



**Affinity Water**  
Customer Scrutiny Group

<b>Purpose of Meeting</b>	<b>Customer Scrutiny Group – Meeting 6</b>	
<b>Location</b>	Hub	
<b>Date of Meeting</b>	<b>16<sup>th</sup> September 2015</b>	
<b>Present</b>	Chair: Robin Dahlberg  Adam Warner                      Community Stakeholder Manager David Cheek                      Friends of the Mimram Gill Taylor                         Groundwork Hazel Smith                        GlaxoSmithKline Karen Gibbs                        Consumer Council for Water Tim Charlesworth                Operating Performance Manager Yolanda Rugg                      Herts Chamber of Commerce Jill Thomas                         Independent Consumer Advocate CCW (via video link)	
<b>Presenters</b>	Emma Grigson                    Head of Corporate Affairs Nigel Beaven                      Head of External Communications Richard Aylard                    Thames Tideway Tunnel Tim Charlesworth                Operating Performance Manager Tim Compton                      Social Business Manager Adam Warner                      Community Stakeholder Manager	
<b>Apologies</b>	Damian Williams                Tendring Council David Howarth                    Environment Agency John Fox                            Tendring Council Laura Willoughby                Consumer Council for Water John Rumble                        Environment, Herts County Council Keith Cane                         Town and Country Housing Group (video conference Folkestone)	
<b>Originator</b>	Adam Warner / Fiona Rowe	
<b>No</b>	<b>Notes of Meeting</b>	<b>Action</b>
1	<p><b>Introductions and Apologies</b> The Chair noted apologies for absence and welcomed those present.</p> <p><b>Changes to Affinity Water Business Structure</b> Emma Grigson ran through the updated organisational design of AWL led by Simon Cocks. A copy was distributed to all present. The changes highlighted were the additions of a Managing Director for Wholesale Operations, Andrew Ritchie (joining on 5 October 2015); Director of Customer Relations (Household), Amanda Reynolds (joining on 26 October 2015); Director of Customer Relations (Non-Household), still to be confirmed; Chris Offer as Director of Regulation; and Sue Johnstone as the Director of HR.</p> <p><b>Chairs Report</b> The Chair advised that Ofwat are keen to re-engage with the CCG's and a meeting has been arranged for 7<sup>th</sup> October 2015. Tim Charlesworth advised that in PR14 the CCGs were generally quite successful.</p> <p>RD advised that he has tendered his resignation to the AWL Chairman, Dr Phil Nolan. He said that AWL preferred that the next Chair would ideally be one of their customers. A recruitment agency is currently assisting with this appointment.</p>	

## Customer Scrutiny Group

	<p><b>Actions Log</b> The Chair advised that the December meeting will run from 10am – 4pm due to the number of items to be discussed on the Agenda.</p> <p><b>Regulator Updates</b> <b>Karen Gibbs, CCWater</b> Karen advised that the annual complaints report had been circulated earlier today. Complaints to CCWater have increased by 15%. However, it is now a level playing field as the complaints are measured per 10,000 connections.</p> <p><b>Minutes</b> The minutes from the meeting 17<sup>th</sup> June 2015 were approved and signed.</p>	
2	<p><b>Thames Tideway Tunnel Presentation – Richard Aylard</b></p> <p>A copy of the presentation was circulated. Richard Aylard stated that this project is six times bigger than any other project they have ever embarked on. It runs across 14 London boroughs and will cost £4 billion. The tunnel will be 20 miles long and the width of 3 double decker buses.</p> <p>Ofwat advised the Chair that the costs of this could be separately identified on customers bills. Defra is not in agreement with this.</p> <p>The committee were advised that there are 10 000 people currently on the Thames Water social tariff scheme Water Sure Plus of which 370 are AWL customers. A 50 % discount will be given to people most in need. By 2020 (end of AMP6) this will be 40 000 people.</p> <p>Thames Water have improved their outreach by working collaboratively with debt advice bureaus such as the Citizens Advice Bureau and by making improvements to the form. They believe that the figure for eligible customers is likely to be around 200,000. Thames Water are currently working with a third party company who is assisting with a “one-stop shop” approach to debt advice, and AWL are in turn working closely with Thames Water.</p>	
3	<p><b><u>Regulation Update – Tim Charlesworth</u></b></p> <p><b>CMA – Bristol Water Update</b></p> <p>Bristol Water did not accept Ofwat’s determination, so they appealed to the CMA. They got £50m out of the original £150m originally requested.</p> <p>This has no impact on AWL. The CMA are demanding that Ofwat “do things differently”. A decision is expected in November 2015 which will bring a formal end to PR14.</p> <p><b>Ofwat – Resilience Consultation Response</b></p> <p>This consultation was held to ensure that we have enough water to supply our customers in the future. Bristol Water have stated that they cannot supply the water with what they are currently</p>	TC



**Affinity Water**  
Customer Scrutiny Group

	<p>charging their customers. A customer resilience event is being held in November.</p> <p>Hazel Smith asked if AWL are comfortable with the understanding and interpretation of "Resilience". Tim Charlesworth responded that "yes we are," as demonstrated in our response to Ofwat.</p> <p><b>Water 2020 Summary</b></p> <p><b>Upstream</b> - A review of PR14 was undertaken and an overview of what is going to be done for PR19. The possibility of resources and raw water transport being separated out at a later stage was discussed together with <b>Customer Engagement</b> and the success of the CCG's. However there were concerns with measuring the levels of consistency across the water companies.</p>	<p>CO</p> <p>AW</p>
<p>4</p>	<p><b><u>External Communications Update – Nigel Beaven / Adam Warner</u></b></p> <p><b><u>WSP update</u></b></p> <p>Nigel Beaven updated the group on the Water Saving Programme. Nearly 60,000 letters have been sent out to customers since the start of the programme, and we have received a comparatively low level of complaints.</p> <p>NB said that the programme was behind schedule due to the high number of internal fits. With the opening of a new work stream, we should catch up to the programmes targets within the next 12 months.</p> <p>Around 85% of customer contacts over the phone have been wanted calls. Where we have received unwanted contacts and complaints these have been due to three key things:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Issues with reinstatements</li> <li>• Customers not wanting a meter</li> <li>• Calls regarding no water or perceived reduction in pressure following the fitting of a meter.</li> </ul> <p>These are all areas we are working to improve our teams and our communications.</p> <p>Customers who already have meters are also included in our communications during this programme. This is to drive the take up of Home Water Efficiency Audits and promote water saving,</p> <p>Jill Thomas asked if the written and telephone complaints were the same. NB answered that this was the case.</p> <p>Finally, we are initiating proactive communication in Luton with faith groups. AWL have undertaken significant engagement with councillors in Luton.</p> <p>AWL are also engaging with five schools in central Luton</p> <p><b><u>Customer Bill Research</u></b></p> <p>On the 13<sup>th</sup> of July we ran two focus groups on our annual bills.</p> <p>From this we found that customers liked the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The idea of comparative data</li> <li>• Tips on saving energy and water</li> <li>• The inclusion of infographics</li> </ul>	

	<p>We also found that customers found our bills confusing and did not understand the split between sewerage and freshwater. 60% of customers said they would phone us for a sewerage issue.</p> <p>Customers claimed that they often just threw straight in to the bin other literature included with the bill. David Cheek noted that while this is consistently stated in customer research, but the reality is different. Leaflets included with bills are effective.</p> <p>The conclusion is that we need to improve the design and clarity of our written bills.</p> <p>Hazel Smith asked about online bills and whether we were considering redesigning these. The Chair added that online bills need to be made mobile device friendly.</p> <p>NB responded that we have not started looking at online bill yet, but we will be doing this in future.</p> <p>The Chair stressed the importance of putting the billing period at the top of the bills to ensure customers know exactly what period they are paying for.</p> <p>NB will take comments forward into the planning.</p>	
5	<p><b><u>Egham Incident Communications Review – Emma Grigson / Tim Compton</u></b></p> <p><b>Lessons Learnt: Communicating with customers and stakeholders</b></p> <p>On the first of July, the hottest day of the year, we experienced a burst on our Egham treatment works on a 1000mm raw water main. This led to reduced pressure for several thousand customers and garnered a lot of local media attention.</p> <p>The Chair asked whether this had affected the leakage target for the year.</p> <p>Emma Grigson said that this has not impacted the ODI on leakage as it was a raw water duct, but it has impacted on our interruptions target. This was due to the reduction of pressure in some zones.</p> <p><b>Digital Media</b></p> <p>Tim Compton presented a review of the communications that went on throughout the incident, highlighting the effectiveness and importance of digital engagement. There were 700 direct mentions online to the incident which compares to the normal average of 800 in a month. There were 12,000 visits to our incident web page during the incident, and we received over 3,000 calls with the majority of those hanging up once they had listened to the pre-recorded message. The incident proved that most customers get their information from the web.</p> <p>A new approach which was taken was to include pictures of the incident to give customers an idea of scale. Customers using the web responded very well to this as it gave context to the burst. These pictures went up after 2 days, and we found that this really had an impact on improving sentiment in messages directed at the company.</p> <p>Customers were sharing and retweeting our information highlighting the importance of putting information up quickly and making it accessible.</p> <p>Another change in approach centred around the adoption of a more informal style which again improved customer sentiment in their messages.</p>	

	<p>We carried on updating on the web twice daily and also updated councillors, MPs and key stakeholders in the area.</p> <p>The Chair asked what the key lessons learned from the incident were.</p> <p>Beyond lessons learned around speed, tone and content, there were 200 action points taken from the incident on both communications and operational sides</p> <p>The Chair also asked specifically about lessons on the engineering side.</p> <p>We will be improving resilience on site and engaging with the suppliers of specific types of pipes to reduce the lead in times during emergencies.</p> <p>The incident has also helped us identify key people in the organisation and made us think more deeply about succession planning.</p>	
6	<p><b><u>Community Reporting Dashboards – Adam Warner</u></b></p> <p>Adam Warner presented a draft of the community reporting dashboards to the group.</p> <p>The aim of the dashboards is to inform customers about AWL’s performance against the ODIs and to allow them to compare the company’s performance in their community against that in other AWL communities.</p> <p>AW showed where the dashboards would sit on the website, how they might look and talked the group through example wording before opening discussion and feedback. The group were also told the timeline for delivery, with December/January being the target date for publication. An online panel has been planned for November to test the look and feel with a customer group.</p> <p>The group agreed that the dashboard was right in terms of its content and approach. The comments focused on style and presentation of the information to make it more customer friendly.</p> <p>The key points that came out of the session were the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tone needs to be more customer friendly</li> <li>• The layout is too text heavy</li> <li>• It is difficult to see what constitutes good performance</li> <li>• The group wanted the community and company data to be integrated.</li> </ul> <p>Jill Thomas recommended that we look at SSE’s performance dashboard and questioned whether we were trying to do too much in the first iteration.</p> <p>AW will distribute the next version of the dashboard for comment prior to the next meeting.</p>	
7	<p><b><u>Any Other Business</u></b></p> <p>The meeting in December will run until 16:00 as there will be a substantial agenda.</p>	
8	<p><b><u>Next meeting</u></b></p>	

  
**Affinity Water**  
Customer Scrutiny Group

Wednesday, 2 <sup>nd</sup> December at the Hub, Hatfield	
----------------------------------------------------------	--

Minutes of CSG 16<sup>th</sup> September 2015

Approved by: *Ron Wilson*

Date: 2 December 2015