



Affinity Water Customer Challenge Group

Report on the customer and stakeholder engagement for the revised draft Water Resources Management Plan 2019

31 May 19

Introduction

This is a report for Affinity Water giving the views of a sub-group of the Customer Challenge Group (CCG) on the consultation with customers and stakeholders that underpins the revised draft Water Resources Management Plan (rdWRMP).

Members of the sub-group were:

Teresa Perchard (Chair of the CCG)

Jon Sellars (Environment Agency)

Karen Gibbs (Consumer Council for Water)

David Cheek (independent member of the CCG)

The sub-group has met with the company staff managing this project four times between November 2018 and May 2019. In addition, we have dealt with a range of issues – for example drafts of survey material and consultation collateral – outside of meetings. Attached to this report is a list of all the documents we have reviewed (Annex A) and the comments we have given (Annex B). As can be seen from Annex B the CCG members have engaged at a fairly granular level of detail with questions and drafting of information being presented to customers and stakeholders.

We have also observed customer research focus groups and attended a Stakeholder Assembly held by the company as part of its consultation exercise. We have sought to work constructively with the company in a spirit of collaboration to improve the consultation process providing advice and challenge. We have also been asked to provide an opinion on the process followed, which is the primary purpose of this report.

The rest of this report summarises:

- The background to our task/brief
- Our views on the questions the company has asked us to consider
- The issues we have raised with the company and the advice we have given.

We have focussed on the **quality and effectiveness of the customer and stakeholder engagement the company has deployed**. We have not sought to evaluate or form a view on the technical options the rdWRMP proposes, or whether the data and analysis those options are based on is correct, or sufficient. We consider those questions are for others, including the regulators. We have noted the positive response from the Environment Agency (EA) that notwithstanding some aspects and assumptions which need reviewing:

‘The company has improved its plan significantly as a result of its first consultation and it has responded positively to government aspirations. Affinity Water’s revised draft plan addresses most of the points made in our

representation. The reporting is extremely clear and concise. Affinity Water has improved its resilience, options assessment, customer engagement and included changes to ensure abstraction is sustainable.'

In addition to areas which the EA has highlighted require attention we also note that Ofwat's response to the company says:

*'While we welcome the improvements set out in the revised draft plan, we are still concerned that the plan does not provide sufficient evidence that it delivers in the best interest of customers in several areas, including regional co-ordination and strategic solution planning; consideration of all available options; and the validity of some of its planning assumptions.'*¹

We expect the Board will wish to seek assurance that concerns raised by these regulatory bodies in response to the consultation are addressed.

Annex A lists the documents we have received and reviewed as part of our work.

Annex B lists the queries and challenges we have raised and the company responses. Notes of our meetings with the company on 20 November 2018, 6 December 2018, 11 February 2019 and 13 May 2019 are available on request.

Background

Water companies in England and Wales must produce a water resources management plan (WRMP) every 5 years that shows how they will provide a secure supply of water to their customers over a 25-year period, at an affordable price without damaging the environment.

On 19 March 2018 Affinity Water published a draft Water Resources Management Plan (dWRMP) for the period 2020 – 2080 following the approval of the Secretary of State. However, in its draft Business Plan ² for the period 2020-25 Affinity Water said that during 2018/19 it would be undertaking further consultation with the public on its Water Resources Management Plan (WRMP), with the intention of submitting a **revised** plan (rdWRMP) to the Secretary of State in Spring 2019. We understand this decision was prompted by challenges posed by the Environment Agency and Ofwat, the regulators.

During Autumn 2018 work was undertaken by the company to produce a rdWRMP, and a further public consultation with customers and stakeholders took place between 1 March and 26 April 2019 on the revised elements of the plan. More information about this and the published documents can be found on the company website.³

In November 2018 Affinity Water asked its independent Customer Challenge Group (CCG) to help the process of developing the rdWRMP by establishing a sub-group of members to review and advise on the company's proposed approach to the rdWRMP

¹ Affinity Water – revised draft water resources management plan 2019, David Black, 26 April 2019

² **Draft Business Plan 3 September 2018** – https://c88d1e33bf5fc84aff94-78b79c2eaff604e780b80bec40f24d05.ssl.cf3.rackcdn.com/AFW_Business_Plan_2020_to_2025.pdf

³ <https://stakeholder.affinitywater.co.uk/water-resources.aspx>

customer and stakeholder engagement and consultation. The Working Group was expected to act in an advisory capacity to provide ongoing and ad-hoc expertise to the company in the development of its customer and stakeholder consultation and engagement plans. The Working Group was also asked to independently evaluate the proposed consultation method and approaches; evaluate how customer insight was incorporated into the Plan; and assess the need for any new or different consultation and/or research.

The company asked the Group to give views on the following issues in relation to the rdWRMP:

- a) Whether the company has a genuine understanding of its customers' priorities, needs and requirements in relation to the issues of long-term water resource issues?
- b) Whether customer insight and engagement, including with stakeholders, on these areas has been appropriate and informed the company's final WRMP proposals?
- c) Whether there is evidence of ongoing, two way and transparent customer engagement on long-term water resource issues?
- d) Whether the company has engaged customers effectively and appropriately on any relevant future/long term issues relating to water resources?

Summary

- Overall the company has secured a significantly greater level of engagement and participation in its rdWRMP consultation exercise than it did for the dWRMP exercise in 2017/18 with 827 individual responses received to the consultation compared to 82 in 2017/18.
- Customers and stakeholders' responses shows strong support (c77%/80%) for the rdWRMP plan overall and 77% of the 662 online consultation responses – most of which are from individual customers - supported the view that the rdWRMP allows the company to adapt to uncertainties and deliver solutions.
- Across both surveys – including customers and stakeholders - there was strong support for reducing leakage, reducing customer consumption of water and investing in new water resource solutions if required.
- We consider the company has gathered good evidence which enables it to understand its *customers'* priorities, needs and requirements in relation to the issues of long-term water resource issues.
- We also consider the company has, broadly, engaged customers effectively and appropriately on future/long term issues relating to water resources. The company has been transparent in publishing its plans, and has sought to make the presentation accessible to a wide range of people from individual customers to informed stakeholders. CCG members' advice on this has been acted on and appears to have significantly enhanced the effectiveness of the exercise.
- Overall It seems to us that customer insight and engagement, including with stakeholders, has **informed** the company's final WRMP proposals.
- The company has set out a high-level plan and approach for continued engagement with customers and stakeholders. This is important in view of the 'adaptive' nature of the rdWRMP. Key decisions about strategic investment in water resources to meet demand are yet to be made but the plan outlines the process by which those decisions will be arrived at. The CCG would be happy to advise the company further on the detail of the customer and stakeholder engagement plan that will accompany the implementation of the agreed WRMP and the ongoing decision process.

Our report makes some additional comments and recommendations for the company relating to ensuring it has the capability to communicate with all customers by email in future when their views on strategic issues, like water resources, are being sought.

Our views on the questions the company has asked us to consider

At the time of writing the sub-group has seen the following information about the company's engagement and consultation with customers and stakeholders:

- Results of a representative survey of 1000 customers conducted by Ipsos Mori in March 2019 and a report from two waves of qualitative focus group discussions which preceded this, also facilitated by Ipsos Mori.⁴ CCG members observed the focus group sessions held in December 2018 and January 2019.
- A draft and final version of the 'Triangulation' report produced for the company by Ove Arup which includes summaries of the consultation and engagement activities and key 'findings'⁵
- A presentation from the company for us on the volume and nature of responses received to its consultation with customers and stakeholders about the rdWRMP.
- A draft extract from the fWRMP summarising the further consultation process conducted by the company, including the marketing and communication activities used.⁶
- Responses from Consumer Council for Water, Ofwat and the Environment Agency.
- Some primary research analysis including results mentioned in Arup's Triangulation report (ICS Willingness to Pay research Spring 2019 and Blue Marble 'Customer Perception' analysis of the Value for Money survey data Spring 2019)
- Draft extract from the rdWRMP submission listing the changes made to the proposals in response to points raised by stakeholders and consumers in the consultation⁷
- Draft extract from the rdWRMP outlining future plans for engagement with stakeholders and consumers as the plan is implemented (the 'Monitoring Plan')⁸

We note that the company has secured a significantly greater level of customer and stakeholder engagement to its consultation on the rdWRMP than it did in 2017/18 for its initial dWRMP. As set out on pages 12 and 13 of the Triangulation report this included

- a representative survey of 1000 customers was conducted by Ipsos Mori
- **662** people responded to an online survey about the rdWRMP. Of these we understand that 85% responses were from individual customers, the majority

⁴ Ipsos Mori report – detail.

⁵ WRMP and Business Plan Programme – Triangulation Report: Revised Draft Water Resources Management Plan Consultation– Versions of 10 May and the final version at 23 May 2019 also circulated to the sub-group

⁶ The company has also shared with us some underlying detail about the responses to the online survey including an analysis of postcodes of respondents to show that although self selecting in nature responses have come from all three of the company's supply areas.

⁷ This material was circulated to the CCG Chair on 28 May

⁸ This material was circulated to the CCG Chair on 28 May.

of those customer responses (66%) having been prompted by individual emails the company sent to just under 26,000 of its customers informing them about the consultation exercise and how they could take part.

- **165** individuals and organisations including 9 individual customers, local councils and regulators responded to the consultation exercise by providing written responses. We understand that around 125 of these individual responses were from customers of Thames Water living in the area likely to be affected by plans for the South East Strategic Reservoir.

A total of 827 responses to the consultation is ten times the volume of responses. the first dWRMP consultation exercise in 2017/18. The significant number of responses from individual customers is notable.

In addition to the above structured evidence gathering a series of 1 -1 meetings with individual stakeholders were held and 59 people attended a Stakeholder Assembly event in April representing 48 different organisations

Overall the company has secured a significantly greater level of engagement and participation in its rdWRMP consultation exercise than it did for the dWRMP exercise in 2017/18.

As highlighted in the Triangulation Report (p20) 80% of customers surveyed support or tend to support the rdWRMP plan overall and 77% of the 662 online consultation responses supported the view that the rdWRMP allows the company to adapt to uncertainties and deliver solutions.

Across both surveys⁹ – including customers and stakeholders - there was strong support for reducing leakage, reducing customer consumption of water and investing in new water resource solutions if required.

However, when the views of customers alone are considered, their support for the proposed plan is slightly lower than the overall result, at around 70% for most elements, and lower, at 60% for the increase in bills proposed. This difference is something the company will need to bear in mind as it progresses with the proposed plan and as the costs of the different strategic options/proposals become firmer.

We also note the Triangulation report suggests that the significant minority of customers or stakeholders who did not support the proposed plan were either sceptical about the realism of the projected customer demand reductions or were unhappy about the proposal to construct a reservoir adjacent to the Thames River (South East Strategic Reservoir).

We have reviewed and noted the response from Consumer Council for Water which is positive about the difference between the first dWRMP consultation and that just undertaken:

'Although we do not feel that customer insight was used from the beginning to determine the options in the initial dWRMP, we are more reassured that the improved customer engagement in the pre consultation has meant that the revised dWRMP is

⁹ The Ipsos Mori survey and the online survey

*closer to satisfying customer's expectations. The company has used the opportunity of resubmitting their dWRMP to answer the concerns raised and make changes to demand management and strategic supply options.'*¹⁰

On the substance of the company's current proposals Consumer Council for Water is supportive of both the adaptive plan approach and closer/collaborative working with other water companies in the South East region. We have also noted the response from the EA, mentioned above.

Having considered all the above, and particularly the quantity of evidence and responses Affinity Water has secured from individual customers, we consider the company has a good evidence base which enables it to understand its customers' priorities, needs and requirements in relation to the issues of long-term water resource issues. The representative survey of customers undertaken by Ipsos Mori is particularly important in this regard, as is the significantly greater volume of customer (and stakeholder) responses to the consultation about the rdWRMP compared to the dWRMP exercise in 2017/18. In addition, the company has a significant evidence base of customer insight research conducted for the PR19 process underpinning its business plan, which included very strong customer support for the high level outcomes of that plan.

We also consider **the company has, broadly, engaged customers effectively and appropriately on future/long term issues relating to water resources.** For example, the company has undertaken independent representative research, distributed information about the consultation exercise to just under 26,000 individual customers by email, as well as circulating leaflets and producing other 'one to many' communications on social media.

We were advised that the emails to individual customers secured an open rate of 52% suggesting the presentation of the issue attracted the interest of a significant proportion of customers and 559 customers completed the individual online survey response as a result, accounting for most of the response to the online survey about the consultation. We strongly advocated that the company contacted customers individually and understand they hold 500,000 email addresses but that a requirement for manual intervention meant it was not feasible for more than just under 26,000 emails to be issued on this occasion. **We hope that the customer response to this channel provides the company with strong evidence that it would make sense to put itself in a position to be able to email all its customers without manual intervention being required.**

We have not seen a full draft of the Company's 'statement of response' to the representations it has received but have seen a summary of the main changes the company is making to the rdWRMP compared to the consultation.¹¹ In the main the significant changes seem to be responses to the EA and Ofwat, GARD and a local

¹⁰ CCWater response to Affinity Water consultation on rdWRMP, x date

¹¹ Draft table/summary sent to the CCG by email on 28 May

Council. They include a more challenging aspiration in relation to leakage reduction between 2020 and 2025 (to reduce leakage by 50% in that period) than was proposed between 2015 and 2045 initially proposed. The company also says it has included a River Thames ‘trading option’ in response to EA and Ofwat comments and provided more explanation and clarification of its methods and the approach it will take to future decisions on the strategic options within the plan. It was also evident from the qualitative focus groups with customers that they found the strategic option involving the use of existing infrastructure (Grand Union Canal particularly) very appealing in principle, and we understand the company is continuing to consider and investigate this development as a strategic solution for the future. **From this it seems to us that insight and engagement, including with stakeholders, and customers, has informed the company’s final WRMP proposals.**

Finally, we were asked to comment if there is evidence of ongoing, two way and transparent customer engagement on long-term water resource issues. Up to this point **the company has been transparent in publishing its plans, and has sought to make the presentation accessible to a wide range of people from individual customers to informed stakeholders.** The question of whether the engagement with customers and stakeholders **is** ongoing seems to us to be a matter for the future. Given the level and nature of response it has received, and its ‘adaptive plan’ approach to the rdWRMP it appeared to us that the company will need to continue to engage with customers and stakeholders as its WRMP is implemented. This is because most of the significant decisions required are yet to be made as a variety of options remain on the table with firm decisions to be made in future years.

We have been briefed that the company has plans for continued engagement with stakeholders and customers including the [re] establishment of a Chalk Rivers Partnership, establishing a Partnership for Managing Growth and Demand and including the WRMP within future customer consultation and engagement in plans for Citizen Assemblies. We would be happy to review the plans for these future engagement activities in more detail and advise the company on whether they are likely to be sufficient and effective.

The issues we have raised with the company

Annex B lists the queries, challenges and advice we have given to the company during this process and how they have responded. The main areas of challenge and advice from us have been about the approach to communications and research.

We strongly advocated to the company that they set ambitious targets for the volume of responses to the consultation and that the collateral materials (emails, video, marketing materials) relating to the consultation should emphasise very clearly, and starkly, the significance of the water resource challenge faced by the company and the need for decisions and action – creating a clear ‘burning platform’ that might

encourage more engagement and response from customers and stakeholders. A greater level of response will provide stronger legitimacy for the company's plans.

Members of the group helped the company by contributing specific drafting and presentational suggestions which were by and large taken on board. We believe the benefits of creating clear and impactful messages are clear from the high open rate to company emails to customers about the rdWRMP consultation, and the relatively high number of individual customer responses to the consultation paper.

We also strongly advocated that in addition to its 'one to many' communications (press release, social media etc) the company email all of its c500k customers, for whom it has an email address telling them about the consultation on the rdWRMP. The company distributed emails to just under 26k customers. We strongly advocate that for future exercises a larger number of emails are circulated.

Finally, we challenged the company to commission representative quantitative research with customers in addition to the qualitative focus group discussions that formed part of its initial customer engagement plan for the rdWRMP. We consider that although the eventual consultation exercise did generate a fairly large number of responses from customers this could not have been guaranteed, and is in any case a self selecting and unrepresentative sample. Taking the step to secure a representative survey with customers on the rdWRMP was in our view a significant and necessary boost to the evidence of customer engagement underpinning the revised plan.

Teresa Perchard

Chair

Customer Challenge Group

31 May 2019

Annex A

Documentation Shared with CCG for the rdWRMP

Ref	Items	Author	Status	Date circulated	Discussion forum	Record
1	Draft Water Resources Management Plan 2019 - Statement of Response	AWL	Final	15/10/2018	Quarterly meeting Oct 18	minutes of meeting
2	Revised dWRMP –approach to further consultation	AWL	Final			
3	rdWRMP 2018_Pre Consultation Method Statement_V4	Ipsos Mori	Draft	14/11/2018	sub group meeting 20th Nov 18	minutes of meeting and rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
4	rdWRMP consultation paper v final	AWL	Final			
5	rdWRMP sub group meeting schedule	AWL	Draft			
6	revised rdWRMP Awareness campaign plan 4 Dec 18 v2	AWL	Draft	05/12/2018	sub group meeting 6th Dec 18	minutes of meeting
7	rdWRMP non tech summary v30.11.18	AWL	Draft	05/12/2018		
8	rdWRMP timeline Dec 18	AWL	Draft	05/12/2018		
9	Revised draft ToR CCG WRMP working group	AWL	Draft	15/01/2019	e-mail for review	comments via e-mail
10	rdWRMP Consultation and Timeline Summary Jan 19	AWL	Draft	15/01/2019	e-mail for review - updates following Board meeting	comments via e-mail
11	rdWRMP technical plan(board item 2.1)	AWL	Final			
12	rdWRMP consultation video storyboard 01	AWL/Campaign Works	Draft	25/01/2019	sub group e-mail for review	rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses

13	rdWRMP - Method statement for the on line customer survey	Ipsos Mori	Final	29/01/2019	sub group e-mail for review	rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
14	1. rdWRMP WG minutes 6-12-18 v final	AWL	Final	06/02/2019	sub group meeting 11th Feb 19	minutes of sub group meeting & rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
15	2. CCG WG ToR Jan 19 tracked changes 2	AWL	Draft			
16	4. WRMP Timeline_Jan 2019	AWL	Final			
17	5i. Stakeholder engagement	AWL	Draft			
18	5ii. rdWRMP pre consultation customer focus Groups 2 - Report	Ipsos Mori	Final			
19	5iii. 2019-02-05 rdWRMP Triangulation report	Arup	Final			
20	6i. rdWRMP Further consultation campaign 6Feb 2019	AWL	Draft			
21	6ii. Video Storyboard	AWL/Campaign Works	Draft			
22	6iii. drWRMP consultation leaflet A5	AWL	Draft			
23	6iv. Non Tech summary content version draft 3	AWL	Draft			
24	6vi. Further consultation questions v8	AWL	Draft	08/02/2019	sub group meeting 11th Feb 19	minutes of sub group meeting & rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
25	6v. draft customer survey	Ipsos Mori	Draft			

26	Further consultation questions v13	AWL	Draft	15/02/2019	e-mail to sub group for review	rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
27	rdWRMP customer on line survey_V13	Ipsos Mori	Draft	25/02/2019	e-mail to sub group for review	rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
28	rdWRMP further consultation Stakeholder Engagement timetable	AWL	Final	06/03/2019	e-mail to sub group to note	comments via e-mail
29	WRMP update (for all members)	AWL	Final	08/03/2019	Quarterly meeting 13 March 19	minutes of meeting
30	rdWRMP further consultation update 020419	AWL	Final	2/04/19	Update via e-mail	rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
31	Ipsos MORI rdWRMP customer survey report	Ipsos Mori	Final	12/04/19	e-mail to sub group for review	rdWRMP table of collated comments and responses
32	rdWRMP CCG Challenges and responses summary v2	AWL	Final	09/05/2019	e-mail to sub group for review	Comment at sub group meeting and reflect in CCG report
33	rdWRMP Draft Triangulation Report Draft 2.1	Arup	Draft	10/05/19	For review at sub-group meeting – 13 th May 19	Minutes of meeting and comments reflected in CCG report
34	Business Plan WTP study report	ICS Consulting	Final	13/5/19	For review, requested additional information at sub group meeting 13 th May 19	Comments via e-mail and reflected in CCG report
35	Affinity Water Customer Perception survey 2018-19 Annual report draft 29-4-19	Blue Marble	Draft			
36	Ofwat Response to Affinity Water Revised draft WRMP19 consultation	Ofwat	Final			
37	CCW Response to AFW rdWRMP Consultation April 2019 final	CCW	Final			
38	Status of responses as at 1st May 2019	AWL	Draft			
39	Communications Campaign	AWL	Draft			
40	On line consultation findings 15 May 2019 v3	Ipsos Mori	Final	20/5/19	e-mail to sub group for review	Comments via e-mail and reflected in CCG report

41	Statement of Response section - further consultation process Draft	AWL	Draft			
42	Minutes from sub group meeting 13-5-19	AWL	Final	20/5/19	e-mail to sub group	Comments reflected in CCG report
43	Revised Triangulation Report	Arup	Final	28/5/19	e-mail to sub group for review – includes feedback from May sub group meeting	Comments reflected in CCG report
44	Copy of triangulation report feedback – Arup response	AWL	Final	28/5/19	e-mail to sub group – response to queries	Comments reflected in CCG report

Annex B

List of queries, challenges and company response – to 9 May 2019

Feedback from	Feedback	Action taken
rdWRMP Further consultation questions feedback February 2019		
David Cheek	Tracked changes made on Word document	Largely incorporated.
Teresa Perchard	Overall having a very short online questionnaire is helpful/more likely to be filled in by people who are non-experts – though you might want to give more space for free text comments for those people who are fairly well informed but find the opportunity to fill in an online form appealing. So don't make the comments boxes text limit too small.	This has been incorporated.
	David's suggestion to put the overall approach question upfront makes sense.	This is now Question 1.
	In addition to 'what is your reason' for your response you could include space for 'any other comments' on each question/topic – i.e. leakage. You might also look at structuring it so that 'do you agree' is 'is this acceptable to you' and the 'not acceptables' could have different reasons to select.	We will consider this.
	Will you be gathering any identity or profile information from respondents – i.e. whether they are customers or responding on behalf of a group interested in the issues? If so it would probably be helpful to know where they live.	These questions are already included.
	Will you be asking respondents if they would like any more information on any topics – and if they would like to receive any information regularly from the company. This could be an opportunity to sign up people to receiving more communication, and to updating your stakeholder mailing list.	We will consider this.
	When people have completed the survey what do they get – i.e. is there a 'thank you' and confirmation of your submission page? And will they be sent something when the plan is submitted to government? Also do you need to ask people if they are happy to be listed as a respondent in the analysis you do of the consultation etc.	This is already included.

Jon Sellars	Tracked changes made on Word document	Largely incorporated.
Karen Gibbs	Tracked changes made on Word document	Largely incorporated.
rdWRMP Non-technical summary feedback February 2019		
Teresa Perchard	Population growth – do these assumptions take account of the ageing population? How much is the growth reflecting that demographic change or other factors.	
	Drought – last line instead of ‘under this circumstance’ make it clear that this is in the event of a drought or to meet the standard.	Change made.
	How much water do we use? – I suggest amend to read ‘Affinity water customers use an average of 152 litres of water per person per day. This is higher than the national average consumption [for England and Wales] of 141 litres per person per day’. [Query which year is this data from?] At end after the line on supporting customers spell out what you are doing already on this – it’s all a bit vague/non-specific.	Change made.
	4 th line from bottom insert ‘will’ after ‘we’	Change made.
	<p>Charts. I like these BUT the scales are not consistent either on the vertical or horizontal axis – thus on South east the 4Mld shortfall in ?2080 looks to be equivalent to 25% of the 256 MI/d shortfall for Central region. Your colleagues were concerned about scales of the horizontal axis where time period points are not clear and some are more concentrated than others.</p> <p>Various other points on the charts, including very steep incline projections ‘post’ 2080 in all of them. For example, that suggests population in the East will double in an undefined period post 2080.</p> <p>There is no start year shown etc.</p> <p>Confusing to use same colour/shade key for excess water and ‘excess’ of water supply. All that could be tightened up.</p> <p>Explain ‘Central’ and ‘South east’ – what are they?</p>	<p>Changes made.</p> <p>Changes made.</p> <p>Images show key points in time over the plan.</p> <p>Changes made.</p> <p>Text add to explain this.</p>

	<p>However, the idea of the charts is good and much simpler than the materials used in stakeholder presentations last year. Having clear charts which show the nature/extent of supply deficit will help you explain the problem to a variety of audiences.</p> <p>Some may wonder why they say, 'no long term climate change impact on supply'....</p> <p>Query if the Central chart shows the impact that metering is expected to have on the deficit or if the deficit is after all measures you are presently committed to have been taken?</p>	<p>Images show supply/balance position if do nothing.</p>
	<p>'They told us that we should...' then list works better:</p>	<p>Change made.</p>
	<p>Did you get any messages about the cost?</p>	<p>Overall cost of the whole plan will be included.</p>
	<p>Discussion of 'adaptive plan' should include something about the risk of not committing soon enough if major construction works are involved to deliver the solution.</p>	<p>Added.</p>
	<p>Query on leakage – how does the stated targets fit with PR19 decisions and Ofwats response? When will the SMART meters be installed by?</p>	<p>This will be consistent.</p>
	<p>Discussion of different schemes partic reservoir and canal – is the company doing both these or are they alternatives? This implies both could happen. Include information about when those would have to be delivering by at the latest and what the likely cost would be and implications for customer bills.</p>	<p>Clarified. Overall cost of the whole plan will be included.</p>
	<p>What does 'new chalk groundwater options' actually mean? This could be redrafted to improve understanding for a non-technical audience. Does it mean you propose to protect natural water resources by not increasing the number of places where you draw water from the local environment? What does it mean?</p>	<p>Clarified.</p>

David Cheek	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introduction sounds like the usual customer service questionnaire and does not dramatise the problem to really engage the viewer 2. I think there is too long on the current situation 3. The call to action at the end is very weak. 	See below.
David Cheek	<p>Suggested re-write:</p> <p>“We all face a problem. By 2080 there will not be enough water unless we change. And we would like your views on what we do.</p> <p>At the moment we supply 900 mlpd to 3.6m people and businesses.</p> <p>We depend on rain and rivers for our water. But we are already one of the driest areas of the UK and the effects of climate change will make it worse.</p> <p>Plus, experts expect 51% more people in our area by 2080. So there will be a shortfall of water (show graph – just household & water availability. Delete notes etc)</p> <p>And we need to be ready for a drought. And also protect the rare chalk streams in our area. So what should we do?</p> <p>Well, we all need to use less water. Currently, on average, we each use 151mlpd. The national average is 141 but some parts of our region already only use 126.</p> <p>We plan to help households achieve this. And we plan to reduce leakage.</p> <p>But that alone will not be enough. So we need to find extra water from somewhere.</p> <p>So we are planning to build a reservoir or use recycled effluent water and, where possible, carry the water to our region using rivers or canals. The water would then be treated to the current high standard.</p>	<p>Incorporated.</p> <p>Incorporated.</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>We need to show the difference in population for all 3 regions due to the variations in these. The graph presents regionally so not possible to use this here. Will be used in Non-technical summary and main plan. An improved version has been produced.</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>Incorporated. Have not included the reference to 126 due to time available.</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>Incorporated an edited down version of this due to time available.</p>

	<p>We will work to protect and improve the rare chalk streams and their environments.</p> <p>And importantly, we will work with other water companies to solve the problem.</p> <p>But what do you think of our plans? Tell us your views? Visit our website now and fill in the short questionnaire to help us provide water for the next generations. Thank you”</p>	<p>Incorporated</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>Incorporated</p>
Jon Sellars	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Could you illustrate in the film what 152l/p/d looks like so people can understand how much this figure equates to and also highlight that this is one of the highest PCC in the country. 2. In the solutions, no mention of future working with developers/retrospective fitting of water saving appliances and systems. 3. I would like to see a mention of ‘We will make sure there is enough water for the environment and future generations’ 4. ‘helping customers to reduce the amount of water they use’ and ‘improving awareness of the need to save water’ are very similar, could they be combined? 	<p>Incorporated</p> <p>This is not a key element of our preferred plan so not included.</p> <p>Incorporated</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
Teresa Perchard	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I don’t think I can add any comments to those you have had. I think David’s suggestions to you are really about bringing forward the burning platform question of having significantly less water to go round in future to the start of this very short opportunity to get people’s attention. And making it more prominent and attention grabbing. 2. Will there be any incentives/rewards for people who watch it and/or complete a response etc? 3. Will you use it to increase your stakeholder mailing list and permissions to contact people or involve them more going forwards? 	<p>Incorporated</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Yes, collected if they complete the survey and choose to provide this.</p>
David Cheek	The video works well. The only improvement I would suggest, if you have time, is to get the	Unfortunately, we are not able to re-record the

	voice over artiste to a greater variety in her delivery tone. While it is very earnest, it is also quite 'sing song' and so it's easy to lose the argument.	voiceover due to time available
Jon Sellars	I like the video, it's a clear and succinct message (although the lady in the animation has an odd walk)!	Animation on moving people has now been finalised.
rdWRMP Customer online survey (Ipsos Mori) feedback February 2019		
David Cheek	I think the intro should very clearly state 'Unless we do something, there will not be enough water, naturally' to get people answering the questions in context. At the moment the proposal is that the respondent works through the numbers and comes to this conclusion. I don't believe they will. So I believe we should make the conclusion for them.	Incorporated.
	Should there be mention of a reservoir in the info box about the canal transfer?	No – this has been removed
	I thought whole numbers are easier to understand than fractions – so it is better to say £425,000 rather than £0.425 million	Change made.
	Why not mention Thames as the sewerage provider, rather than being coy?	We have included refence to all the sewerage providers – Thames, Southern and Anglian.
November Meeting – Phase 1		
	KG suggested that customers were prompted for pros and cons for each solution.	Included.
	JS suggested comparisons to national average would be helpful when talking about the current PCC levels.	Included.
	KG commented that the context setting could be clearer in the proposal. DC felt that this message needed to be strong and direct, telling customers of the supply demand issues in simple terms. This could be done through a few bullet points which would combine some of the slides, e.g. population growth, climate change, supply demand deficit. The group suggested reviewing and using anything that Thames had used successfully	Included.
	DC requested that environmental groups such as HMWT were included in the pre-consultation stakeholder engagement.	Included.

	DC suggestion to ask people at the customer focus groups if they would be interested in taking part in future WRMP work and if they would like to receive a copy of the focus group findings – this would include Awareness campaign	This was done and customers from the January focus groups were emailed regarding the further consultation.
	Again, it was proposed that the campaign is kept simple and maximising existing channels of communications, social media, website. DC suggested a video/animation < 3 mins but need to be mindful of audience and align language accordingly. DC asked if there was an option to raise awareness through messaging on the bill/leaflet? (Thames Water had used this opportunity).	The campaign focused on these channels and a video was developed. Additional channels were also used to reach those not online i.e. leaflet and local print media. This was investigated but was not possible.
	DC suggested that we may be able to alert customers through text/e-mail.	Just under 25,000 customers were contacted by email.
December Meeting - Phase 1/Campaign		
	TP suggested that 'further consultation' is renamed 'final consultation'. This will be considered but is the term we have used in our Business Plan and Statement of Response. It also aligns with Thames Water's terminology	It was decided not to rename to keep consistent with the Business Plan and Statement of Response.
	Suggestion to split the 'Ongoing Stakeholder Engagement' box at the bottom of the timeline to reflect Pre and Further consultation activity.	Done.
	It was asked if we could engage with customers who have already had contact with us i.e. via complaints.	This was investigated but was not possible
	Feedback was that the number of customers being engaged will be low. Need to consider undertaking some quantitative research for Phase 2 or running more focus groups or undertaking some other forms of engagement. The tight timescales to achieve this were acknowledged. EM to look at what options are available and discuss with Ipsos Mori.	A representative online survey was undertaken with 1000 customers. Delivered by Ipsos Mori.
	Recommendation to include a target for the total number of further consultation responses from customers and stakeholders as this is the overall aim of the campaign. This was agreed.	A target of 100 was set. 662 achieved via online survey.
	It was also felt that the 'Impact measurement' targets could be higher and that things like	These were not included as targets but were monitored

	opening emails or newsletters could be added as measurements	and results will be included in the Statement of Response.
	It was suggested to add a 'How did you hear about this consultation' response box to the on line further consultation form as this would be useful to measure impact of the campaign.	This was added and results will be useful going forward.
	Sending a letter to those customers who we don't hold emails for was discussed. The cost of this option was prohibitive, but it was agreed to investigate production of a leaflet	14000 leaflets were distributed across the supply area.
February Meeting – Phase 2		
	TP suggested that a “pop up” window appeared when a customer logs into My Account	This was not actioned but is a good idea to implement for future consultations and campaigns.
	TP asked if the communication could be shared though the education centre work to involve future customers	It was felt we had already undertaken substantial research at draft plan with future customers (over 800).
	DC asked if there was an opportunity to include a communication with the Bill.	This was not possible due to timescales.