of Maximo data has not been fully resolved. There have been significant improvements to the completeness of comms pipe material data – increasing from 91% in 2023/24 to 97.5% in 2024/25. This means for APR-25 that 2.5% of comms pipes are still assigned estimated pipe materials via an apportionment process. It is understood that process changes are being investigated to increase the data completeness to the 'pre-Maximo' level of 99%, reducing the percentage of comms pipes with estimated materials to 1%.	Green	Amber
6D.15-20	Demand Savings from Metering	The Company uses advanced techniques to calculate demand savings resulting from metering via its 'PCC Impacts' model. For meters renewed from Basic to Smart (AMR) there is a demand increase shown. This would not be expected. The Company confirmed it will review the method for calculating the demand benefit which may include removal of outliers and also a consideration of the driver for meter replacement, i.e. whether it is due to poor data or asset life.	Amber	Green
6F.4	Demand Savings	The Company is reviewing its model and approach to calculating demand savings. There is concern regarding the uncertainty of demand savings generated from the 'Save Our Streams' campaign and the risk of double counting due to the way customer data has been collected and also between other demand saving activities such as metering. The Company will need to revise and update the methods for calculating demand savings for AMP8, in particular from associated water efficiency work resulting from smart metering.	Amber	Amber

2.4 PR19 Reconciliation Models

We are required to undertake assurance of Affinity Water's PR19 reconciliation models submitted for the purpose of PR19 "blind year" reconciliation.

Ofwat's Information Notice (IN) 25/01 "Expectations for the PR19 blind year reconciliation" sets out the expectations of how companies should update their reconciliation of the AMP7 incentive mechanisms to reflect actual performance in APR-25. It requires companies to submit PR19 reconciliation models and data tables. It also requires that companies provide supporting commentary summarising the key movements compared to the 2024 Final Determination.

In its email of 12th June 2025 Ofwat further confirmed that it expects all blind year models and tables submitted to be externally assured, and that it expects a proportionate process with assurance over any significant variations, stating:

This includes proportionate assurance over the processes for populating the models and data tables and review of them. We expect the processes for populating the models are similar to those used for PR24 business plans and updated submissions provided alongside company responses to PR24 Draft Determinations. We therefore note that assurers should already have assured previous versions of these models as part of the PR24 process.

We also expect assurance to have been undertaken over any significant variations between actual performance in the blind year submissions and forecast performance included in PR24 Final Determinations to enable us to have confidence in the data submitted in the blind year submissions.

The Company has provided us with copies of all of its PR19 reconciliation models as well as its supporting commentary, methodology and background calculations. We reviewed these models and carried out an audit session with key members of staff.

We reviewed the process followed by the Company in populating these models, from its background calculations to the outputs. We trailed reported model inputs back to the APR tables figures or external sources. The Company presented us with a summary of the variance between the PR24 Final Determination figures and the revised incentives using APR25 actuals. We used this to focus our efforts in a proportionate way on the areas with most significant differences i.e. revenue forecasting incentive, totex cost sharing, RPI-CPIH wedge, strategic water resources, ODI performance and residential retail.

We can confirm that we have undertaken assurance of the models and supporting commentary and that the Company has addressed all of the issues we identified.

Our assurance found that the Company has an excellent process of second line assurance with all model inputs being checked back to source by a separate individual and any variances identified and rectified. This process significantly increased the confidence we have in the Company's models.

We found one small error in the indexing used to rebase expenditure in the strategic water resource cost model. The Company rectified this error immediately. We also asked the Company to add to its explanation of the approach taken to transitional and accelerated expenditure which it has done.

The Company has not amended its ODI calculations for the effects of Covid on PCC. We note that the guidance does not make it clear whether it should or should not be corrected for the effects of Covid on PCC. The Company has clearly stated its assumption in its commentary which we consider to be a reasonable approach.

APPENDIX

Appendix A - Summary of Changes in Company Submission

We have listed below a summary of the impact of changes made as a result of the technical assurance of the Affinity Water's submissions. These changes relate to either or both changes to the Company methodology and the reported data. Their RAG status was at one time either likely to be "Amber" or "Red" but these areas generally have a "Green" status now because the issue(s) identified have been addressed and therefore are no longer likely to represent notable issues or risks.

In total, there have been 15 areas with changes (9 in APR-24, 23 in APR-23, 17 in APR-22, 39 in APR-21) to reported data compared with what was originally presented for audit. If a reporting area is not listed herein, there were no issues identified with the reported data and if any changes to the methodology were suggested, they were only minor improvements to the documentation of the end-to-end processes.

Table 2-3 Summary of Changes to Company Methodology and/or Reported Data

No.	Table, Line and Subject	Changes to Methodology applied	Changes to Reported Data	Reported Data	
				Audit	Final
1	3A.6 Unplanned outage		Peak Week Peak Capacity changes reflected in unplanned outage figure	1.40%	1.45%
2	3D D-MeX quantitative component metric		We identified that the Company had not included SLPM 5/1b in its data table	Not populated	100.00%
3	3E.1 Risk of severe restrictions in a drought	The 2024 methodology stated that Affinity had not formally changed this PC with Ofwat but were planning to once the year 4 APR data was confirmed. There is not any record that this has happened, or that Ofwat has commented on this change of approach. This should be stated in the methodology and commentary and a query to resolve and close this uncertainty should be raised with Ofwat.	The PC value reported needs to be corrected from the annual to the 25-year average value in line with the 2022 revised methodology. The 'in year' figure is 11.9% using the Final Determination original methodology, but the 22.23% from the revised methodology considers risk over the 25-year period.	11.9%	22.23%

4	3I.1 Planned outage		Peak Week Peak Capacity changes reflected in planned outage figure	5.74%	3.70%
5	Capex lines 4D,4F,4J,4L (various)		We challenged the allocation of projects which were subsequently changed to the appropriate category. This has a knock on effect to much of the table content.	Multiple	Multiple
6	4Q.4: New connections 4Q.8: Properties and mains		4Q.4 total properties was entered, not new connections 4Q.8 total volumes calculated incorrectly	2,366 3,400	1,424 3,408
7	4R.17 Total new residential		The Company had installed smart meters and at the time of audit the numbers and impact were unknown. We also identified other meters that had not been reported	Unmeasured No meter 0.435 Basic 0.000 AMR 0.000 Measured Basic 0.459 AMR 11.187 AMI (c) 0.000	Unmeasured No meter 0.422 Basic 0.009 AMR 0.004 Measured Basic 0.447 AMR 11.120 AMI (c) 0.079
8	4R.19 Residential properties billed		The Company had installed smart meters and at the time of audit the numbers and impact were unknown. We also identified other meters that had not been reported	Unmeasured No meter 329.729 Basic 1.333 AMR 44.039 AMI (c) 0.000 Measured Basic 569.417 AMR 515.504 AMI (c) 0.000	Unmeasured No meter 329.632 Basic 0.980 AMR 44.105 AMI (c) 0.384 Measured Basic 565.024 AMR 500.418 AMI (c) 19.479
9	4Z.C Lines related to GSS		Error in C1 sum and also other lines where values from a working version had incorrectly been transposed into Table 4Z.	Multiple lines	Multiple lines

10	6A.28 Peak Week Peak Capacity		Peak Week Peak Capacity revised to satisfy requirement for assessment in last 5 years and other adjustments.	1231.02MI/d	1192.34MI/d
11	6D Meter numbers: 6D.10: Business meters installed and renewed 6D.6 New optant meters 6D.7 New selected meters		We identified mismatch of AMR and Basic meters whilst sampling Incorrect work order coding of a meter installation that was surveyed A property in the sampled data was incorrectly classified as household	Basic 0.038 AMR 1.627 AMR 3,964 AMR 10,696	Basic 0.030 AMR 1.635 AMR 3,962 AMR 10,695
12	6D.21 Residential properties – meter penetration		This line changed as a direct result of the changes to Table 4R	Basic 39.0 AMR 35.3 AMI 0.00	Basic 38.7 AMR 34.3 AMI 1.3
13	6F.1-3 Capex and Opex		6F.1 OPEX post 2024/25 6F.3 OPEX post 2024/25	0.343 2.810	0.272 2.442
14	6F.4 Demand Savings		Challenge on the assumptions used in the reported data to calculate overall demand savings.	117.66	113.75
15	10H Accelerated schemes data capture reconciliation model input for the 12 months ended 31 March 2025		10H.97 Scheme cost 2022-25. Broome (NO ₃) 10H.98 Scheme cost 2022-25. Kingsdown (NO ₃) 10H.99-100 Scheme cost 2022-25. Holywell (PFOS) 10H.101-105 Scheme cost 2022-25. Stortford WQ (NO ₃)	£0.368m £0.530m £0.183m £1.940m	£0.459m £0.621m £0.274m £2.031m

Appendix B - Detailed Scope of Work

Scope of assurance – AMP7 Performance Commitments

Unique Reference	Common performance commitments
PR19AFW_W-A1	3A.1 - Water quality compliance (CRI)
PR19AFW_W-D1	3A.2 - Water supply interruptions
PR19AFW_W-B1	3A.3 - Leakage
PR19AFW_R-B1	3A.4 - Per capita consumption
PR19AFW_W-D4	3A.5 - Mains repairs
PR19AFW_W-D3	3A.6 - Unplanned outage
PR19AFW_W-D2	3E.1 - Risk of severe restrictions in a drought
PR19AFW_R-N3	3E.2-4 - Priority services for customers in vulnerable circumstances
PR19AFW_R-C1	3C - C-MeX
PR19AFW_W-C1	3D - D-MeX

Unique Reference	Bespoke performance commitment
PR19AFW_W-D5a	3E.6 - Average time properties experience low pressure
PR19AFW_R-C2	3E.7 - Customers in vulnerable circumstances satisfied with our service (receiving financial help)
PR19AFW_R-C3	3E.8 - Customers in vulnerable circumstances who found us easy to deal with (receiving financial help)
PR19AFW_W-B2	3A.7 - Environmental innovation - delivery of community projects
PR19AFW_R-C4	3A.8 - Reducing the total number of void properties by identifying false Voids
PR19AFW_W-B3	3A.9 - River restoration
PR19AFW_W-B4	3A.10 - Abstraction reduction
PR19AFW_W-B5	3A.11 - Number of sources operating under the Abstraction Incentive Mechanism
PR19AFW_D5b	3A.12 Properties at risk of receiving low pressure
PR19AFW_W-C2	3A.13 - Number of occupied properties not billed (Gap sites)
PR19AFW_W-N1	3A.14 - Unplanned interruptions to supply over 12 hours
PR19AFW_W-N2	3A.15 - Customer contacts per 1000 population for Water Quality (taste, odour & appearance)
PR19AFW_R-N4	3E.9 - BSI accreditation
PR19AFW_R-N6	3E.10 - IT Resilience
PR19AFW_R-N7	3E.11 Customers in vulnerable circumstances satisfied with our service (receiving non-financial help)
PR19AFW_R-N8	3E.12 - Customers in vulnerable circumstances who found us easy to deal with (receiving non-financial help)
PR19AFW_R-N9	3E.13 - Value for Money Survey
PR19AFW_NEP01	3E.14 - Delivery of water industry national environment programme requirements

Scope of assurance – AMP7 Asset and Financial Data

Subject	Table(s)	Table Line(s)
Accelerated schemes	10H	96-98, 100-104
Average pumping head	5A 6A 6B	23 6, 34 24
Bulk supply volumes, Water treatment volumes	4A 6B	1-52 8-15, 25-29
Business meters installed and renewed	6D	8, 10
Business properties	4R	5-9, 13-16, 18, 23-27
Capex	4D; 4F; 4J; 4L	All
Communication pipe numbers	6C	18-20

Company area	6C	22
Debt	2N	28-49
Energy	5A 6A 6B	24 7, 35 23
Green House Gas (GHG)	11A	All
Guarantee Standard of Service (GSS)	4Z	Section C
Lead communication pies replaced	6C 10F	21 2
Leakage improvements delivering benefits	6D 10F	23 23
Leakage / Per Capita Consumption (PCC)	3F 6B 6D 10F	4-6 4-7, 30-39, 58-67 22, 24-25 21-22
Low pressure	3E 6C	6 25
Mains lengths	4Q 5A 6A 6C 10F	13-14 22 5, 12 1-17 1
Main repairs	3F	1-3
Metering: benefits to supply demand balance	6D 10F	15-20 15-20
NAVS and new connections	4Q	1-12
Number of sources and raw water imports/exports, Number of treatment works and treated water imports/exports	6A	13-39
Population	4R	28-32
PR19 blind year reconciliation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The past delivery data table for the blind year reconciliation • Strategic regional water resources reconciliation model • Updated versions of the following models: • ODI performance • In-period adjustments • Strategic regional water resources • RPI-CPIH wedge 	
Priority services	3F	9
Pumping stations and service reservoirs	5A 6A 6B	9-21 1-4 1-3, 16-22
Raw water abstracted / Transported and imported/exported from third parties	5A 6A	25-28 8-11
Residential meters installed and renewed	6D 10F	6-9, 11-14 3, 5, 7, 9, 11-14
Residential properties	4R 6D	1, 4, 10-12, 17, 19-22 21
Risk of restrictions in a drought	3I	2
Supply interruptions	3F	7
Tariffs	2N	1-27
Treatment - orthophosphate and remedial action	6A	32-33
Unplanned outage	3F 3I 6A	8 1 28-30
Volume of raw water reservoirs, Intake and source pumping stations, Balancing reservoirs and raw water transport stations, Number and	5A	1-8

capacity of service reservoirs and towers, Number and capacity of treated water pumping stations		
Water quality measures	6C	23-24
Water resource capacity and AIM	5A	29
WINEP	5A	30
WRMP reporting activity	6F	1-4

Scope of assurance - Environment Agency – Annual average out-turns (WRMP Annual Review) and Supply Demand Balance Index

Performance report
Supply
Demand
Customers
Population
Metering
Supply-Demand Balance

Scope of assurance – Reports to CCW

Performance report
Metering penetration business
Complaints – Household only
Vulnerable customers
Leakage
Per Capita Consumption
Supply Interruptions
Metering
Water demand

AtkinsRéalis



AtkinsRéalis
Woodcote Grove
Ashley Road
Epsom
Surrey
KT18 5BW

© AtkinsRéalis except where stated otherwise